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A: Unit Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses

B: Historical and Current Context

App. B1: Rationale for choice of peer programs

**Rationale for choice of peer programs**
Choosing the schools to serve as comparison peer institutions was a multistep task. We first began with the Board of Regents proposed peer institutions and aspirant institutions (see list below for Regents’ lists and other schools under consideration). We then cross-listed with the “Urban 13” schools to establish peer colleges with an urban location and a focus on urban education and other urban issues. We next queried members of the department faculty, department chair, the college Dean, and members of the department of Instructional Technology for their recommendations of both peer and aspirant institutions specifically for colleges of education, departments of curriculum and teaching, as well as instructional technology. Finally we evaluated U.S. News college rankings and college statistics for institutions comparable to GSU in rank and size, as well as for aspirant universities.

The unique nature of MSIT’s department organization, the inclusion of Instructional Technology, the separation from Early Childhood, the large size of the department, and the many programs we offer make direct comparisons with other departments difficult. We therefore sought to find a collection of schools that were similar in many ways, and to align our overall nature across a breadth of peer institutions.

We settled on a final list of institutions and sent out a detailed survey. Our final list of schools included:

- University of Cincinnati
- Florida State University
- Michigan State
- University of Louisville
- U of Illinois, Chicago
- University of Houston
- Indiana University Purdue University, Indianapolis
- University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
- University of Missouri-Kansas City
- University of New Orleans
- Temple University
- Virginia Commonwealth University
- University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The survey included 23 questions covering faculty composition, productivity, enrollment and graduation numbers, program information, and so forth. The complete survey can be found at the end of this appendix.

We hoped for a 20-30% response rate, but heard back from over half of the petitioned institutions.

Responses to our questions varied in the school’s interpretation and context. For instance, when asked about credit hours taught, we received a wide range of answers suggesting our question was not clear enough. When we asked about the “number of undergraduate majors” some schools answered with the count of students, others with how many degrees. In the future, more specific questions with detailed comments about the types of answers we are looking for would be helpful.

We were extremely grateful to receive detailed responses to our survey from the following individuals at their respective universities:
University of Missouri, Kansas City
Monika Williams Shealey, Ph.D
Associate Dean for Teacher Education
Associate Professor of Special Education School of Education

Florida State University**
Lawrence C. Scharmann, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean & Director
School of Teacher Education

University of Illinois- Chicago
Karen Lenhart Dop
Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Indiana University
Joyce Alexander, Ph.D.
Executive Associate Dean
School of Education

University of Louisville
Jennifer Bay-Williams
Chair & Professor, Department of Middle and Secondary Education

Virginia Commonwealth University
Dr. Leila Christenbury
Interim Chair and Commonwealth Professor, English Education
Department of Teaching and Learning/School of Education/

Michigan State University
Avner Segall
Associate Professor
Acting Chair, Dept. of Teacher Education
College of Education

University of Cincinnati
Holly Johnson
Division Head &Associate Professor
College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services

**The information received from FSU was presented in such a way as to make it impossible to align with other universities and was excluded from this report.

Board of Regents Proposed Peer Institutions
George Mason University
Wichita State University
Old Dominion University
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
San Diego State University
Temple University
University of Central Florida
University of Houston
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
University of Louisville
University of New Orleans
University of Missouri-Kansas City
University of Texas at Dallas
University of Texas, Arlington
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Virginia Commonwealth University

**Board of Regents Proposed Aspirational Institutions**
University of Alabama
University of Oregon
Drexel University
Northeastern University
University of Delaware
University of California, Riverside
Arizona State University

"Urban 13"
University of Alabama at Birmingham
University of Missouri-St. Louis
University of Cincinnati
University of Missouri-Kansas City
Cleveland State University
University of New Orleans
Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University
City College of New York
Georgia State University
University of Pittsburgh
University of Houston
Portland State University
University of Illinois at Chicago
Temple University
Indiana University Purdue University, Indianapolis
University of Toledo
University of Massachusetts at Boston
Virginia Commonwealth University
University of Memphis
Wayne State University
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

**MSIT Recommended Schools:**
Arizona State University
Rutgers University
Chair and Dean Recommended Schools
Michigan State
Florida State
University of Louisville
University of Cincinnati
University of Illinois- Chicago

GSU Peer Institution Survey
Faculty
1. How many faculty members are in your department?
2. How many are female?
3. How many minority?
4. How many are tenured or tenure track?
5. What is the student to faculty ratio in your department?
6. How many published books or articles are published per faculty member per year?
7. How much external funding is generated per year in your department?
8. What faculty research support does your department provide, including paid leave, etc.?
9. How many total credit hours were taught in your department last year, for graduate level courses? Undergraduate?
10. What is the average course load per semester per faculty?

Students
11. How many undergraduate majors do you have?
12. How many graduate students are enrolled in your program?
13. What is the racial/ethnic and gender makeup of your student body?
14. How many students graduated last year in each category- MAT, Med, PhD?
15. What percent of your enrolled graduate students complete the program?
16. What is the average timeframe for completion of the program for MAT, Med, and PhD students?

Programs
17. How many degree programs does your department offer?
18. How many courses are taught by graduate students?
19. What is the average class size in the undergraduate program?
20. What is the average class size in the graduate program?
21. What opportunities for service or learning internships does your department offer?
22. How many computer classrooms does your department have access to?
23. What amount of funding does the University provide your department?

App. B2: Organization of unit governance and committee structure

Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology

Department Standing and Ad Hoc Committees 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSIT Promotion and Tenure Committee</th>
<th>Representatives (Tenured Faculty) Elected by Unit Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Representing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Youngjoo Yi</td>
<td>Language and Literacy Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Wanjira Kinuthia</td>
<td>Learning Technologies Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Christine Thomas</td>
<td>Mathematics Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lisa Martin-Hansen</td>
<td>Science Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Amy Flint</td>
<td>Social Studies Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mary Deming</td>
<td>Urban Adolescent Teaching and Learning Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSIT Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty</th>
<th>Representatives Elected by Unit Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Term:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Tisha Lewis</td>
<td>(two-year term; 2011-2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Membership must represent faculty diversity and ranks. If the elected representatives do not show this representation, the department chair will appoint additional member/s to fulfill the previously mentioned categories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mary Shoffner</td>
<td>Learning Technologies Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Stinson</td>
<td>Mathematics Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kadir Demir</td>
<td>Science Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joe Feinberg</td>
<td>Social Studies Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gertrude Tinker Sachs</td>
<td>Urban Adolescent Teaching and Learning Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MSIT Advanced Graduate Degree Program Committee**

**Representatives Elected by Unit Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Michelle Zoss</td>
<td>Language and Literacy Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steve Harmon</td>
<td>Learning Technologies Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Nancy Brown</td>
<td>Library Media Technology Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Iman Chahine</td>
<td>Mathematics Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brett Criswell</td>
<td>Science Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Chara Bohan</td>
<td>Social Studies Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Christopher Jett</td>
<td>Urban Adolescent Teaching and Learning Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MSIT Culture, Climate and Equity Committee**

**Representatives Elected by Department Faculty and Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominations</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mary Shoffner</td>
<td>Tenured Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Michelle Zoss</td>
<td>Tenure-track Professors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Nancy Brown  
Clinical Professors

Ms. Erika Bullock  
Doctoral Students

Ms. Jamie Fergerson  
Staff

**MSIT Faculty Self-Study Committee for Academic Program Review 2010-2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mary Deming</td>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gertrude Tinker Sachs</td>
<td>Language and Literacy Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mary Shoffner</td>
<td>Learning Technologies Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Nancy Brown</td>
<td>Library Media Technology Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Christine Thomas</td>
<td>Mathematics Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lisa Martin-Hansen</td>
<td>Science Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Caroline Sullivan</td>
<td>Social Studies Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mary Ariail</td>
<td>Urban Adolescent Teaching and Learning Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology**

**Dr. Dana L. Fox, Chair**

**COE, PEF, and Senate Representatives 2011-2012**

Representatives Elected by Department Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Education (COE) Committees</th>
<th>MSIT Representative</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COE Academic Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Dr. Mary Deming</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE Advisory Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure</td>
<td>Dr. Chara Bohan</td>
<td>1/1/11-12/31/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE Committee on Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty - CCRTF</td>
<td>Dr. Mary Deming</td>
<td>1/1/10-12/31/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE Committee on Diversity of the College Community</td>
<td>Dr. Youngjoo Yi</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE Dean’s Faculty Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Dr. Laurie Brantley-Dias</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Dr. Amy Flint</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE Research and Scholarship Committee</td>
<td>Dr. Amy Flint</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE Student Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Dr. Mary Shoffner</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Education Faculty (PEF) Committees</th>
<th>MSIT Representative</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEF Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Dr. Mary Ariail</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEF Content Knowledge Committee</td>
<td>English/Language Arts:</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Ewa McGrail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESOL/COE At-Large:</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Jayoung Choi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics:</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Pier Junor Clarke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Level Education:</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Christopher Jett</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science:</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Kadir Demir</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Studies:</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Joe Feinberg</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEF Curriculum Committee</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Martin-Hansen</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEF Diversity Committee</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Gladys Yarbrough</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEF Field Experiences and Clinical Practice Committee</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Janet Burns</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEF Induction Committee</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Stephanie Behm Cross</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEF Professional Education Council</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Janet Burns</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEF Standards and Accreditation</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Caroline Sullivan</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Georgia State University</strong></th>
<th><strong>MSIT Representative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Term</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Senate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MSIT Faculty Senate Representatives</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Peggy Albers</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brendan Calandra (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS&amp;T (Chair)</td>
<td>Dr. Steve Harmon</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gertrude Tinker Sachs</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To learn more about the COE Committees and their purposes, go to the COE Bylaws: [http://education.gsu.edu/main/FacultyHandbook.htm](http://education.gsu.edu/main/FacultyHandbook.htm) or [http://education.gsu.edu/main/docs/COEbylaws.04.27.07.doc](http://education.gsu.edu/main/docs/COEbylaws.04.27.07.doc)

To learn more about the PEF Committees and their purposes, go to [http://pef.gsu.edu/membership_list.htm](http://pef.gsu.edu/membership_list.htm)

To learn more about the GSU Faculty Senate and Standing Committees, go to [http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwsen/](http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwsen/)
### App. B3: By-laws of unit

### App. B4: Current Faculty Roster

**MSIT FACULTY**

- Dr. Peggy Albers
- Dr. Mary Ariail
- Dr. Nermin Bayazit
- Dr. Chara Bohan
- Dr. Laurie Brantley-Dias
- Dr. Nancy Brown
- Dr. Janet Burns
- Dr. Brendan Calandra
- Dr. Iman Chahine
- Dr. Jayoung Choi
Dr. Brett Criswell  
Dr. Stephanie Behm Cross  
Dr. Chantee Earl (formerly McBride)  
Dr. Mary Deming  
Dr. Kadir Demir  
Dr. Joe Feinberg  
Dr. Amy Flint  
Dr. Dana Fox  
Dr. Steve Harmon  
Dr. Christopher Jett  
Dr. Pier Junor Clarke  
Dr. Wanjira Kinuthia  
Dr. Tisha Lewis  
Dr. Miyoun Lim  
Dr. Ed Lomax  
Dr. Ewa McGrail  
Dr. Joyce Many  
Dr. Ollie Manley  
Dr. Lisa Martin-Hansen  
Dr. Anton Puvirajah  
Dr. Mary Shoffner  
Dr. Caroline Sullivan  
Dr. David Stinson  
Dr. Christine Thomas  
Dr. Gertrude Tinker Sachs  
Dr. Gladys Yarbrough  
Dr. Youngjoo Yi  
Dr. Michelle Zoss

**App. B5 Listing of Program Codes and Descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>CONCENTRATION</th>
<th>CONC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>ENE</td>
<td>ENGLISH EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>ENE</td>
<td>ENGLISH EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td>INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td>INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td>INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MLM</td>
<td>LMT</td>
<td>LIBRARY MEDIA TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>LMT</td>
<td>LIBRARY MEDIA TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>SPV</td>
<td>SUPERVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>LMT</td>
<td>LIBRARY MEDIA TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>MCE</td>
<td>MIDDLE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>MCE</td>
<td>MIDDLE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</td>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>SCIENCE EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>MCE</td>
<td>MIDDLE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</td>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS &amp; SCIENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>MCE</td>
<td>MIDDLE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>MLED</td>
<td>MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION</td>
<td>LSS</td>
<td>LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>MLED</td>
<td>MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION</td>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS &amp; SCIENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>MLED</td>
<td>MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>MRLE</td>
<td>READING/LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY ED</td>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>ENGLISH AS SECOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>MRLE</td>
<td>READING/LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>MIDDLE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</td>
<td>LSS</td>
<td>LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>MIDDLE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</td>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS &amp; SCIENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>MIDDLE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS EDUCATION</td>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>RLE</td>
<td>READING/LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY ED</td>
<td>TES</td>
<td>TEACHING ENG AS A SEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>RLE</td>
<td>READING/LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>RLE</td>
<td>READING/LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY ED</td>
<td>ELI</td>
<td>EARLY LITERACY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>RLE</td>
<td>READING/LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY ED</td>
<td>RDS</td>
<td>READING INSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>RLE</td>
<td>READING/LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY ED</td>
<td>TES</td>
<td>TEACHING ENG AS A SEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  MED  RLE</td>
<td>READING/LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  ND  RLE</td>
<td>READING/LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY ED</td>
<td>ELI  EARLY LITERACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  ND  RLE</td>
<td>READING/LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY ED</td>
<td>RDS  READING INSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  ND  RLE</td>
<td>READING/LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY ED</td>
<td>TES  TEACHING ENG AS A SEC LANGUAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  ND  RLE</td>
<td>READING/LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  MAT  SCE</td>
<td>SCIENCE EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  MED  SCE</td>
<td>SCIENCE EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  ND  SCE</td>
<td>SCIENCE EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  MAT  SSE</td>
<td>SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  MED  SSE</td>
<td>SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  ND  SSE</td>
<td>SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING AED</td>
<td>ART EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING ENE</td>
<td>ENGLISH EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING ESL</td>
<td>TEACHING ENG AS A SEC LANGUAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING ESL</td>
<td>ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING FL</td>
<td>FOREIGN LANGUAGES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING INT</td>
<td>INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING LMT</td>
<td>LIBRARY MEDIA TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING MCE</td>
<td>MIDDLE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING MLED</td>
<td>MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING MTE</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING MUE</td>
<td>MUSIC EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING RDS</td>
<td>READING INSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING SCE</td>
<td>SCIENCE EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT  EDS  TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING SSE</td>
<td>SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>EDS</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING AED ART EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING LLE LANGUAGE &amp; LITERACY EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING MTE MATHEMATICS EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING MTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING MTE MIDDLE CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING MUE MUSIC EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING SCE SCIENCE EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING SSE SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**App. B6- Faculty Journal Publications 2008-2011**

**Language and Literacy**

- 57th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference
- 58th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference
- 59th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference
- 60th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference
- Action in Teacher Education
- Adviser Update [the Dow Jones Newspaper Funds’ Quarterly]
- Asian Journal of English Language Teaching
- Computers and Composition
- Contemporary Issues in Technology & Teacher Education
- Education and Information Technologies
- Educational Leadership
- English in Education
- English Journal
- GATESOL
- Handbook of Research on Teaching the English Language Arts
Innovate

Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy

Journal of Adult and Adolescent Literacy

Journal of Asian Pacific Communication

Journal of Early Childhood Literacy

Journal of Literacy Research

Journal of Reading Education

Journal of Research in Childhood Education

Journal of Second Language Writing

Professional Development in Education

Reading Research Quarterly

Reflective Practice

Talking Points

Teaching & Learning: The Journal of Natural Inquiry and Reflective Practice

The CATESOL Journal

The Heritage Language Journal

The National Gallery of Writing

The Reading Teacher

**Learning Technologies**

Career and Technical Education Research

Distance Learning Administration Annual 2011

Educational Technology

Educational Technology Research and Development

International Journal of eLearning
International Journal of Internet Education
International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education
International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning
International Journal on E-Learning
Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange
Journal of Industrial Teacher Education
Journal of Interactive Learning Research
Journal of Research in Technology and Teacher Education
Journal of Research on Technology in Education
Journal of Science Teacher Education
Journal of Technology and Teacher Education
Multicultural Education and Technology Journal
Performance Improvement
Proceedings of Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International Conference 2008
Talking Points
TechTrends

**Mathematics Education**
American Educational Research Journal
Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education
Georgia, Educational Researcher Journal (GERJ)
International Journal for Studies in Mathematics Education
International Journal of Critical Pedagogy
International Journal of Teaching
International Journal of Teaching in Mathematics Education
International Study Group on Ethnomathematics Newsletter (ISGEm).
Journal for Research in Mathematics Education

Journal of Technology and Teacher Education (JTATE)

Journal of the European Teacher Education Network

Journal of Urban Mathematics Education

Journal of Urban, Learning, Teaching, and Research

Proceedings of the Thirty Second Annual Meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education

Research and Practice in Social Sciences

The Qualitative Report

The Urban Review

Urban Education

**Science Education**

Cultural Studies of Science Education

Educational Technology

Electronic Journal of Science Education

Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education

Eurasia Journal of Science and Mathematics

Florida Scientists

Georgia Journal of Science

Journal of Chemical Education

Journal of College Science Teaching

Journal of Elementary Science Education

Journal of Research in Science Teaching
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App. C1: Unit's strategic plan
Unit’s strategic plan and goals as of the beginning of the self-study period

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN
Adopted by the College of Education Faculty
August 14, 2009
Strategic Action Plan
2009-2014
Moving Lives Forward

Mission Statement

The College of Education is committed to research and scholarship that enhances human potential through high quality professional preparation and instruction with dedicated service to our local, state, national, and international communities. **PREAMBLE** Since its inception in 1968, the College of Education (COE) at Georgia State University has excelled in teaching, research, and service. In October 2007, with the lifecycle of the 2002-2007 strategic plan complete, the Dean of the College, Randy W. Kamphaus, charged the Dean’s Faculty Advisory Committee (DFAC) to coordinate the development of a new five-year plan with the goal for the COE to seek new levels of excellence.

During the 2007-2008 academic year, faculty, staff, students, school principals, teachers, along with other stakeholders took part in a comprehensive planning effort. A draft of the strategic plan was distributed to all stakeholders for review and feedback. At the close of the academic year, this feedback was collated and the draft was refined. In the fall of the 2008-2009 academic year, DFAC worked to finalize the strategic plan. Under the direction of Dean Kamphaus, the committee created a plan to guide the college toward becoming one of the top-tier colleges of education in the nation and in the world. The following non-hierarchical priorities are submitted for College approval. **We will:**

A. **Maximize the research and scholarly expertise available to metropolitan areas through improved teaching, mentoring, professional development, and innovative academic programs.**

This priority builds on the COE’s long-term successes in preparing teaching, human service, and research professionals of the highest quality who will contribute to metropolitan areas to enhance the development of people and their communities.

A1. Foster partnerships with Atlanta industries for the purpose of developing endowments, initiatives, scholarships, research centers, and faculty lines.

A2. Explore and develop interdisciplinary degree programs in areas of curricular strength in partnership with other colleges within Georgia State University and other Georgia institutions.

A3. Create new and expand existing programs and professional fields of study with high potential for credit hour growth, and garner the financial support needed to do so effectively.

A4. Conduct an internal program evaluation study and review of the extant literature to determine the influence of part-time instructors on graduate program effectiveness and continuity in order to **maximize effectiveness of part-time instructors in graduate programs.**

A5. Review and revise as needed department plans for recruitment, retention, and mentoring of new faculty.

A6. Design a College mentoring plan to assist faculty in obtaining external research, training, and service funding.

A7. Design a plan and process for improving the quality of teaching in the College.

A8. Develop more cultural immersion, study abroad, and cross-cultural exchange programs to increase the diversity of opportunities available to students, beyond the current programs in China, Mexico, and England. Establish new formal programs in other international locales.

A9. Offer an Ed.D. program consistent with the Carnegie Foundation recommendation to create a doctorate for professional practice that is of the highest quality but differentiated from a research-oriented Ph.D. degree.

A10. Reduce the number of years to completion and increase the graduation rate of students across all COE doctoral programs.

A11. Increase the placement rates of doctoral graduates in research universities.

A12. **Enhance and coordinate services and programs among the ITC, Learning Technologies faculty, instruction design in the college, and college technology support with all COE Departments.**

A13. Implement all relevant ADA accessibility guidelines within the College.
Provide effective adaptations and modifications of teaching and resources to accommodate students with special needs as indicated by ADA guidelines.

B. **Strengthen and improve access to our community services.**

This priority builds on the COE’s established dedication to serving the Atlanta community and its residents. Existing and future community service projects, clinics, and other units will be brought together in one accessible location to create one of the first community service units of its type in the United States. Such consolidation of services will build and deepen the COE’s connection to the children and adults in the metropolitan Atlanta community. Access will extend to include state, national and international audiences.

B1. Acquire a centrally located building to house all college educational services that directly impact the public.

B2. Form a technical assistance center to support department and program professional development school initiatives in order to develop, enhance, evaluate, and expand school partnerships.

B3. Host a state-of-education conference for the general public, informing them about the state of education at local, state, national, and international levels with a launch of the conference within the next few years.

C. **Hasten the progress of research and scholarship aimed at resolving the unique educational, health, occupational, and social challenges faced by individuals in metropolitan settings both domestically and internationally.**

This strategic priority builds on the considerable research, expertise, and success of COE scholars in many areas. To support and extend this success, the college will (a) improve research and scholarship infrastructure to create more opportunity for further breakthroughs, (b) foster an idea-driven interdisciplinary research and scholarship culture, (c) focus on translating basic research and research from varied disciplines to educational and human development practice, and (d) encourage earlier dissemination and adoption of findings by practitioners. The creation of a new electronic journal is one of several outlets proposed to hasten implementation of research and scholarship to resolve the unique challenges faced by individuals in local, state, national, and international metropolitan settings. This journal, peer reviewed and staffed by doctoral students in the tradition of existing scholarly journals, will be published quarterly.

C1. Highlight COE faculty and student research and scholarship by creating a monthly series of electronic policy briefs based on high impact faculty research findings.

C2. Host a yearly conference for top tier graduate students from across the country that features high profile speakers to highlight research and scholarship innovations and trends in education.

C3. Support and strengthen the COE’s Research and Scholarship Colloquium Series by advertising the COE’s Colloquium Series outside of the COE (e.g., other colleges within GSU, other local universities and the community). As the Colloquium Series matures, the College should reduce the number of speakers from one per week to one or two per month and continue to attract national figures to share their research and scholarship.

C4. Further diversify faculty, students, and staff of the college through competitive compensation and benefits with annual salary compression review, with the goal of raising salary and compensation above the median for urban research university colleges of education, and rectifying any pay inequities by gender and ethnicity, with recognition of market forces.

C5. Create a fund to provide financial support for otherwise non-funded scholarship (e.g., GRAs, travel support).

C6. Provide professional support for research and scholarship initiatives (e.g., research summer salary, seed grants, course or service buy-outs).

C7. Increase the number of external grants submitted by faculty.

C8. Analyze the current policy for the use and distribution of Indirect Cost Recovery Funds (ICR).

C9. Increase the salary for GRA’s for 12 month appointments to nationally competitive levels in
order to attract top quality students for graduate and doctoral study from national and international locales.

C10. Increase opportunities for the involvement of undergraduate and graduate students in research and scholarship.

C11. Clarify and make accessible guidelines for professional leave for faculty research, scholarship, and/or service.

C12. Plan, deliver, and evaluate faculty and student mentoring.

**App. C2: Global Conversations**

**Global Conversations in Literacy Research: 2011-2012 Series of Seminars**

[http://globalconversationsinliteracy.wordpress.com/](http://globalconversationsinliteracy.wordpress.com/)

We are now announcing the 2011-2012 series of Global Conversations in Literacy Research, free web seminars presented by leading international scholars in the field of literacy and language whose research foci include early childhood literacy, critical literacy, assessment, discourse analysis, literacy and the arts, and family literacy. GCLR is a series of interactive web-based seminars that provide international spaces for literacy researchers at all ranks and has three distinct goals: 1) to present and share their research and work with other literacy and language arts scholars from across the globe; 2) to build an international literacy research networks; and 3) and to invite important international conversations about a range of research that literacy researchers are doing. Host of GCLR web seminars: Dr. Peggy Albers ([malbers2@gsu.edu](mailto:malbers2@gsu.edu)) from Georgia State University in Atlanta, GA, USA.

*You will be able to join the web seminar 45 minutes prior to the start of the session. Please click on the hyperlink and follow the directions to download Elluminate and Java.*

**September 4, 2011:** Dr. Jerome C. Harste, Indiana University, USA, and Dr. Vivian Vasquez, American University/USA; "What Do We Mean by Literacy Now: Critical Curricular Implications"; 7:00 p.m. EST/USA

*Paste this URL into your browser:*
[https://sas.elluminate.com/m.jnlp?sid=221&password=M.14711BB3A0D543F2A252AFA5119F3B](https://sas.elluminate.com/m.jnlp?sid=221&password=M.14711BB3A0D543F2A252AFA5119F3B)

**October 30, 2011:** Dr. Peter Johnston, University at Albany-SUNY/USA; “Literacy, Learning, Thinking and Classroom Communities”; 7:00 p.m. EST/USA

*Paste this URL into your browser:*
[https://sas.elluminate.com/m.jnlp?sid=221&password=M.DC6E1C69CB8DCEDC828535C7366A47](https://sas.elluminate.com/m.jnlp?sid=221&password=M.DC6E1C69CB8DCEDC828535C7366A47)

**November 13, 2011:** Dr. Catherine Compton-Lilly, University of Wisconsin, USA;
“Literacy and Schooling in One Family across a Decade”; 7:00 p.m. EST/USA

Paste this URL into your browser:
https://sas.elluminate.com/m.jnlp?sid=221&password=M.CC9D5E8A110E3980D286747CBACF15

January 15, 2012: Dr. Karen Wohlwend, Indiana University/Indiana, USA; "Constructing the Child at Play: From the Schooled Child to Technotoddlers and Back Again”; 7:00 p.m. EST/USA

Paste this URL into your browser:
https://sas.elluminate.com/m.jnlp?sid=221&password=M.35D87F90B6D5EE35866CC0A2E741E6

February 19, 2012: Dr. Kate Pahl, University of Sheffield, UK and Dr. Jennifer Rowsell, Brock University, Ont., Canada, “Understanding Literacy and Education: Literacy as Artifactual, Immaterial, and Embodied” (Time to be announced)

Paste this URL into your browser:
https://sas.elluminate.com/m.jnlp?sid=221&password=M.6B96BCB0E4F31FEF6C6ID93B977DACF

March, 2012: Dr. Brian Cambourne, University of Wollongong in NSW, Australia, “Conditions of Literacy Learning.” (Date/time To Be Announced)

April 1, 2012: Dr. Candace Kuby, University of Missouri/Missouri, USA: “Tensions from Analyzing Children’s Images of Racial Bus Segregation: Searching for Tools”; 7:00 p.m. EST/USA

Paste this URL into your browser:
https://sas.elluminate.com/m.jnlp?sid=221&password=M.50295980BE948CB62AEBE26AA18523
D: Curriculum Quality

App. D1: Learning outcome statements and assessment plans

2008-2009 Assessment Report

Georgia State University

Detailed Assessment Report
2008-2009 English Education MEd

Mission/Purpose

The M.Ed. major in English Education provides for master's level study in English Education and English content and leads to T-5 certification in secondary English (grades 6-12). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle and high school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content.

The program's underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other
human. The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban English education.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

**Goals**

**G 1: Become subject and pedagogical knowledge experts**

The first goal for students in the English education MEd program is to become experts in the English subject discipline and the pedagogical content knowledge required to deliver high quality lessons.

**G 2: Continue to practice critical reflection skills**

The students in the English education MEd program will understand the theoretical foundations and practical applications as critical thinkers in their classrooms. The students will use critical reflection to make informed decisions about their instruction and curriculum choices.

**G 3: Commit to achievement of urban students**
Students in the English education MEd program are committed to the successful learning and achievement of students in urban settings.

**G 4: Integrate English content with technology**

The students in the English education MEd program will use a variety of technologies to prepare, teach, and assess lessons in the English discipline. The use of technology will be a part of the curriculum, instruction, and reflection practices of the MEd English teacher. Furthermore, technology will become a literacy through which MEd English teachers communicate with their students, other teachers, and school personnel.

**Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge: Reading & Writing**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wtg**
A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of English Education MEd completers (n=3) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of reading and writing through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral response.

**O 2: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of Literature**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of an extensive range of literature, including U.S. literature, British literature, world literature, and multicultural literature as well as literature written specifically for children and young adults.

**Associations:**
Related Measures:

M 2: Portfolio Rating Std 3 Knowledge of Literatures

A portfolio rating for Standard 3 will be derived from each student`s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of English Education MEd completers (n=3) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on knowledge of literatures through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral response.

O 3: Uses Effective Assessment and Instr. Techniques
Candidates demonstrate the use of a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 8 Assessment**

A portfolio rating for Standard 8 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of English Education MEd completers (n=3) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on effective use of assessment and instructional techniques through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral response.

O 4: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of English Grammars

Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of English grammars as well as the history and evolution of the English language.

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 4: Portfolio Rating Standard 1 Know Eng Grammars

A portfolio rating for this standard will be derived from each student`s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of English Education MEd completers (n=3) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on knowledge of English grammars through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral response.

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Continued innovation in teaching for urban sites and technological savvy

All of the target measures for the 2008-2009 group of English education MEd students were met. We, the English education faculty, are interested in fostering innovation in our students' work as teachers. To that end, we are committed to including a focus on urban education sites and the students and communities served by those sites. We are also committed to infusing our courses with technology so that our students can bring technological savvy to their teaching practices in their own urban and metropolitan schools. Our action plan, then, is to continue to find ways to bring issues specific to urban education into coursework and portfolio reflections, while also weaving thoughtful uses of technologies into both course and portfolio requirements. Our digital portfolio and all of its embedded standards will continue to support this action plan.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Completion Date: 06/01/2010
Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

To achieve our action plan item (focus on urban education and innovation with technologies in literacy classrooms), we plan to consider ways that our degree program might be more attractive to a larger potential group of students. That is, as a faculty we will review our course syllabi and portfolio requirements, as well as the coursework and portfolio reflection that are composed by our students, to consider how well these students are addressing issues pertinent to urban education sites and their uses of technologies in developing both coursework and portfolio requirements. We will also consider possibilities for repackaging our program, with possibilities including an interdisciplinary approach.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Analysis of our data revealed that every English Education M.Ed. program graduate performed at high levels on all standards. Oral defenses of the portfolios demonstrated our students’ strengths in literatures, reading and writing processes, pedagogy, professional development, inquiry, collaboration, and technology use. With respect to Action Item 1 from 2007-2008: "Increase Publicity in the English Ed M.Ed.", program faculty revised and updated website information regarding certain program information documents, such as: 1)
entrance and coursework requirements overviews, 2) the flowchart with the sequence of coursework, and 3) directories with program faculty contact information. The program faculty, and the program coordinator specifically, were available to answer questions online and in person for prospective students. During the 2008-09 school year, 5 new students began their MEd program in English education.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Our students met all of the measures we set for performing knowledge, skills, and dispositions for teaching and learning as set in our portfolio standards. With this success in mind, we can focus on our commitment to urban education and innovation with technologies in literacy classrooms. As we continue to review the progress of our students in the MEd program, we are mindful of trends in master degrees to be interdisciplinary. The number of students entering the program each year continues to be fewer than 10 students, so it may be that we need to consider the packaging of our MEd degree. For instance, would it be advantageous to move our program into a New Literacies degree? A possible direction for our degree program, a focus on New Literacies would focus on the myriad technological, visual, and multimedia ways in which literacies are practiced in the 21st Century. We will consider this and other possibilities for growing our program while providing solid opportunities for innovation in teaching in urban schools and integrating technologies into literacy classrooms.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

The M.A.T. major in English Education provides initial teacher preparation for individuals holding bachelor's degrees in English. It leads to both a master's degree and certification for teaching secondary English language arts (grades 6-12).

The program's underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program is a cohort program that encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban English education. The program ensures that candidates gain sufficient subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle and high school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content, and manage classrooms effectively.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.
In our department, MSIT, our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta, the nation, and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity to push the boundaries of knowledge and practice.

We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

**Goals**

**G 1: Acquires English content pedagogical knowledge**

English education students acquire and demonstrate a knowledge base and ability to teach in language and literature, in literary theory, and in the processes of reading and composing, including speaking, listening, and viewing.

**G 2: Effectively plans, teaches and manages instruction**

English education students effectively plan for, teach (or execute) instruction for students in an environment that is conducive to teaching and learning for students from diverse backgrounds.

**G 3: Committed to excellence in urban English education**
English education students demonstrate a commitment to and are sensitive to the complexity of teaching English language arts to students in urban settings and develop methods, strategies, and materials to meet the needs of diverse learners. English education students foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

**G 4: Uses reflection and inquiry to inform practice**

English education students reflect critically and consistently on their practice in order to improve their instruction, students' learning, and their professional development.

**G 5: Uses technology in teaching English language arts**

English education students apply knowledge of effective learning technologies to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the English language arts classroom.

**Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 1: Involves school and community in learning**
The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students` learning and well-being.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 10: Community**

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of
his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

80.77% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Involves school and community in learning" at the expected level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Community Action Plan**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty to determine areas needing improvement; as a result, assessment opportunities are no...

**O 2: Understands student development re: learning**

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 2: Faculty Rating
STARS Standard 2: Student Learning

Supervisor, final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Achievement Target:

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met

82.14% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Understands student development re: learning" at the expected level.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Student Learning Action Plan**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities...

**O 3: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**

The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience
**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3: Diversity**

Supervisor, final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

81.93% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners" at the expected level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Diversity Action Plan**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities...
O 4: Understands and uses assessment for learning

The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

M 4: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
67.86 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Understands and used assessment for learning" at the expected level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Assessment Action Plan**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportuniti...

**O 5: Practices professional reflection**

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

**Associations:**
Institutional Priorities:

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 5: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 9: Reflection

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Achievement Target:

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
85.71 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Practices professional reflection" at the expected level.

M 10: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

O 6: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:
M 6: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 1: Content/Pedagogy

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
85.54% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge" at the expected level.

O 7: Uses communication skills and technology

The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 6: Communication**

Supervisor, final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

85.71% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met “Uses communication skills and technology” at the expected level.
O 8: Can effectively plan for instruction

The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 8: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 7: Planning**

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

72.62% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Can effectively plan for instruction" at the expected level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Planning Action Plan**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify varied assessment oppo...

**O 9: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 9: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 4: Strategies

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Achievement Target:

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met

80.25 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies" at the expected level.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Strategies Action Plan
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportuniti...

O 10: Can motivate and manage students for learning

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience
**Related Measures:**

**M 10: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage**

Supervisor, final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

83.33% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Can motivate and manage students for learning" at the expected level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Motivate/Manage Action Plan**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportuniti...
Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Assessment Action Plan

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand and use a variety of formal and informal assessments to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the student.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment  | Outcome/Objective:
Understands and uses assessment for learning

Implementation Description: We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.
Completion Date: 06/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS English Education Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Community Action Plan
The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty to determine areas needing improvement; as a result, assessment opportunities are now embedded within our coursework that link communities and schools to student learning. In the future, we would like to keep this curriculum change unchanged.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Faculty Rating STARS Standard 10: Community  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Involves school and community in learning

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.  
**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

---

**Diversity Action Plan**

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand diverse student learning needs and to create instruction that will address such needs.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

**Measure:** Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3: Diversity  | **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.

**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty

**Additional Resources Requested:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

---

**Motivate/Manage Action Plan**

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to develop and use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

**Measure:** Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage  | **Outcome/Objective:** Can motivate and manage students for learning

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.

**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010
**Planning Action Plan**

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify varied assessment opportunities within our coursework that will allow our students to plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Faculty Rating STARS Standard 7: Planning  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively plan for instruction

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.  
**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

**Strategies Action Plan**
The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Faculty Rating STARS Standard 4: Strategies  
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.  
**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

---

**Student Learning Action Plan**

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand a student's intellectual, social, and personal development and to plan instruction that will support such development.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

**Measure**: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 2: Student Learning  
**Outcome/Objective**: Understands student development re: learning

**Implementation Description**: We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.  
**Completion Date**: 06/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group**: TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested**: Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Our strategies include studying the assignments within our courses and making revisions as articulated in Questions 1 and 2, with the standards in mind. One strategy we use is to work collaboratively to make collective decisions about curriculum changes, student progress, and program goals. Another strategy we use is to strive to understand and communicate with our students on a regular basis, and to act and offer support as necessary while upholding the standards. An additional strategy is to work collaboratively
with mentor teachers and GSU supervisors who have administrative and/or classroom experience in urban schools. This provides our students with professional and experienced educators’/administrators’ insights into teaching and working in urban schools specifically. We intend to continue to revisit our curriculum in our courses in light of student achievement, student responses to our curriculum, and recent findings in research, theory, and practice, all of which inform our own instruction in teacher education and our students’ working with their students.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

As a faculty, we have made several modifications to our English Education MAT program. 1) The portfolio standards have been aligned with methods and practicum course assignments (EDLA 6550, 7550; EDCI 6600, 7660, 7670, 7680; EDRD 7630). This allows for a seamless connection between the methods course content and practicum experiences in the field so that our students can reflect on, execute, and theorize their practice.

2) Through new course assignments, we have encouraged stronger understandings and year-long inquiry into issues related to literacy in urban settings. This emphasis gives our students concrete activities for thinking and learning about students in urban schools and the diverse needs of these school populations. This curriculum modification supports our students’ continued learning about both community and diversity (Action Item I and Action Item II in the 2007-2008 report). The new assignments also foster relations among university faculty, secondary school teachers, and our GSU master’s students (an area of attention in the 2007-2008 report). Finally, this latest curriculum change allows our students to have immediate access to the College of Education mission to focus on urban schools.
3) Through another set of course assignments we have also created opportunities for students to explore and execute new literacies in the context of their urban classrooms. The technology required to complete these assignments reflects literacy and technology connections as well as the new Professional Standards Commission initiative to integrate technology into all course curricula.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Based on the data of our students’ performance during the 2008-2009 school year, we have made several changes in our curriculum. These changes include: a) aligning the portfolio standards very closely to the curriculum content in the methods and field-based courses (EDLA 6550, 7550; EDCI 6600, 7660, 7670, 7680; EDRD 7630) and b) implementing a digital composition activity to support an inquiry into urban education.

These data also help us understand how we might revise our course assignments to better reflect the content of the standards we use to assess our students. We see our work in this program as being a continual work in progress. That is, the changes we institute in our program are direct reflections on the urban schools that we serve, the changing needs of our diverse students at Georgia State University, and in response to innovative teaching, research, and theory in the field of English education.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

The mission for the Master of Science degree in Instructional Technology is to provide students with the basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to perform as an instructional technologist. An instructional technologist is a professional educator who can combine knowledge of the learning process, knowledge of instructional systems theory, and knowledge of various forms of media and learning environments to create the most effective and efficient learning experiences. The program is designed for individuals interested in working with adults in a wide variety of training and development areas such as those found in education, business and industry. We seek to further this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

Goals

G 1: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in P-16

The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the P-16 education sector.

G 2: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in Corp

The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the corporate, government and military sectors.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to develop instructional materials and experiences by applying principles, theories, and research related to print, audiovisual, computer-based, and integrated technologies.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates

2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3 Contribute to the greater community good

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plans:**
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

M 2: Internship Report

All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**M 3: End of Course Assessments**

Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.

**M 4: Comprehensive Exam**

All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.

**M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi**
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**Achievement Target:**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.

**O 2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design**
Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to design conditions for learning by applying principles, theories, and research associated with instructional systems design, message design, instructional strategies, and learner characteristics.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1. Excellent and competitive academic programs
   1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
   1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
   1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
   1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
   1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2. Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3 Contribute to the greater community good

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

M 2: Internship Report

All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

M 3: End of Course Assessments

Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.

M 4: Comprehensive Exam

All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career
goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.

**M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi**
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**Achievement Target:**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.

**O 3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**
Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan, organize, coordinate, and supervise instructional technology by applying principles, theories and research related to project, resource, delivery system, and information management.

**Associations:**
Institutional Priorities:

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates

2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3 Contribute to the greater community good

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:
M 1: Portfolio

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

M 2: Internship Report

All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

M 3: End of Course Assessments

Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.
Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.

M 4: Comprehensive Exam
All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.

M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

Achievement Target:
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.

O 4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to use processes and resources for learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to media utilization, diffusion, implementations, and policy-making.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
   1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
   1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
   1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
   1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
   1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
   2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
   2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
   2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3 Contribute to the greater community good
   3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio**

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

**M 2: Internship Report**

All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.
Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

M 3: End of Course Assessments
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.

M 4: Comprehensive Exam
All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.

M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

Achievement Target:
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.

O 5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to problem analysis, criterion-referenced measurement, formative and summative evaluation, and long-range planning.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates

2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3 Contribute to the greater community good

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio**

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100 percent of students met or exceeded the standard.

**M 2: Internship Report**
All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**M 3: End of Course Assessments**
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
95% of students achieved at least 80% in every course.
M 4: Comprehensive Exam

All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards on the comprehensive exam.

M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi

Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**Achievement Target:**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
Annual review of syllabi and curricula indicate they continue to reflect current practice. Minor adjustments have been made regularly to reflect best practice.

Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

In order to increase enrollment we will continue to expand our online offerings. We will implement our previously approved endorsement program in Online Learning. We have also begun the approval process for offering our MS degree in a fully online format.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have increased our online offerings and recruitment efforts.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

While our current academic program is effective, increasing fiscal pressure coupled with low enrollment has forced us to cancel some classes, resulting in some students facing a delay in finishing the program. We need to increase enrollment.
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Although not reflected in this report, the majority of our credit hour generation comes through service courses we offer at both the graduate and undergraduate level. We have standardized the way we offer these courses, which has not only improved them, but has also given us more time to focus on our graduate degree programs.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

This year’s findings emphasize our need for recruitment.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We anticipate reaching an entirely new student base to whom we may not have had access before.
Mission/Purpose

The mission for the doctoral program in instructional technology is to provide specialization for instructional technologists in all aspects of the field, including instructional design, alternative instructional delivery systems, research, management, evaluation, and consulting for the betterment of education and human development. We seek to bring about this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

Goals

G 1: Produce Researchers in Learning Technologies

The IT Ph.D. program will produce graduates capable of conducting world-class research in Learning Technologies.

G 2: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies

The IT Ph.D. program will produce graduates capable of world-class teaching in Learning Technologies.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Understands and uses technology

The Ph.D. student understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

Associations:
Institutional Priorities:

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
   1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
   1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
   1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
   2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
   2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
   2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

4.43 Effective utilization of resources

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

4.3 Technology

Related Measures:

M 1: Dissertation

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Achievement Target:
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

Achievement Target:
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

M 3: Residency Report

Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

O 3: Demonstrates research expertise

The Ph.D. student demonstrates a general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:
President, Georgia State University

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Dissertation**

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

M 3: Residency Report

Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination
Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

**M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination**

Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**O 4: Engages in scholarship**

The Ph.D. student engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.
Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Dissertation

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Achievement Target:
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

M 3: Residency Report

Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination
Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination
Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

O 5: Understands foundations of education

The Ph.D. student develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological, and economic influences that affect education today.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Dissertation

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee.
members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

**M 3: Residency Report**

Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery
Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination
Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination

Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

O 6: Develops a professional identity

The Ph.D. student develops an identity as a professional and contributes to a professional community of scholars and educators.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Dissertation**

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

M 3: Residency Report

Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

O 7: Develops an extended knowledge base
The Ph.D. student develops an extended knowledge base that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Dissertation

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Achievement Target:
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

Achievement Target:
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

M 3: Residency Report
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

**M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination**

Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

**M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination**

Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 2: Develops leadership for the profession

The Ph.D. student provides leadership through teaching and professional development within his/her major discipline of inquiry.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience
Related Measures:

M 1: Dissertation

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Achievement Target:
100% of program completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

Achievement Target:
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
Faculty were satisfied that syllabi reflected current practice, but updated syllabi in several courses to keep pace with changes in technology.

M 3: Residency Report
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review**
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

**Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

We will submit more proposals for external funds.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have standardized our cumulative review process using LiveText. We have recruited more full-time Ph.D. students. We have engaged more students in faculty research.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We need to increase our external funding to support more full-time students. We need to provide for additional faculty professional development. Current travel funds are targeted toward presenting research at professional meetings. We need separate funds strictly for knowledge enhancement.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

We are better able to track outcomes based on our standardization of cumulative review. We expect, but do not yet have data to support it, that student completion rates will improve.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Our department is on pace with the university as it transitions to becoming more research oriented.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We expect to increase our external funding and to engage our students in more research prior to their dissertation work.
Mission/Purpose

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organization in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committe to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good. The Library Media Technology Program prepares students to serve as school library media specialists and information technologists in the Pre-K - 12 school environment. The focus is on administering media centers in modern school settings.

Goals

G 1: Become subject and pedagogical experts

The students in the Library Media Technology Program will strive to become experts in their professional responsibilities as school media specialists.

G 2: Critical Reflection Skills

Continue to practice critical reflection skills The students in the Library Media Technology Program will hone the theoretical foundations and practical applications as critical thinkers in their media centers. The students will use this critical reflection to make informed decisions about their instruction and curriculum choices.

G 3: Integrate Library Media Technology content with current technologies

The students in the Library Media Technology Program will use a variety of technologies to prepare, teach, and assess lessons in the subject discipline. The use of technology will be
a part of the instruction, curriculum, and reflection practices of the school media specialist. Furthermore, technology will become a literacy through which school media specialists communicate with their students, other teachers, school personnel, parents and the extended community.

**Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 1: Uses communication skills and technology.**

The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Action Plan
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Maintain and monitor.

M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of
his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and
understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.
O 2: Can motivate and manage students for learning.

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

Related Measures:

M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of
his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and
understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.
M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the
standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

O 3: Can effectively plan for instruction.

The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Related Measures:

M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or
assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and
understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

O 4: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge.

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Related Measures:

M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrate proficiency in knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrate proficiency in knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrate proficiency in knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and
understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.
M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

O 5: Involves school and community in learning.

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.
Related Measures:

M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.
M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the
standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and
understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

O 6: Practices professional reflection.

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Related Measures:

M 1: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the
standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 4. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 2: Faculty STARS Standard 3 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
Achievement Target:

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 3. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 3: Faculty STARS Standard 9 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 9. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a
professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 4: Faculty STARS Standard 2 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 2. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 10 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 10. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 6: Faculty STARS Standard 1 Rating**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 1. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 7: Faculty STARS Standard 7 Rating**
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 7. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 8: Faculty STARS Standard 8 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 8. 93% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and
understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

**M 9: Faculty STARS Standard 5 Rating**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 5. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.

M 10: Faculty STARS Standard 6 Rating

Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
Supervising final eval, mentor eval, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for Standard 6. 93% of candidates will demonstrates a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

99% of the students in the Library Media Technology Program demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and indicate readiness for certification.
Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Action Plan

Maintain and monitor.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 4 Rating  | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology.

Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Beginning during Professional Advisement Week (PAW) in October, 2009, the Library Media Technology unit will be gathering data on student achievement using a LiveText portfolio.
ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Faculty in the Library Media Technology unit has designed a LiveText portfolio that will assess a student's progress at specific points throughout the program. This portfolio has been submitted to the LiveText system administrator in MSIT and will be available as a template.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The Library Media Technology faculty is moving away from using STARS data to assess student achievement. We will, instead, use data collected from the LMT LiveText portfolio to facilitate programmatic and curriculum decisions and improvements.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
The Library Media Technology faculty has designed a new portfolio using LiveText. This portfolio will be assessed at the midpoint of a student's program and again at the final stage of the LMT program. Students will be required to submit the portfolio for assessment at the beginning of his/her enrollment in the LMT practicum (ELMT 7660 - Internship in Library Media Technology) and again at the beginning of the semester in which they will be graduating. It is anticipated that using this portfolio will allow us to have a more profound knowledge of overall student achievement.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Findings for this year's assessment will have little impact for the MSIT department. However, faculty in the Library Media Technology unit are working closely together to design a more profound data-gathering instrument using LiveText and anticipate having important information that will lead to operational improvements in the coming school year.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

It is anticipated that a high degree of improvement will be seen during the coming year as a result of moving from using STARS data as the basis for our student performance assessment to using a LiveText portfolio for Library Media Technology.

Annual Reports

Most Important Accomplishments for Year
Faculty in the Library Media Technology Unit of MSIT has worked collaboratively to design a LiveText portfolio to be used to assess student achievement.

**Challenges for Next Year**

The Library Media Technology Unit in MSIT will begin gathering data using the LiveText portfolio beginning in October, 2009.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**

Intended outcomes in the Library Media Technology Program will be evidenced by data gathered using the LiveText portfolio.

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**

Modifications in measurement methods in the Library Media Technology Program will be evidenced by data gathered using the LiveText portfolio.

**University-wide Committee Participation**

It is anticipated that information gathered through use of the LiveText portfolio will enrich data-gathering potential for the College of Education and for the University.

**Publications and Presentations**

It is anticipated that use of the LiveText portfolio in the Library Media Technology Program will provide valuable information to aid in research and other scholarly activities.

**Academic Teaching Activities**

Faculty members started using LiveText as the sole course-management software at the beginning of fall semester, 2009. All agree that this program has allowed us the opportunity to focus our teaching activities and begin gathering data reflecting authentic student achievement.

**International Activities**
The use of the LiveText portfolio is allowing our students to design and share course assignments reflecting a commitment to international studies. Such assignments include the following: A study of multicultural and bilingual literature in ELMT 7250 (Survey of Literature for Children) and a budgeting assignment for a Title I school with a majority immigrant population (ELMT 7410 - Administration of Library Media Centers).

Contributions to Student Retention

Faculty in the Library Media Technology unit of MSIT believe that the use of the LiveText portfolio will contribute to student retention in the program through encouraging collegiality, professional networking, and a sharing of information resources.
Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 8: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 10: Unknown
Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

O 2: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 2: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 7: Unknown
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 9: Unknown
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.
M 12: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 14: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 15: Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 17: Unknown**

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 18: Unknown**

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 19: Unknown
Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

O 3: Unknown
Unknown

Related Measures:
M 1: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 2: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.
M 5: Unknown
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

M 6: Unknown
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 11: Unknown
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

O 4: Unknown
Unknown
Related Measures:

M 1: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 3: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program.
Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 4: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 9: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.
M 13: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

O 5: Unknown

Unknown

**Related Measures:**

M 2: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 5: Unknown
Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 7: Unknown
Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program.
Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 9: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 11: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.
M 15: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 17: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 18: Unknown
Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

O 6: Unknown

Related Measures:

M 2: Unknown

Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.
**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 7: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 9: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.
**M 12: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 15: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**M 16: Unknown**
Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 17: Unknown
Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

M 18: Unknown
Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
90% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level or above of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
- **Completion Date:** 10/01/2009
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
- **Additional Resources Requested:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given
that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program
goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued
monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE
coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-
2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the
program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program
either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE
faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given
that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program
goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued
monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE
coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given
that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

**Completion Date:** 10/01/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

**Completion Date:** 10/01/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given
that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given
that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes  
Completion Date: 10/01/2009  
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
Additional Resources Requested: None  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels. The MED-MTE is a new program...
design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

None

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
100% of program completers meet target performance level of program. Currently, no Action Plan needed, just completed second full year of program redesign. Findings indicate that program is meeting target performance levels.
Mission/Purpose

This program should be listed as Mathematics Education M.Ed. Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). The mission of the Georgia State University Online M.Ed. Program in Mathematics Education is to provide an opportunity for certified teachers to build capacity by expanding their content knowledge and pedagogical practices.

Goals

G 1: Goal Statement

The goal of the MEd Online Mathematics Education program is to help certified teachers expand their content knowledge base and pedagogical practices through application where they demonstrate their knowledge and skills of advanced topics in mathematics and pedagogical practices which includes working with diverse student populations, problem solving, and literacy.

Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Expected Outcome 1

Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program will investigate issues of equity in the mathematics classroom.
**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Document:**

- *Rubric Cultural Awareness Project*

**Achievement Target:**

80% of the students will score 20 out of 25 points in order to achieve this target.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

All of the students (100%) met the standard.

**O 2: Expected Outcome 2**

Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program will engage in pedagogical practices that promote problem solving and inquiry.

**Related Measures:**
M 2: Measure for Learning Outcome 2

Students are to develop a unit plan designed to teach a mathematical concept using the Georgia Performance Standards and the National Council of Teacher of Mathematics Standards as references. The unit plan should contain no less than five complete lesson plans, and should include an introduction (title, duration of class, grade level, and rationale), goals, behavioral objectives using Bloom's Taxonomy, linkage to national and state performance standards, background information about target audience, instructional processes, concept map, alignment with concept map, objectives, and instructional processes, closure, reflections, references, and resources.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Document:
- Rubric Unit Plan

Achievement Target:

80% of students will score a minimum of 24/30 in order to achieve this target.

Document:
- Rubric Unit Plan

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

All of the students met or exceeded the target.

O 3: Expected Outcome 3
Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program will plan and implement an active, coherent, and effective curriculum that promotes literacy and is consistent with the goals and recommendations of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Standards.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Measure for Learning Outcome 3**

The curriculum exploration and analysis paper will require teachers to generate a list of criteria after consulting professional documents to evaluate curriculum materials. Using these criteria, the students will examine two mathematics curricula: one traditional curriculum developed by textbook publishing companies and one National Council of Teacher Mathematics Standards reform. The students will write a report based on the criteria highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of each curriculum.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Document:**

- *Rubric Curriculum Exploration Project*

**Achievement Target:**

80% of students will score 12/15 in order to meet this target.

**Document:**

- *Rubric Curriculum Exploration Project*

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

All of the students met or exceeded the target.
**Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

In order to achieve the goals of the action plan faculty will:
1. Align syllabi with National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Standards for all pedagogical courses.
2. Develop a common approach to improving students' understanding of planning inquiry lessons.
3. Embed in their courses content that focuses on diversity and multicultural issues.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

This is a new degree report and there was no report for last year.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
In order to achieve the expected targets, a good percentage of the students had to resubmit the required documents. Plans have been made to embed principles of curriculum, strategies for planning inquiry lessons, and content that focuses on diversity and multicultural issues in all of the pedagogy courses that are offered in the program. Faculty will develop a common approach to improving students’ understanding of planning inquiry lessons, and this type of planning will be embedded in all pedagogy courses with more emphasis in EDMT 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Education.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Unknown

Unknown

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of
his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
85% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures. Made changes to the course curriculum.

O 2: Unknown

Unknown

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 2: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of
his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
85% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures. Made changes to the course curriculum.

**O 3: Unknown**

Unknown

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of
his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
95% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures. Made changes to the course curriculum.

**O 4: Unknown**

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of
his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
92% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures. Made changes to the course curriculum.

**O 5: Unknown**

**Unknown**

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of
his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

90% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures. Made changes to the course curriculum.

**Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

Our department will be supportive to faculty in their pursuit for improving the program, curriculum, and most importantly the development of effective mathematics teachers for urban and suburban school environments.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Based on courses, e-portfolio assessments, and streamlining the field placements, students have demonstrated continuous progress in their disposition, knowledge and performance. Our implementation of two or three student teachers at a school site for their
internship has proven to have some effects in our students' performance and such placements have become our department-wide initiative. However, we will continue to monitor this effort. Relationships across the school and university communities have become stronger. Our department is utilizing the PDS sites advantageously.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

This year’s assessment based on the standards are good and improving. Our department chair encourages and supports faculty in these continued efforts. The standards that are borderline to our target will be modified for further improvement. An interdisciplinary action plan within the program was initiated and we will continue to maintain and monitor such initiatives to develop effective mathematics teachers.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
**Goals**

**G 1: Is committed to student learning and development**

Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.

**G 2: Can apply knowledge of learning and development**

Students in the Middle Childhood Education MEd program will draw upon their knowledge of learning theories and apply their knowledge in practical classroom contexts.

**G 3: Knows how to manage & monitor learning/development**

Students in the Middle Childhood Education MEd program will be able to monitor and manage students’ learning and development effectively.

**G 4: The student is a reflective practitioner.**

Students will think systematically about their practice and will draw upon professional and practical experience to inform their teaching.

**G 5: Participate in professional learning communities**
Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development

The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning and development.

Related Measures:

M 3: Faculty STARS standard 3 rating

A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

Ninety percent (90%) of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

There was 1 completer for the 2008-2009 academic year. 100% of the program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans
O 1: Demonstrates commitment to learning/development

Educators are committed to the learning and development of students in urban contexts.

Related Measures:

M 1: Faculty STARS standard 1 rating

A summary rating derived from culminating papers, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
There was 1 completer for the 2008-2009 academic year. 100% of the program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Recommend Deactivation of Program
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MED for Middle Childhood Education has been an underenrolled program for several years. Enrollment dropped even more when t...
O 2: Applies knowledge of learning and development

The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning and development.

Related Measures:

M 2: Faculty STARS standard 2 rating

A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

There was 1 completer for the 2008-2009 academic year. 100% of the program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

O 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.

Related Measures:
M 4: Faculty STARS standard 4 rating

A summary derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

There was 1 completer for the 2008-2009 academic year. 100% of the program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

O 5: Participates in profession's learning communities

The educator is an active member of one or more learning communities.

Related Measures:

M 5: Faculty STARS standard 5 rating

A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate
level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

There was 1 completer for the 2008-2009 academic year. 100% of the program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action.

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Recommend Deactivation of Program**

The MED for Middle Childhood Education has been an underenrolled program for several years. Enrollment dropped even more when the Bachelor of Science in Middle Childhood Education, from which some of the MED students came, was phased out in December 2006. Currently, there are only five students who are actively enrolled. In order to use faculty resources in programs that serve a larger population of students, the program faculty are recommending that the MED program in Middle Childhood Education be deactivated. Faculty will fully support the remaining five students until completion of their degree requirements or until the program is deactivated in December 2011.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

*Measure:* Faculty STARS standard 1 rating | *Outcome/Objective:* Demonstrates commitment to learning/development

**Implementation Description:** The faculty will recommend that the program be deactivated by December 2011. This should give current students ample time to complete their degree requirements.
Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

Program faculty will file necessary paperwork to deactivate the program.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Last year’s Action Plan included the following: “The Mathematics and Science MCE MED options will continue as the numbers of certified teachers interested in pursuing these options is slowly but steadily increasing. The plan is to double the current number of program completers.” The program experienced a loss of the program coordinator (Dr. Kezia McNeal), and enrollments for the program dropped rather than increased.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The current faculty made the decision to deactivate the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

None

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The decision to drop the program will mean that faculty will be able to concentrate their time and resources toward other Middle Level programs (i.e., the two MAT programs in Middle Level Education and the new BSE in Middle Level Education).

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Program faculty will work closely with the remaining students to ensure high quality learning experiences for them.

**Annual Reports**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**

The department hired a new clinical faculty, Dr. Stephanie Behm Cross, to coordinate all program, including the MED in Middle Childhood Education. Dr. Behm Cross examined current records and created a complete list of current students in the program.

**Challenges for Next Year**

During the coming year, plans for deactivating the program will be started. All necessary paperwork will be submitted to the department, the college, and the university.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**

None

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**

The new program faculty will use the existing portfolio and assessment rubric to evaluate current students.

**University-wide Committee Participation**

N/A

**Publications and Presentations**

N/A

**Academic Teaching Activities**
N/A

International Activities
N/A

Contributions to Student Retention
N/A
Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 1: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS LA/SS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
Findings: (2008-2009): Achievement target MET - 100% (8 of 8 teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the Language Arts/Social Studies content and curriculum.
O 2: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 1: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS LA/SS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
Findings: (2008-2009): Achievement target MET - 100% (8 of 8 teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain.

O 5: Unknown
Related Measures:

M 1: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS LA/SS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met

Findings: (2008-2009): Achievement target PARTIALLY MET - 91.67% (8 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the Planning and Instruction domain.

O 6: Unknown

Unknown
Related Measures:

**M 1: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS LA/SS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

Findings: (2008-2009): Achievement target PARTIALLY MET - 84% (8 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the Professionalism domain.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 3: Unknown**
Achievement Target:

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS LA/SS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
Findings: (2008-2009): Achievement target PARTIALLY MET - 82% (8 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the Learning Environments domain.
85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS LA/SS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009): Achievement target PARTIALLY MET - 87.5% (8 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the Assessment domain.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?
Program faculty have already identified courses and assignments within the curriculum to provide additional and/or more rigorous experiences for MCE TEEM LA/SS teacher candidates.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have updated our LiveText portfolio system to use the Georgia Framework for Teaching to use in addition to the STARS system in order to ensure we obtain a comprehensive view of the status of MCE TEEMS LA/SS.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We have identified four areas which require some strengthening in both curricular and teacher practice. This report verifies anecdotal evidence of the need to improve our work with Learning Environments, Assessment, Planning and Instruction, and Professionalism. We have already begun improvements in our curriculum and teaching approaches which will address these issues and provide for higher success rates next year.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Detailed Assessment Report
2008-2009 Middle Grades Education (Math and Science) TEEMS MAT

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Content and Curriculum

The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge; adapts content and teaching to meet observed learner needs; builds teaching on a strong and current foundation in the content area(s) they teach; makes content relevant to students; uses available resources, including technology, to learn more about content area(s); and, follows state and local curriculum.

**Related Measures:**

M 1: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
Met 86.7% (13 of 15 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the Content and Curriculum domain.

M 2: Portfolio Evaluation using LiveText Rubric
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
Met 94% (17 of 18 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the GSTEP Content and Curriculum Standard.

O 2: Knowledge of Students and Learning

The teacher candidate believes that all students can learn; understands and uses basic theories of learning to create productive classroom instruction; communicates respect for and develops rapport with all students; analyzes student data; identifies students' stages of development, multiple intelligences, learning styles, and areas of exceptionality and develops and uses a repertoire of strategies to accommodate individual needs; communicates with student families/guardians; understands the major principles and theories of adolescent development; understands the range of individual differences of all young adolescents and the implications of these differences for teaching and learning; and, understand issues of young adolescent health and sexuality.

Related Measures:
M 1: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

M 2: Portfolio Evaluation using LiveText Rubric

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

90% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

Met 94% (17 of 18 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of
knowledge and understanding of the GSTEP PRINCIPLE II. KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS AND THEIR LEARNING Standard.

M 3: Faculty Ratings

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS MA/SC will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
90% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
90% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText received a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

O 3: Planning and Instruction

The teacher candidate locates, comprehends, and builds rationales from curriculum guides, other applicable documents, and experienced colleagues; plans and carries out instruction based on state and local performance standards; selects and varies instructional strategies, assessing their impact on student engagement and learning; observes students closely and acknowledges how adjustments in teaching can impact learning; explores teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for assigned students; assesses individual learners’ needs and seek resources to improve instruction and learning; learns to work and plan productively as part of a team, grade level, and/or department group.
**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

Met 86.7% (13 of 15 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the INTASC Planning domain.

**M 2: Portfolio Evaluation using LiveText Rubric**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
Met 94% (17 of 18 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the GSTEP Planning and Instruction Standard.

M 4: Planning and Instruction

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS MA/SC will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS MA/SC will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
90% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS MA/SC demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain.

O 4: Professionalism

The teacher candidate learns basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education; learns about, locate resources for, and follows laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families; adheres to state and local Codes of Ethics, and models ethical behavior for students; reflects on teaching practice and examines the connections to student learning; self-assesses teaching strengths and areas for improvement, seeking and using guidance from mentors and instructional leaders; works through appropriate channels to seek answers to questions, voice concerns, explore ideas, and speak out about issues that matter to them and their students; accepts entry-
level leadership roles (e.g., clubs, special topics, coaching) with support of identified mentors, administrators, coaches, and facilitators.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

Met 88.9%% (13 of 15 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the INTASC Reflective Practice: Professional Development domain

**M 2: Portfolio Evaluation using LiveText Rubric**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
90% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
Met 77% (14 of 18 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the GSTEP Professionalism Standard.

O 5: Learning Environments

The teacher candidate creates a learning environment in which students can learn both independently and collaboratively; organizes and manages time, space, activities, technology, software, and other resources; understands the importance of and builds a functional classroom management plan; seeks, uses, and refines strategies for motivating learners; creates a culturally responsive classroom; learns about and uses resources specific to the school, district, and community; develops appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster supportive learning-based interactions in the classroom.

Related Measures:

M 1: Faculty Ratings
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate
demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
Met 86.7% (13 of 15 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the INTASC Motivation and Management standard. Met 86.7% (13 of 15 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the INTASC Communication and Technology standard.

**M 2: Portfolio Evaluation using LiveText Rubric**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
Met 94% (17 of 18 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the GSTEP Learning Environments Standard.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 6: Assessment**
The teacher candidate will have a basic understanding of assessment and measurement theory; collect and use pre-assessment data to select student learning goals; use formative and summative assessments at appropriate points in the learning process; identify students' learning needs and provide students with goals for learning; develop and implement consistent, fair, and accurate grading procedures; report student progress to students, families, and administrators; use required resources to keep accurate and up-to-date records and reports of student work and behavior; examine ways to identify student strengths and weaknesses through various assessment processes and methods.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

85% of teacher candidates enrolled in MCE TEEMS will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate demonstrates the domain consistently in a field setting and can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of her/his professional performance and decisions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

Met 86.7% (13 of 15 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the INTASC Assessment standard.

**M 2: Portfolio Evaluation using LiveText Rubric**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
Met 94% (17 of 18 total teacher candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the GSTEP Assessment Standard.

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Additional support in professionalism**

Faculty will provide additional support to students through focused assignments. Student handbook will clearly describe expectations for professionalism.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The target date of October 2010 will give faculty adequate time to implement the additional support structures.
- **Completion Date:** 10/01/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty; field experiences director
- **Additional Resources Requested:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Strengthening knowledge of professionalism**

While faculty ratings on professionalism of teacher candidates (via the STARS system) have met our achievement target, our assessment results based on portfolio evaluation have indicated we have partially met our achievement target. To strengthen our teacher
candidates' knowledge of professionalism, we will provide a revised coursework (added learning modules on legal and ethical issues) which will guide our teacher candidates to develop basic knowledge of professionalism. Also teacher candidates will be required to submit weekly reflections as part of their coursework which will offer continued communication and guidance between university supervisors and teacher candidates, thus will foster our teacher candidates' understanding and reflective practices of professionalism.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We have identified and developed course assignments within the program to provide additional learning opportunities for our teacher candidates.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have identified and developed changes in course assignments to respond to last year's assessment report.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We have identified on area (professionalism) that requires some strengthening. Based on this information, we have already made changes in the coursework to address this issue thus to be able to meet our achievement target better next year.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

Goals

G 1: G1: Knowledge and Expertise

G 1: Subject and pedagogical knowledge experts

Candidates in the MEd Reading Specialist program are to become experts in literacy processes and development for students grades pre-K through 12. Additionally, candidates are to gain the expertise in delivering high quality lessons for student success.

G 2: G2: Commitment to urban education and students

G 2: Commitment to urban education and students
Candidates in the MEd Reading Specialist program are committed to the successful learning and achievement of students in urban settings.

**G 3: G3: Critical Reflection**

G 3: Critical reflection skills

Candidates in the MEd Reading Specialist program will hone the theoretical foundations and practical applications as critical thinkers in their classrooms. Candidates will use this critical reflection to make informed decisions about their instruction and curriculum choices.

**Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 1: History of Reading**

Candidates are knowledgeable of reading research and histories of reading.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History**

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the history of reading research and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:  
100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met  
100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) of the standard on the history of reading research through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):  
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio  
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

O 2: Foundations of Reading and Writing  
Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

Related Measures:  

M 2: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations  
In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:

100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) of the standard on foundations of reading and writing through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

O 3: SBRR

Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the SBRR principles (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) as related to literacy development.
Related Measures:

**M 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBRR**

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the SBRR principles and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) of the standard on SBRR principles through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Redesigned Portfolio**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...
O 4: Creates a Literate Environment

Candidates integrate knowledge and dispositions of instructional practices, curricular materials, assessment and evaluation to create a literate environment that fosters both reading and writing.

Related Measures:

M 4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4: Literate Environments

In the exit portfolio, candidates articulate their understanding how to integrate knowledge and dispositions of instructional practices, curricular materials, assessment and evaluation to create a literate environment that fosters both reading and writing.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) on the standard of creating literate environments through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...
O 5: Range of Curricular Materials

Candidates use a wide range of curricular materials in effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Related Measures:

M 5: Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the range of curricular materials for providing effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) of the standard on the range of curricular materials for learners at different stages of the reading process and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.
Redesigned Portfolio

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

O 6: Professional Development

Candidates view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.

Related Measures:

M 6: Portfolio Rating Standard 6: Prof Dev

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of how to view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) of the standard on professional development through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

O 7: Variety of Assessment Tools
Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction.

Related Measures:

M 7: Portfolio Rating Standard 7: Assessment
In the exit portfolio, candidates articulate their understanding of how to use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) on the standard of using a variety of assessment tools through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

O 8: Evaluate Practice
Candidates work with colleagues to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other’s practice.

Related Measures:

M 8: Portfolio Rating Standard 8: Evaluate Practice
In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of how to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other’s practice, and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of program completers will demonstrate an outstanding level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 4).
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of MEd Reading Specialist completers demonstrated at least an outstanding level of knowledge (level 4) of the standard on how to observe, evaluate and provide feedback to colleague's work through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Redesigned Portfolio

Portfolio will be re-designed with professional standards aligned with courses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Completion Date: 05/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lori Elliott
Additional Resources Requested: nono
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
Redesigned Portfolio

The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the 2010 International Reading Standards for reading specialists. Students will create a video document that provides opportunities for synthesis and analysis of the reading process, diagnosis, and instructional decision making.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History | Outcome/Objective: History of Reading
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations | Outcome/Objective: Foundations of Reading and Writing
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBRR | Outcome/Objective: SBRR
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 4: Literate Environments | Outcome/Objective: Creates a Literate Environment
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials | Outcome/Objective: Range of Curricular Materials
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 6: Prof Dev | Outcome/Objective: Professional Development
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 7: Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Variety of Assessment Tools
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 8: Evaluate Practice | Outcome/Objective: Evaluate Practice

Completion Date: 09/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: MEd faculty in Reading, Language and Literacy Education

Analysis Answers
ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The faculty involved in the MEd reading program are learning how to create iMovies. They are also familiarizing themselves with the 2010 International Reading Association reading standards for reading specialists. GRA support will be used to facilitate faculty members’ development and learning of the technology so that by Fall 2010, the new portfolio will be in place.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Language and Literacy unit faculty have decided that the portfolios have outlived their usefulness for students and for faculty. The students are spending an inordinate amount of time creating the documents; faculty are spending an inordinate amount of time reading the documents. To that end, a plan is in progress to utilize 21st century technologies and have students create video documents that highlight and showcase their knowledge of the reading process, diagnosis and assessment, and instructional decision making. The students will learn how to make iMovies, which serves as a useful tool for their own classroom instruction.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

In order for students to exit from the MEd program, they must receive at least a score of 4 (out of 5) on each standard in the portfolio. When students receive less than a 4 on a standard, they are asked to revise and resubmit until it satisfies the criteria for a 4. The results are not particularly useful because all students need to successfully pass the portfolio to exit the program. There is a large amount of faculty time used in reviewing and rating the portfolios. We are in the process of redesigning the portfolio to better demonstrate what students know and understand about the reading process, diagnosis and assessment, and instructional decision making.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
N/A
Mission/Purpose

Note: This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy ESOL - Online MAT Degree Program (Georgia On My Line).

Our online TEEMS-ESOL program is a nontraditional approach to teacher education at the graduate level and leads to certification in Pre-K-12. It is built upon cutting edge research and best practices in preparing teachers to work in urban environments with students who are linguistically and culturally diverse. Our mission is to prepare teachers who are leaders in the field in their knowledge, teaching and dispositions so as to enable their students to attain the highest standards in their literacy, language and emotional development. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In this online program, we strive to realize a vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

Goals

G 1: Become subject and pedagogical knowledge experts

Students in the online MAT-ESOL program will become experts in reading, language, and literacy, and ESOL subject disciplines.

G 2: Promote student language and literacy development

Students in the online MAT-ESOL program will apply the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to planning, managing, and evaluating instruction to promote student language and literacy development.
G 3: Become reflective practitioners

Students in the online MAT-ESOL program will think critically and reflectively about his/her practice and develop appropriate dispositions for working with learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

G 4: Become members of professional communities

Students in the online MAT-ESOL program will become members of one or more professional learning communities.

Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: O1: Understands student development and learning

The teacher understands how children learn and develop and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social, and personal development.

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubri

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

Achievement Target: 75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

M 2: M2: Portfolio Rating Std 2 Reading and Writing

A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via Live Text will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
**Portfolio support**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**M 3: M7: Portfolio rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt**

A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**  
75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Portfolio support**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**M 4: M8: Faculty Ratings**
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher, or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the EDCI courses.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Portfolio support**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**O 2: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**Related Measures:**
M 5: M1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
75% of student candidates’ portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Portfolio support**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

M 6: M2: Portfolio Rating Std 2 Reading and Writing

A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
75% of student candidates’ portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

M 7: M7: Portfolio rating standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt
A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
75% of student candidates’ portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

M 8: M8: faculty ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Portfolio support**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**O 3: O3: Knows/uses multiple instructional strategies**

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Related Measures:**

**M 9: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via Live Text will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Portfolio support**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**M 10: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching**

A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**  
75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Portfolio support**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
M 11: Faculty ratings
Faculty rating of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via
the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. the candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

O 4: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
Related Measures:

M 12: M1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidates’ portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

M 13: M1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

M 14: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching
A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.
Source of Evidence: Portfoliom showing skill development or best work

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
75% of student candidates' portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Portfolio support**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**M 15: M8: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. *Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure*

*Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other*

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

M 16: M8: Faculty Ratings

Faculty rating of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

O 5: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning

The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.

Related Measures:

M 17: M1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

M 18: M4: Portfolio Rating standard 4 Teaching
A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Portfolio support**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**M 19: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
Portfolio support
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

O 6: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction
The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Related Measures:

M 20: M1: Portfolio
Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

M 21: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching
A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Portfolio support**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**M 22: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

O 7: O7: Uses communication skills and technology

The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Related Measures:

M 23: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric  Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Portfolio support**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**M 24: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching**

A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.  
*Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.*

*Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work*

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.
**Portfolio support**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**M 25: M8: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.
**Portfolio support**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**O 8: O8: Practices professional reflection**

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

**Related Measures:**

**M 26: M1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

M 27: M6: Portfolio rating standard 6 Advocacy and Colla

A portfolio rating for Standard 6 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
**Portfolio Support**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**M 28: M8: Faculty Ratings**  
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

O 9: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

**Related Measures:**

**M 29: M1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

M 30: M3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3 Culture

A portfolio rating for Standard 3 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence; Portfolio, showing skill development or best work or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
**Portfolio support**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

---

**M 31: M8: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

---

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

---

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

---

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.
**Portfolio support**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**O 10: O10: Involves school and community in learning**

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

**Related Measures:**

**M 32: M1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Portfolio support

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

M 33: M5: Portfolio Rating std 5 Porfessional Development

A portfolio rating for Standard 5 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence; Portfolio, showing skill development or best work or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
**Portfolio support**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**M 34: M8: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.
Portfolio support

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M2: Portfolio Rating Std 2 Reading and Writing | Outcome/Objective: O1: Understands student development and learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O1: Understands student development and learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric  
- **Outcome/Objective:** O1: Understands student development and learning

**Implementation Description:** Time to completely implement  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** M2: Portfolio Rating Std 2 Reading and Writing  
- **Outcome/Objective:** O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Time for implementation  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0
Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M7: Portfolio rating standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt | Outcome/Objective: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Portfolio  | Outcome/Objective: O3: Knows/uses multiple instructional strategies

Implementation Description:  Time for complete implementation
Completion Date:  10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle:  2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority:  High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching  | Outcome/Objective: O3: Knows/uses multiple instructional strategies

Implementation Description:  Time for complete implementation
Completion Date:  10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** M1: Portfolio  
- **Outcome/Objective:** O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Faculty ratings  
- **Outcome/Objective:** O3: Knows/uses multiple instructional strategies
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

**Measure:** M7: Portfolio rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt | **Outcome/Objective:** O1: Understands student development and learning

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

**Measure:** M8: Faculty Ratings | **Outcome/Objective:** O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Portfolio support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation  
Completion Date: 10/01/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard  
Additional Resources Requested: 0  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: M4: Portfolio Rating standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation  
Completion Date: 10/01/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard  
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M8: faculty ratings | Outcome/Objective: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: Plan will be assessed in October 2010.
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

Measure: M3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3 Culture | Outcome/Objective: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O7: Uses communication skills and technology

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation  
Completion Date: 10/01/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard  
Additional Resources Requested: 0  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation  
Completion Date: 10/01/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard  
Additional Resources Requested: 0  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching  
  **Outcome/Objective:** O6: Can effectively plan for instruction

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Faculty Ratings  
  **Outcome/Objective:** O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O10: Involves school and community in learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M5: Portfolio Rating std 5 Professional Development | Outcome/Objective: O10: Involves school and community in learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** M1: Portfolio  
**Outcome/Objective:** O10: Involves school and community in learning

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching  
**Outcome/Objective:** O7: Uses communication skills and technology

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0
**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

---

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** M1: Portfolio  
- **Outcome/Objective:** O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**Portfolio support**

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

---

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O7: Uses communication skills and technology

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Portfolio Support

We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M6: Portfolio rating standard 6 Advocacy and Colla | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The department chair will ensure that the program coordinator has time and resources to accomplish the action plan.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
This year's findings are incomplete. Faculty will continue to monitor assessment of student achievement.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy M.Ed. with ESOL Concentration - Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line).

The M.Ed. major in English Speakers of Other Languages provides for master's level study in ESOL Education and Reading Education and leads to T-5 certification in ESOL(grades K-12). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing K-12 students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content.

The program's underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in ESOL education.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.
Goals

G 1: Become subject and pedagogical knowledge expert

Students in the online M.Ed program will become experts in Reading, Language, Literacy and ESOL subject disciplines.

G 2: promote student language and literacy development

Students in the online M.Ed.-ESOL program will apply the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to planning, managing and evaluating instruction to promote student language and literacy development.

G 3: Become reflective practitioners

Students in the online M.Ed. - ESOL program will think critically and reflectively about his/her practice and develop appropriate disposttions for working with learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

G 4: Become members of professional communities.

Students in the M.Ed. -ESOL program will become members of one or more professional learning communities.

Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: O1: Understands students development and learning

The teacher understands how children learn and develop and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social and personal development.

Related Measures:
M 1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed standards for portfolio

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

**M 2: M2: Portfolio rating Std 2 Reading and Writing**

A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Embed Standards**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the...

**M 3: M7: Portfolio rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt**

A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Embed standards**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the...

**M 4: M8: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
Embed standards
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

**O 2: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge**

The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric  Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Embed standards**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

**M 6: M2: Portfolio Rating Std 2 Reading and Writing**

A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence; Portfolio, showing skill development or best work or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed standards

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

M 7: M7: Portfolio Rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt

A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence; Portfolio, showing skill development or best work or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed standards
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the...

M 8: M8: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed standards
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

O 3: O3; Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Related Measures:

M 9: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed standards
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

M 10: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching

A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed standards

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

M 11: M8: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Embed standards**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

**O 4: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning**

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.
**Related Measures:**

**M 12: M1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Embed standard**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the...
M 13: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching

A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Embed standard**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the...

**M 14: M8: Faculty ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.
Embed standards
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

O 5: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning

The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Related Measures:

M 15: M1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed standards
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

M 16: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching

A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed standard

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

M 17: M8: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed standards for portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

O 6: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction

The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Related Measures:

M 18: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.
**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Embed Standards**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the...

**M 19: M4; Portfolio rating standard 4 Teaching**

A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student’s written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed Standards
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

M 20: M8: faculty ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of
his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Embed Standards**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

**O 7: O7: Uses communication skills and technology**

The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Related Measures:**

**M 21: M1: Portfolio**
Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Embed Standards**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the...

**M 22: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching**

A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Embed Standards**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

**M 23: M8: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Achievement Target:

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed Standards
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

O 8: O8: Practices professional reflection

This teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.
Related Measures:

M 24: M1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed Standards
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...
M 25: M6: Portfolio rating Standard 6 Advocacy and Colla

A portfolio rating for Standard 6 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed Standards
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

**M 26: M8: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Embed Standard**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

O 9: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Related Measures:

M 27: M1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed Standards
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

M 28: M3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3 Culture

A portfolio rating for Standard 3 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence; Portfolio, showing skill development or best work or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Embed Standards**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

**M 29: M8; Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Embed Standards**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

**O 10: O10: Involves school and community in learning**

This teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students learning and well-being.

**Related Measures:**

**M 30: M1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluation collected via LiveText rubric  Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Embed Standards**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

**M 31: M5: Portfolio Rating Std 5 Professional Developmen**

A portfolio rating for Standard 5 will be derived from each student's written and oral rationales explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. *Source of Evidence; Portfolio, showing skill development or best work or best work.*

*Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work*
Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met
At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

M 32: M8; Faculty Ratings
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. Source of Evidence: Academic Direct Measure

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a
professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Not Met

At this point, we have no students who have completed the program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Embed Standards
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the ...

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Embed
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M5: Portfolio Rating Std 5 Professional Development
Outcome/Objective: O10: Involves school and community in learning

Implementation Description: Time for complementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Embed standard

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O4: Can motivate and manage students for learnin

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** M8: Faculty Ratings  
**Outcome/Objective:** O8: Practices professional reflection

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Embed standards**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Embed standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O3; Knows and uses multiple instructional strategi

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: additional faculty
Embed standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Embed standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** M2: Portfolio Rating Std 2 Reading and Writing  
- **Outcome/Objective:** O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

**Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.

**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** Additional faculty  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

### Embed standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

**Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.

**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard

**Additional Resources Requested:** Additional faculty

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

Embed standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** M8: Faculty Ratings | **Outcome/Objective:** O3: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategi

**Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.

**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard

**Additional Resources Requested:** Additional faculty
Embed standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O1: Understands students development and learning

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Embed standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** M8: Faculty ratings  
- **Outcome/Objective:** O4: Can motivate and manage students for learning

**Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.

**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** Additional faculty  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**Embed standards**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O3; Knows and uses multiple instructional strategi

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Embed standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M7: Portfolio Rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt | Outcome/Objective: O2: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: Additional faculty
Embed standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M7: Portfolio rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wt | Outcome/Objective: O1: Understands students development and learning

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** M4; Portfolio rating standard 4 Teaching  
- **Outcome/Objective:** O6: Can effectively plan for instruction

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Framces Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Embed Standards**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M8; Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O10: Involves school and community in learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Embed Standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O10: Involves school and community in learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Embed Standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M8; Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Embed Standards
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M1: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation  
Completion Date: 10/01/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard  
Additional Resources Requested: 0  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Embed Standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned
Embed Standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4 Teaching | Outcome/Objective: O7: Uses communication skills and technology
Embed Standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M6: Portfolio rating Standard 6 Advocacy and Colla | Outcome/Objective: O8: Practices professional reflection

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Embed Standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Embed Standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.
Embed Standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure**: M8: faculty ratings
- **Outcome/Objective**: O6: Can effectively plan for instruction

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** M8: Faculty Ratings  
- **Outcome/Objective:** O7: Uses communication skills and technology

**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources Requested:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**Embed Standards**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned
Embed standards for portfolio

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M8: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: O5: Understands and uses assessment for learning

Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Embed standards for portfolio

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: O1: Understands students development and learning

Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources Requested: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

The department Chair will ensure that the program coordinator has adequate time and resources to accomplish the action plan.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

This year's findings are incomplete. Faculty will continue to monitor assessment of students' achievement.
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy M.Ed. Degree with ESOL Concentration.

The mission for the major in reading, language, and literacy program is to provide educators with a master's level study of literacy processes and literacy instruction for culturally diverse learners with specialization in one of three options: reading instruction, early literacy, or teaching. English as a second language. Our purpose is to develop teachers as critical inquirers in multicultural, urban settings. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity and social justice where individuals have access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge for the greater good.

Goals

G 1: Become a Subject and Pedagogical Knowledge Expert

Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will become experts in Reading, Language, Literacy and the Early Literacy and/or ESOL subject disciplines.
G 2: Promote Student Language and Literacy Development

Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will apply the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to planning, managing, and evaluating instruction to promote student language and literacy development.

G 3: Become Reflective Practitioners

Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will think critically and reflectively about his/her practice and develop appropriate dispositions with learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

G 4: Become Members of Professional Communities

Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will become members of one or more professional learning communities.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Candidates are knowledgeable about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension (SBRR principles).

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience
**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading**

Our target is for all candidates to achieve an intermediate level of knowledge in their performance (Level 3).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

Our target is for all candidates to attain an intermediate level of knowledge in this standard.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of the candidates attained an intermediate level of knowledge in this standard.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**For all candidates to attain above intermediate standard**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

**The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures....

**O 2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL**

Candidates will understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and acquisition of language learning and teaching.
**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL**

Our target is for all candidates to achieve an intermediate level of knowledge in their performance (Level 3).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

Our target is for all candidates to achieve an intermediate level of knowledge in their performance (level 3).

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of the students successfully attained this standard.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measure...

**O 3: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture**

Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will become experts in Culture subject discipline.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture**

Our target is for all candidates to achieve an intermediate level of knowledge in their performance (Level 3).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

Our target is for all candidates to achieve an intermediate level of knowledge in their performance (Level 3).

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of our students met this target.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measure...

**O 5: Demonstrate Advocacy on Behalf of Learners**

Candidates will demonstrate a disposition indicating that teachers should reflect on, support and advocate for ESOL students and their families and work collaboratively to improve their learning environment.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

*President, Georgia State University*

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Achievement of Reflective Action**

Our target is for all candidates to achieve an intermediate level of performance in reflective advocacy through action (Level 3).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
100% of our candidates successfully met this target.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of our students met this target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measure...

Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 4: Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development
Candidates will know, manage, and implement a variety of standards-based teaching strategies and techniques for developing and integrating English listening, speaking, reading and writing, and for accessing the core curriculum. Candidates will support ESOL students in accessing the core curriculum as they learn language and academic content together.

Associations:
Strategic Plans:
President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 4: Achievement of Instructional Practices
Our target is for all candidates to attain an intermediate level of skills in this standard.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of the students successfully attained this target.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of our candidates met this target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measure...

O 6: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities
Candidates are members of various learning and professional communities and organizations. Candidates will collaborate with and are prepared to serve as a resource to all staff, including paraprofessionals, to improve learning for all ESOL students.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 6: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership**

Our target is for all students to attain an intermediate pass or above in this standard.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of our students attained this target (n=3).

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of our students attained this target (N=3).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.
In today's world, teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures...

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today's world, teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore, we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable, we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture

**Implementation Description:** These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.  
**Completion Date:** 08/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL  
**Additional Resources Requested:** All ESOL faculty  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00
For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
Completion Date: 08/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
Additional Resources Requested: All ESOL faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of Instructional Practices | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development

Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
Completion Date: 08/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
Additional Resources Requested: All ESOL faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of Reflective Action | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Advocacy on Behalf of Learners

Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
Completion Date: 08/01/2010
For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership |
Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities

Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
Completion Date: 08/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
Additional Resources Requested: All ESOL faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures8
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL

**Implementation Description:** These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.

**Completion Date:** 08/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL  
**Additional Resources Requested:** All ESOL faculty  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**For all candidates to attain above intermediate standard**

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading
The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: One year from this date we hope for the majority our new cohort to attain this level of "highly qualified."
Completion Date: 08/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator of our MAT-ESOL.
Additional Resources Requested: All ESOL faculty.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

(1) Discussions with all ESOL faculty who together can attain our targets;

(2) Inform students of our goal to attain highly qualified status in all our standards;

(3) And the use of promotional literature through internet and brochures to broadcast our plans to attain "highly qualified status;"

(4) More focused and concentrated discussion and assignments on the role of advocacy and leadership in our students’ school programs for combatting the prevailing deficit viewpoint on the part of fellow teachers in working with English language learners.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have re-ordered the courses to be taught to allow for greater uptake of key ESOL content. Given that our endorsement program is very intense, we have changed the Applied Linguistics course from the short summer session to the longer instructional period in the fall. This allows our candidates more time for uptake and recycling of information in the other related ESOL courses during the fall as the semester is longer.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings indicate that we are doing well generally but we would like to do better. Our scores in ESOL theory reflected some weaknesses with some of our students so this is an area which we have targeted for more specific instructional emphasis. All ESOL faculty are reinforcing this area in their respective courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

NA

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

NA

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

NA
Mission/Purpose

The exact title of this degree program should be: Reading, Language and Literacy TEEMS ESOL MAT. Our TEEMS-ESOL program is a nontraditional approach to teacher education at the graduate level and leads to certification in Pre-K-12. It is built upon cutting edge research and best practices in preparing teachers to work in urban environments with students who are linguistically and culturally diverse. Our mission is to prepare teachers who are leaders in the field in their knowledge, teaching and dispositions so as to enable their students to attain the highest standards in their literacy, language and emotional development. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

Goals

G 1: Become subject and pedagogical knowledge expert

Students in the TEEMS-ESOL program will become experts in Reading, Language Literacy and ESOL subject disciplines.

G 2: Promote student language and literacy development
Students in the TEEMS-ESOL program will apply the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to planning, managing, and evaluating instruction to promote student language and literacy development.

G 3: Become reflective practitioners

Students in the TEEMS-ESOL program will think critically and reflectively about his/her practice and develop appropriate dispositions for working with learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

G 4: Become members of professional communities.

Students in the TEEMS-ESOL program will become members of one or more professional learning communities.

Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Understands student development and learning

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

Associations:
Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

100% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a satisfactory grade (score of 3 or higher) per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of TEEMS-ESOL candidates (n=17) demonstrated proficiency at understanding the foundations of language acquisition and learning.

M 2: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the candidates demonstrated an "understanding of student development re: learning"

O 3: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
88 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

M 2: Faculty Ratings
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:
75 % of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100 % of the candidates knew and used “multiple instructional strategies.”

O 4: Can motivate and manage students for learning
The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

88 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 2: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of the candidates were able to "motivate and manage students for learning."

**O 5: Understands and uses assessment for learning**

The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**
M 1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
88 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

M 2: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:
75 % of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100 % of the candidates "understood and used assessment for learning"

O 6: Can effectively plan for instruction

The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
88 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3)
of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 2: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of candidates were able to "effectively plan for instruction."

**O 7: Uses communication skills and technology**

The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Associations:**
Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
88 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

M 2: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of the candidates used "communication skills and technology"

**O 8: Practices professional reflection**

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
**Achievement Target:**
75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
88 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of advocacy and collaboration through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 2: Faculty Ratings**
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**
75 % of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100 % of students “practiced personal reflection.”

**O 9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**
The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

88 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (15 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of cultural issues in the teaching and learning through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 2: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Achievement Target:

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of the candidates were able to "effectively teacher diverse groups of learners."

O 10: Involves school and community in learning

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students` learning and well-being.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

M 1: Portfolio
Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
94% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (16 of 17 total teacher candidates) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of professional development through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**M 2: Faculty Ratings**
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of our candidates demonstrated proficiency at "involving school and community in learning."

**Analysis Answers**
ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

(1) Discussions with all ESOL faculty who together can attain our targets;

(2) Inform students of our goal to attain highly qualified status in all our standards;

(3) And the use of promotional literature through internet and brochures to broadcast our plans to attain "highly qualified status."

(4) More rigorous procedures for selection and admission of candidates to our program.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have re-ordered the courses to be taught to allow for greater uptake of key ESOL content. Given that our program is very intense, we have changed the Applied Linguistics course from the short summer session to the longer instructional period in the fall. This
allows our candidates more time for uptake and recycling of information in the other related
ESOL courses.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on
this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational
degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to
curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings indicate that we are doing well generally but we would like to do better. Our
scores in reading reflected some weaknesses with some of our students so this is an area
which we have targeted for more specific instructional emphasis. All ESOL faculty are
reinforcing this area in their respective courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment
report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)?
How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 2: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher on element rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of 2 teachers scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

O 2: Unknown
Related Measures:

M 9: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

O 3: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 10: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
90% of students attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

O 4: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 3: Unknown
Unknown
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of 2 teacher candidates scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

M 6: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit (Nature of Science)
Teacher candidates develop a SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment). The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary
materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage their students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of 2 teacher candidates scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, both teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**O 5: Unknown**

Unknown

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
100 % of teacher candidates will attend and 90 % will successfully complete the safety certification workshop.
**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of 2 students attended and successfully completed the safety certification workshop. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**O 6: Unknown**

Unknown

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Portfolio element: Curriculum Exploration/Analysis**

The curriculum exploration and analysis paper will require teacher candidates to generate a list of criteria after consulting professional documents to evaluate curriculum materials. Using these criteria, the teacher candidates will examine two science curricula: one traditional curriculum developed by textbook publishing companies and one NSF reform based curriculum. The teacher candidates will write a report based on the criteria highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of each curriculum. The curriculum explorations paper is graded using a rubric on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates exceeds expectations, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the teacher candidates has not met the criteria.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.
M 8: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations

O 7: Unknown

Unknown

**Related Measures:**

M 9: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of 2 teachers scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

M 3: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

M 4: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of 2 students scored a 2 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

O 9: Can plan and implement science curriculum

Teachers of science plan and implement an active, coherent, and effective curriculum that is consistent with the goals and recommendations of the National Science Education Standards. They begin with the end in mind and effectively incorporate contemporary practices and resources into their planning and teaching.

Related Measures:

M 2: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher on element rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

M 3: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher on element rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**M 5: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `4` or higher on element rubric.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

50% or 1 student scored a 5 on element rubric while the other 50% (1 student) scored a 4 on element rubric. Therefore, all students either met or exceeded expectations.

**M 9: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher on element rubric.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of 2 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

O 10: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 5: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `4` or higher` on element rubric.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

50 % or 1 student scored a 5 on element rubric while the other 50% (1 student) scored a 4 on element rubric. Therefore, all students either met or exceeded expectations.

Established by Geeta Verma on 4/30/2009
**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Pk-12 involvement**

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, but explore and implement ways to involve the engagement of pk-12 faculty to provide their input in the program design during the 2008-2009 academic year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** This activity is ongoing so there is no target date for full implementation. This is a college wide initiative.
- **Completion Date:** 10/01/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** COE Dean's office

**Providing diverse experiences in the program**

Our student population comprises of in-service teachers that may be working with a specific student population. We need to formalize ways of providing diverse learning experiences to our students and collect data on this process.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** This action plan will be developed further by this date.
- **Completion Date:** 10/01/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** All program faculty. We have implemented two changes discussed in our actions plan for 2006-2007. For providing diverse experiences to our students (in-service teachers), we now require the students to do a revised program assessment (peer teaching). We need to meet as a group to further discuss and develop
ideas for integrating diverse learning experiences for our students.

**Additional Resources Requested:** None

---

**Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

Having an ad-hoc committee to discuss and solve these issues at the dept. level.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

For getting an input and feedback from our pk-12 stakeholders in various programs, the COE has facilitated the process of getting via PDS and other partner schools and forming a PDS adhoc committee. Our program faculty will be participating in that process to address this issue.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

For getting an input and feedback from our pk-12 stakeholders in various programs, the COE has facilitated the process of getting via PDS and other partner schools and forming a PDS adhoc committee. Our program faculty will be participating in that process to address this issue. This allows us to have dept. wide conversations about these two issues in all of our M.Ed. programs since the students in this program are in-service teachers.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

We are beginning to use livetext for data collection at two levels: data from portfolio assessment (summative) and data from individual program assessments (formative assessment) to track students' progress. Livetext will allow us to have a data warehouse to not only store data but also to be able to run different analysis using the data.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

This year's finding further establishes the need to have the data warehouse (LIVETEXT). We need to find a person to manage it (for various programs) so that one person has an overall understanding of the data collection process.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Our goal is to get all of the courses in the program (they house the program assessments) transferred to livetext so that data gathering becoming flawless and efficient.
Mission/Purpose

This program should be listed as Science Education M.Ed. Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). The mission of the Georgia State University M.Ed. Online Program in Science Education is to provide an opportunity for certified teachers to build capacity by expanding their content knowledge and pedagogical practices.

Goals

G 1: Goal/Purpose Statement

The goal of the MEd Online Science Education program is to help certified teachers expand their content knowledge base and pedagogical practices through application where they demonstrate their knowledge and skills of advanced topics in the natural sciences and pedagogical practices which includes inquiry, working with diverse student populations, and literacy.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Unknown

Unknown
**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Document:**

- *Rubric Cultural Awareness Project*

**Achievement Target:**
80% of the students will score 20 out of 25 points in order to achieve this target.

**Document:**

- *Rubric Cultural Awareness Project*

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
Fall 2009 data show that 40% of the students exceeded the expectation of scoring 80% on the Cultural Awareness project on the first submission and 50% achieved the targeted expectation. A total of 90% of the students met or exceeded the target.

**O 2: Unknown**

Unknown

**Related Measures:**
M 2: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Document:
• Rubric Unit Plan

Achievement Target:

80 percent of the students will score a minimum of 24/30 in order to achieve this target.

Document:
• Rubric Unit Plan

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
Data show that 50% of the students exceeded the target expectation and 50% met the target expectation.

Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 3: Unknown

Unknown
Related Measures:

M 3: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Document:

- Rubric Curriculum Project

Achievement Target:

80% of the students will score 12/15 in order to meet this target.

Document:

- Rubric Curriculum Project

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
Data show that 90% of the students exceeded the target of scoring 80% on the first submission of their Curriculum Exploration projects.

Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:
What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

Faculty will develop a common approach to improving students' understanding of planning inquiry lessons and this type of planning will be embedded in all pedagogy courses with more emphasis in EDSC 8400 Strategies of Instruction in Science. Faculty will continue to include in their courses content that focuses on diversity and multicultural issues. In addition, faculty will make the Cultural Awareness Project a course requirement for the Theory and Pedagogy of Science Instruction, EDSC 7550. Curriculum theories and principles will be incorporated in all courses but will be the major focus of EDSC 8600, Science Curriculum Theory, where students will submit the Curriculum Exploration project as a course assignment.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

This is a new degree report, and there was no report for last year.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
In order to achieve the expected targets, a good percentage of the students had to resubmit the required documents. Plans have been made to embed principles of curriculum, strategies for planning inquiry lessons, and content that focuses on diversity and multicultural issues in all of the pedagogy courses that are offered in the program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

The mission of the MAT science program is to prepare high quality urban science teachers who understand and implement reform based practices.

Goals

G 1: Can teach using culturally relevant pedagogy

To prepare science teachers who can implement culturally relevant pedagogy

G 2: Uses reform science methods

To prepare reform minded teachers (e.g., inquiry problem-based learning, socio-scientific issues)

G 3: Uses technology competently

To prepare technologically competent teachers to meet demands of 21st century

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Uses communication skills and technology
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students exhibit knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

4.43 Effective utilization of resources

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: MAT Science Portfolio and online PAAR rating**

Supervisors’ internship (practicum) evaluations, course assignment, student interviews and overall portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS/PAARS database for Standard 6.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the
standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
There is a large discrepancy between the number of completers in our program and the results of assessments by faculty. 100% of students passed the technology component of the online program portfolio. However, faculty reported that 75% of the responses were at or above the target in the area of effective communication and in the use of communication strategies to promote higher level learning in the field.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Related Action Plan(s):
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Faculty members teaching in the MAT science program will revisit standard #6 and revise the activities targeting these areas

O 2: Understands and uses assessment for learning
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students show they understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 2: Uses assessment for learning

Portfolio: Includes artifacts and mentor/supervisor evaluations describing different types of assessment and the appropriate use of them in the classroom

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
68% of students were rated proficient by faculty supervisors. 100% passed the portfolio measure. This would indicate that students can provide several examples of assessment, but are not yet well practiced in the field.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
Extended practica
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

O 3: Motivates and manages students for learning

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students show the understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 3: Motivation and Management of Students

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
100% demonstrated proficiency on the portfolio requirement. 83% demonstrated proficiency in the classroom. Therefore, students were able to discuss and provide artifacts showing their understandings and abilities to manage and motivate students. However, GSU supervisors did not rank their performance in the field as highly.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Extended practica**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

**O 6: School and Community Involvement**
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate purposeful and effective relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.
**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 6: School and Community Involvement**

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of the candidates successfully passed the portfolio assessment while 90% of the candidates demonstrated success in the field as assessed by GSU supervisors.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Continue current actions.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Continue current actions.

O 7: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate an understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) they teach and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

**M 7: Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the candidates successfully passed the portfolio assessment while 94% of the candidates demonstrated success in the field as assessed by GSU supervisors.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Continue current actions.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Continue current actions.

O 8: Practices professional reflection
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate continuous evaluation of the effects her/his choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 8: Reflective Practice**

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of
his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

100% of the candidates successfully passed the portfolio assessment while 85% of the candidates demonstrated success in the field as assessed by GSU supervisors.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Extended Practica**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

**O 9: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate their understands and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 9: Instructional Variety**

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

100% of the candidates successfully passed the portfolio assessment while 81% of the candidates demonstrated success in the field as assessed by GSU supervisors.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
Extended Practica
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

O 10: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate their understandings of how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

3 Contribute to the greater community good
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 10: Effectively teaches diverse learners
The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
100% of the candidates successfully passed the portfolio assessment while 83% of the candidates demonstrated success in the field as assessed by GSU supervisors.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Extended Practica**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pract...

**Extended Practicum**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...
Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures,
Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 4: Can effectively plan for instruction

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students preservice teachers plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community and curriculum goals.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Related Measures:

M 4: Instructional Planning

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
100% of candidates passed the portfolio component while 81% of candidates demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. Therefore, the candidates were able to show readiness on paper, however performance in the field was somewhat inconsistent.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Extended Practica
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

O 5: Understands student development re: learning

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students show they understand how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

**M 5: Student Learning and Development**

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social, and personal development.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

100% of the candidates successfully passed the portfolio assessment while 81% of the candidates demonstrated success in the field as assessed by GSU supervisors.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Extended Practica**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Continue current actions.**

Continue current actions.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Pedagogical Content Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge

**Completion Date:** 05/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen

**Continue current actions.**

Continue current actions.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure: School and Community Involvement  |  Outcome/Objective: School and Community Involvement

Completion Date:  05/01/2010  
Responsible Person/Group:  Lisa Martin-Hansen

Extended practica

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

Established in Cycle:  2008-2009  
Implementation Status:  In-Progress  
Priority:  Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Uses assessment for learning  |  Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning

Completion Date:  05/01/2010  
Responsible Person/Group:  Lisa Martin-Hansen

Extended practica
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Motivation and Management of Students  
**Outcome/Objective:** Motivates and manages students for learning

**Completion Date:** 05/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen

---

**Extended Practica**

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Instructional Variety  
**Outcome/Objective:** Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies
Extended Practica

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Reflective Practice | Outcome/Objective: Practices professional reflection

Completion Date: 05/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen

Extended Practica

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Instructional Planning | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively plan for instruction

Completion Date: 05/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen

Extended Practica

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Student Learning and Development | Outcome/Objective: Understands student development re: learning

Completion Date: 05/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen
Extended Practica

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Effectively teaches diverse learners | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

Completion Date: 05/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen

Extended Practicum

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
**Measure:** Effectively teaches diverse learners  | **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

**Completion Date:** 05/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen

---

**Plan to reexamine technology competency**

There is either a misunderstanding by faculty by the term "developing" or our students need more guided experiences with technology implementation, or our program is not gatekeeping preservice teachers properly to hold them in the program if they are not adequately progressing. It will be necessary to have discussions with faculty regarding course and practicum expectations, revisit the ties to the INTASC standards, and to determine what more could be done to prevent preservice teachers from completing a program if they are not yet ready to teach. Despite training faculty supervisors on the administration of PAARS, ratings are still reporting below average when in reality all students who remained in the program have met or exceeded all expectations.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** We hope to see students navigating technology in the field more appropriately in fall, 2009.  
**Completion Date:** 05/01/2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen and Science MAT faculty

---

**Related Action Plan(s):**

Faculty members teaching in the MAT science program will revisit standard #6 and revise the activities targeting these areas

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: MAT Science Portfolio and online PAAR rating | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology

Implementation Description: Faculty member teaching in the MAT science program will revisit standard #6 and revise the activities targeting these areas
Completion Date: 08/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: MAT Science Ed Unit

Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We are asking students to use appropriate technology in their practicum experiences and in their science teaching methods presentations. We are having our students access information and use technology in a variety of ways including online resources and software.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Based upon last year’s and this year’s assessments, our science education unit as decided that the fall practicum expansion from 6 weeks to 8 weeks is still too brief. We have recommended expanding the practicum to 12 weeks. This will provide for additional practice in the classroom and more experiences to be able to demonstrate proficiencies in several areas.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We are progressing well in our development of future science teachers, however our science ed unit in MSIT will need to continue to find ways to link technology and applications of technology into our methods courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

We attempted to have students use iPOD technology last year. However, our scores remain static in terms of this assessment (no improvement, no loss).

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

The findings are somewhat useful as we are examining different ways to have our students implement technology and to demonstrate these abilities.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

We are asking students to use appropriate technology in their practicum experiences and in their science teaching methods presentations. We are having our students access information and use technology in a variety of ways including online resources and software. We anticipate that more students will accomplish mastery of demonstrating the appropriate use of technology in the classroom.
Detailed Assessment Report
2008-2009 Social Studies Education MEd

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Student Learning/Development

The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

Related Measures:

M 1: Learning and Development (Standard 3)

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for learning and development (Standard 3).

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
85% of students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program, upon completion, will demonstrate a minimum intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting appropriate action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
Findings (2008-2009): Achievement target - MET - 100% (2 of 2) students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program demonstrated at, or above, the intermediate level of proficiency in the knowledge and skills
needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting action.

O 2: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

The educator thinks systematically about her/his practice and learns from professional experience.

Related Measures:

M 2: Reflection (Standard 4)

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for reflection (Standard 4).

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
85% of students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program, upon completion, will demonstrate a minimum intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting appropriate action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
Findings (2008-2009): Achievement target - MET - 100% (2 of 2) students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program demonstrated at, or above, the intermediate level of proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting action.
O 3: Participates in professional learning communities

The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.

**Related Measures:**

M 3: Professional Learning Communities (Standard 5)

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for professional learning communities (Standard 5).

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

85% of students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program, upon completion, will demonstrate a minimum intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting appropriate action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

Findings (2008-2009): Achievement target - MET - 100% (2 of 2) students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program demonstrated at, or above, the intermediate level of proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting action.

O 4: Committed to student learning and development

Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.
Related Measures:

M 4: Commitment to S. Lrng. & Dev. (Standard 1)

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for commitment to student learning and development (Standard 1).

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
85% of students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program, upon completion, will demonstrate a minimum intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting appropriate action.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
Findings (2008-2009): Achievement target - MET - 100% (2 of 2) students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program demonstrated at, or above, the intermediate level of proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting action.

O 5: Can apply expertise for learning and development

The educator is an expert in her/his field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote student learning/development.

Related Measures:

M 5: Expertise to learning and development

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for applying expertise to student learning and development (Standard 2).
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**
85% of students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program, upon completion, will demonstrate a minimum intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting appropriate action.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
Findings (2008-2009): Achievement target - MET - 100% (2 of 2) students enrolled in the Social Studies Master of Education program demonstrated at, or above, the intermediate level of proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning, reflection and resulting action.

**Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We will be looking into various recruitment options available to us, including the possibility of collapsing all of our masters degrees into one program with differing areas of specialty.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Our portfolio assessment is fully aligned with the Advanced level of the GA framework for teaching. We have updated the program of study to better reflect student needs and faculty resources.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We have learned that the program changes we implemented are, thus far, working well for students. We are looking towards significantly increasing enrollment at this point in time.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Goals

G 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will develop broad content knowledge that is transformed given the multiple contexts, purposes, and ends of education as well as specific pedagogical aims and interests.
G 2: Purpose/History of Social Studies

Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will develop an understanding of the purposes and history of the field of social studies.

G 3: Diverse Learning Environments
Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will develop the ability to create a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with special needs.

**Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 1: Content and Curriculum**

The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge; adapts content and teaching to meet observed learner needs; builds teaching on a strong and current foundation in the content area(s) they teach; makes content relevant to students; uses available resources, including technology, to learn more about content area(s); and, follows state and local curriculum.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of our 33 completers demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

O 2: Knowledge of Students

The teacher candidate believes that all students can learn; understands and uses basic theories of learning to create productive classroom instruction; communicates respect for and develops rapport with all students; analyzes student achievement data to improve instruction; identifies students’ stages of development, multiple intelligences, learning styles, and areas of exceptionality; communicates with families regarding student progress through required school and district procedures.

Related Measures:

M 2: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of
his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of our 33 completers demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

**O 3: Learning Environments**

The teacher candidate creates a learning environment in which students can learn both independently and collaboratively; organizes and manages time, space, activities, technology, software, and other resources; understands the importance of and builds a functional classroom management plan; seeks, uses, and refines strategies for motivating learners; creates a culturally responsive classroom; learns about and uses resources specific to the school, district, and community; develops appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster supportive learning-based interactions in the classroom.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of our 33 completers demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

**O 6: Professionalism**

The teacher candidate learns basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education; learns about, locates resources for, and follows laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families; adheres to state and local Codes of Ethics, and models ethical behavior for students; reflects on teaching practice and examines the connections to student learning; self-assesses teaching strengths and areas for improvement, seeking and using guidance from mentors and instructional leaders; works through appropriate channels to seek answers to questions, voice concerns, explore ideas, and speak out about issues that matter to them and their students; accepts entry-level leadership roles (e.g., clubs, special topics, coaching) with support of identified mentors, administrators, coaches, and facilitators.

**Related Measures:**

**M 6: Unknown**
Achievement Target:

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of our 33 completers demonstrated at or above the proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrated the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions.

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Maintain Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.

Completion Date: 06/01/2010

Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.

Additional Resources Requested: n/a

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Maintain Student Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.

Completion Date: 06/01/2010

Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.

Additional Resources Requested: n/a

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Maintain Student Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates’ MAT TEEMS SS initial preparation program.
Completion Date: 06/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources Requested: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Maintain Student Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates’ MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
Completion Date: 06/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources Requested: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Maintain Student Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates’ MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.

**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.

**Additional Resources Requested:** n/a

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**Maintain Student Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates’ MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.

**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.

**Additional Resources Requested:** n/a

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**Maintain Student Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to maintain 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to continue to promote 100% competency. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
Completion Date: 06/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources Requested: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year's action plan does your department intend to implement?

Our department will continue to emphasize each standard in the core social studies classes to better enhance students' understanding of each standard.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Our department increased the target percentage for completers to 85% based on previous data. We also added a new elective course to enhance students' understanding of lesson planning and we reduced the number of content credit hours so students could fit the new social studies elective course into their program of study.
ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Even though we were very successful and exceeded our 85% target with a 100% of our candidates demonstrating at or above the proficient level for all standards, our department will continue to focus on topics and assignments in our core social studies classes that will enhance our students' understanding of each standard.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
The Ed.S. program with a major in Teaching and Learning is intended for professional educators who demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration and wish both to develop those areas further and to develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders and instructional specialists. The purpose of this applied degree is to extend the academic preparation and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers and instructional leaders and to foster the application of these skills and abilities to a variety of educational settings.

In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.
Goals

G 1: Develop Education Experts in Concentrations


G 2: Develop Education Experts, Inquirers & Leaders


Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Committed to Student Learning and Development

Accomplished Ed.S. graduates are committed to student learning and development.

Related Measures:
**M 1: M1: Faculty Rating: Commitment to Student Learning**

Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 1.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

O 2: O2: Applies Expertise to Promote Student Learning

Accomplished Ed.S. graduates are experts in their areas of concentration and can effectively apply that expertise to promote student learning and development.

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: M2: Faculty Rating: Expertise in Learning**

Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 2.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of
knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**O 3: O3: Manages/Monitors Student Learning/Development**

Accomplished Ed.S. graduates demonstrate responsibility and expertise in managing and monitoring student learning and development.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: M3: Faculty Rating: Monitoring Student Learning**

Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 3.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).
O 4: Reflects on and Learns from Experience

Accomplished Ed.S. graduates reflect systematically about their practice and learn from their professional experiences.

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Faculty Rating: Ability to Reflect**

Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 4.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

O 5: Participates in Learning Communities

Accomplished Ed.S. graduates demonstrate how their professional growth is impacted through participation in one or more learning communities.

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Faculty Rating: Learning Communities**
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Future of Ed.S.**

We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to make a decision regarding our commitment to the future of the program during 2009-2010.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** End of Spring Semester 2010
- **Completion Date:** 05/01/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair and Ed.S. Faculty
- **Additional Resources Requested:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00
Future of Ed.S.

We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to make a decision regarding our commitment to the future of the program during 2009-2010.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of Spring Semester 2010
Completion Date: 05/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair and Ed.S. Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Analysis Answers

ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to make a decision regarding our commitment to the future of the program during 2009-2010.
ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have addressed last year's Action Plan in the following ways: 1. Core Content and Delivery. We have re-sequenced and implemented hybrid models of the core courses (i.e., part face-to-face, part online). We have continued to discuss the possibility of fully online options of the core courses, but because of the tentative nature of the future of the Ed.S. program, we have delayed making the investment in creating online courses. We have also considered incorporating the Teacher Support Specialist courses into the program, but again, we have not moved forward with this due to the tentative nature of the future of the program. 2. Increase Recruitment and Retention. We have completely updated the relevant sections of the MSIT website for the Ed.S. degree. However, several sections of the College of Education website remain outdated (e.g., the OAA site). We have sent changes/updates that are needed to the appropriate individuals, but updates are not yet completed. We have begun to offer orientation sessions (program-specific and department-wide) for new Ed.S. students. We also continue to advise students formally twice a year in MSIT's Professional Advisement Week (PAW). In 2009-2010, several Ed.S. concentrations have increased in enrollment.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
All completers met the target performance expectations for measures 1-5. Ed.S. students demonstrate high levels of content knowledge, teaching performance, and ability to impact student achievement. They are engaged in professional growth and participate in learning communities.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

**Annual Reports**

**Most Important Accomplishments for Year**
Our most important accomplishments in the Ed.S. for this year are that 2008-2009 assessment targets were met, enrollments increased slightly, and website materials were updated, and new student orientations were added.

**Challenges for Next Year**

We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to make a decision regarding our commitment to the future of the program during 2009-2010.

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**

N/A

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**

N/A

**University-wide Committee Participation**

The Ed.S. program with a major in Teaching and Learning is intended for professional educators who demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration and wish both to develop those areas further and to develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders and instructional specialists. The purpose of this applied degree is to extend the academic preparation and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers and instructional leaders and to foster the application of these skills and abilities to a variety of educational settings.

**Publications and Presentations**

The Ed.S. program with a major in Teaching and Learning is intended for professional educators who demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration and
wish both to develop those areas further and to develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders and instructional specialists. The purpose of this applied degree is to extend the academic preparation and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers and instructional leaders and to foster the application of these skills and abilities to a variety of educational settings.

**Academic Teaching Activities**

The Ed.S. program with a major in Teaching and Learning is intended for professional educators who demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration and wish both to develop those areas further and to develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders and instructional specialists. The purpose of this applied degree is to extend the academic preparation and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers and instructional leaders and to foster the application of these skills and abilities to a variety of educational settings.

**International Activities**

We have a large number of Ed.S. students in Teaching and Learning who are international students. MSIT boasts 12 international faculty in the department. Multiple international research, teaching, and service activities are in progress.

**Contributions to Student Retention**

For the Ed.S. degree, we now hold new student orientations that are program-specific and department-wide. We also advise students formally twice a year during Professional Advisement Week (PAW). Each individual Ed.S. student works closely with a faculty advisor/mentor.
Mission/Purpose

The mission of the Ph.D. degree program in Teaching and Learning is to prepare accomplished graduates who demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

Goals

G 1: Develop Researchers in Teaching and Learning

Accomplished graduates of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning degree program will demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: O1: Research Competence

The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.

Related Measures:

M 1: M1: Faculty Rating of Research Competence

A summary rating describing the candidate’s research competence will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive
exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective through independent and autonomous performance.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated research competence in at least one research paradigm. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**O 2: O2: Knowledge of Foundations of Education**

The Ph.D. candidate develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological and economic influences that affect education today.

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: M2: Faculty Rating of Foundational Knowledge**

A summary rating describing the candidate's foundational knowledge will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological and economic influences that affect education today. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**O 3: O3: Creates New Knowledge in Major**

The Ph.D. candidate engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: M3: Faculty Rating of Scholarship within Major**

A summary rating describing the candidate's scholarship within the major will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.
Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated the creation of new knowledge and scholarship in his/her discipline or major. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

O 4: O4: Extensive Knowledge of Major Field

The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in the major discipline of inquiry.

Related Measures:

M 4: M4: Faculty Rating of Knowledge of Major

A summary rating describing the candidate's knowledge of the major will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated an extended knowledge base in the major discipline. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

O 5: O5: Extensive Knowledge in Cognate Area

The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in a cognate area that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry.

Related Measures:

M 5: M5: Faculty Rating of Knowledge of Cognate

A summary rating describing the candidate's knowledge of the cognate area will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated an extended knowledge base in a cognate area associate with the major discipline. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**O 6: O6: Professional Identity and Contributions**

The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates a professional identity by his/her contributions to the community of scholars and educators.

**Related Measures:**

**M 6: M6: Faculty Rating of Identity and Contributions**

A summary rating describing the candidate's professional identity and his/her contributions to the profession will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated a professional identity through his/her contributions to the community of
scholars. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

O 7: O7: Teaching and Professional Development

The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates leadership through teaching and professional development within his/her major discipline of inquiry

Related Measures:

M 7: M7: Faculty Rating of Teaching and Prof Dev

A summary rating describing the candidate's teaching and professional development will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.

Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated leadership through teaching and professional development in the major discipline of inquiry. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).
**O 8: O8: Technology as Tool for Inquiry**

The Ph.D. candidate understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

**Related Measures:**

**M 8: M8: Faculty Rating of Technology Skills**

A summary rating describing the candidate's technology skills will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level (level 3) of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous performance.

**Findings (2008-2009) - Achievement Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program demonstrated an in-depth understanding of and expertise in technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning. Thus, 100% of program completers met the target of a faculty rating of level 3 (i.e., intermediate level) or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).
**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Tracking Our Graduates' Positions in Higher Ed**

We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-intensive positions (e.g., an appointment as a faculty member in a research institution of higher education).

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** End of Spring Semester 2010
- **Completion Date:** 05/01/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair and Department Faculty
- **Additional Resources Requested:** None
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Analysis Answers**

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for accomplishing next year’s action plan does your department intend to implement?

We will continue to document the types of academic and research appointments of our graduates each year and strive to increase the percentage of graduates who pursue positions in higher education or other research-oriented positions.
ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

As of 2008-2009, we have begun to document the degree to which our Ph.D. concentrations are preparing researchers/scholars who draw upon their preparation in the Ph.D. degree to become actively involved in academia or in positions as researchers. We have also begun to document the position titles/affiliations of our graduates.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Students in the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program are accomplished individuals who demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

Annual Reports

Most Important Accomplishments for Year

All assessment targets were met for the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning. In 2008-2009, eleven (11) students graduated from the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program. Five (5) of these graduates now hold positions in higher education (e.g., American University in Cairo, Georgia Tech, Kennesaw State University, University of Lousiana-Layfayette, University of North Florida). The others hold teaching or other professional positions in schools or school systems in the Atlanta metro area.

Challenges for Next Year
We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-intensive positions (e.g., an appointment as a faculty member in a research institution of higher education).

**Modifications in Intended Outcomes**

We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-intensive positions (e.g., an appointment as a faculty member in a research institution of higher education).

**Modifications in Measurement Methods**

We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-intensive positions (e.g., an appointment as a faculty member in a research institution of higher education).

**University-wide Committee Participation**

Students in the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program are accomplished individuals who demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

**Publications and Presentations**
Students in the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program are accomplished individuals who demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

Academic Teaching Activities

Students in the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program are accomplished individuals who demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

International Activities

We have a large number of Ph.D. students in Teaching and Learning who are international students. MSIT boasts 12 international faculty in the department. Multiple international research and teaching activities are in progress. One Ph.D. graduate accepted a faculty appointment at the American University in Cairo for 2009-2010.

Contributions to Student Retention

Each Ph.D. student works closely with an academic advisor and mentor, but all Ph.D. students participate in formal Professional Advisement Week (PAW) twice a year. Many Ph.D. students participate in virtual mentoring with faculty and advanced graduate students through online technologies.

2009-2010 Assessment Report

Georgia State University
Mission/Purpose

The M.Ed. major in English Education provides for master's level study in English Education and English content and leads to T-5 certification in secondary English (grades 6-12). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle and high school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content.

The program's underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban English education.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.
Goals

G 1: Become subject and pedagogical knowledge experts

The first goal for students in the English education MEd program is to become experts in the English subject discipline and the pedagogical content knowledge required to deliver high quality lessons.

G 2: Continue to practice critical reflection skills

The students in the English education MEd program will understand the theoretical foundations and practical applications as critical thinkers in their classrooms. The students will use critical reflection to make informed decisions about their instruction and curriculum choices.

G 3: Commit to achievement of urban students

Students in the English education MEd program are committed to the successful learning and achievement of students in urban settings.

G 4: Integrate English content with technology

The students in the English education MEd program will use a variety of technologies to prepare, teach, and assess lessons in the English discipline. The use of technology will be a part of the curriculum, instruction, and reflection practices of the MEd English teacher. Furthermore, technology will become a literacy through which MEd English teachers communicate with their students, other teachers, and school personnel.

Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge: Reading & Writing
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 2 Foundations Rdg Wtg**

A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of English Education MEd completers (n=5) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of reading and writing through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral response.

**O 2: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of Literature**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of an extensive range of literature, including U.S. literature, British literature, world literature, and multicultural literature as well as literature written specifically for children and young adults.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Portfolio Rating Std 3 Knowledge of Literatures**

A portfolio rating for Standard 3 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of English Education MEd completers (n=5) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on knowledge of literatures through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral response.

O 3: Uses Effective Assessment and Instr. Techniques

Candidates demonstrate the use of a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning.

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 8 Assessment
A portfolio rating for Standard 8 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of English Education MEd completers (n=5) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on effective use of assessment and instructional techniques through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral response.

**O 4: Demonstrates Content Knowledge of English Grammars**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of English grammars as well as the history and evolution of the English language.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience
Related Measures:

**M 4: Portfolio Rating Standard 1 Know Eng Grammars**

A portfolio rating for this standard will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Level 3).

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of English Education MEd completers (n=5) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on knowledge of English grammars through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral response.

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Continued innovation in teaching for urban sites and technological savvy**

All of the target measures for the 2009-2010 group of English education MEd students were met. We, the English education faculty, are interested in fostering innovation in our students’ work as teachers. To that end, we are committed to including a focus on urban education sites and the students and communities served by those sites. We are also
committed to infusing our courses with technology so that our students can bring
technological savvy to their teaching practices in their own urban and metropolitan schools.
Our action plan, then, is to continue to find ways to bring issues specific to urban education
into coursework and portfolio reflections, while also weaving thoughtful uses of
technologies into both course and portfolio requirements. Our digital portfolio and all of its
embedded standards will continue to support this action plan. As we consider the long
term view of our courses in the program, we are aware that the MEd in English Education
is a program that may dissolve with the creation of the MEd in Urban Teacher Leadership.
Our commitment, however, will remain focused on urban education and embedding
technological savvy into our courses in English education at the graduate level.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Completion Date: 06/01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: English Education Faculty

New action plan 2010-2011

Test

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Completion Date: 06/30/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Michelle Zoss
Additional Resources Requested: N/A
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We were satisfied with our assessment program and thus have not made any changes. We look forward to continuing to work with our students and assessing their work in our program.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The changes we anticipate for our program include possibly combining with the Urban Teacher Leadership MEd program.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

The M.A.T. major in English Education provides initial teacher preparation for individuals holding bachelor's degrees in English. It leads to both a master's degree and certification for teaching secondary English language arts (grades 6-12).

The program's underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program is a cohort program that encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban English education. The program ensures that candidates gain sufficient subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle and high school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content, and manage classrooms effectively.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.
In our department, MSIT, our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta, the nation, and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity to push the boundaries of knowledge and practice.

We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

**Goals**

**G 1: Acquires English content pedagogical knowledge**

English education students acquire and demonstrate a knowledge base and ability to teach in language and literature, in literary theory, and in the processes of reading and composing, including speaking, listening, and viewing.

**G 2: Effectively plans, teaches and manages instruction**

English education students effectively plan for, teach (or execute) instruction for students in an environment that is conducive to teaching and learning for students from diverse backgrounds.

**G 3: Committed to excellence in urban English education**
English education students demonstrate a commitment to and are sensitive to the complexity of teaching English language arts to students in urban settings and develop methods, strategies, and materials to meet the needs of diverse learners. English education students foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Involves school and community in learning

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:
M 1: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 10: Community

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

93.58 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Involves school and community in learning" at the expected level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Community Action Plan**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty to determine areas needing improvement; as a result, assessment opportunities are no...
O 2: Understands student development re: learning

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 2: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 2: Student Learning

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Achievement Target:
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Understands student development re: learning" at the expected level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Student Learning Action Plan**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunit...
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3: Diversity**

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

97.3 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners" at the expected level.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Diversity Action Plan
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportuniti...

O 4: Understands and uses assessment for learning

The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience
Related Measures:

M 4: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Achievement Target:

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met

100 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Understands and used assessment for learning" at the expected level.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
Assessment Action Plan

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students' knowledge, learning, and p...

Program Assessment for 2010-2011

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students' knowledge, learning, and p...

O 5: Practices professional reflection

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 5: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 9: Reflection

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Achievement Target:

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Practices professional reflection" at the expected level.

M 10: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
O 6: Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

M 6: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 1: Content/Pedagogy

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Demonstrates content pedagogical knowledge" at the expected level.

**O 7: Uses communication skills and technology**

The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience
Related Measures:

M 7: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 6: Communication

Supervisor final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Achievement Target:

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
97.3% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Uses communication skills and technology" at the expected level.

O 8: Can effectively plan for instruction

The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Associations:
Institutional Priorities:

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 8: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 7: Planning

Supervisor, final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Achievement Target:

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met

96.15% of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Can effectively plan for instruction" at the expected level.
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Planning Action Plan**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify varied assessment oppo...

**O 9: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience
Related Measures:

**M 9: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 4: Strategies**

Supervisor, final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

97.3 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies" at the expected level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Strategies Action Plan**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
O 10: Can motivate and manage students for learning

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

M 10: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage

Supervisor, final evaluation, mentor evaluation, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS database for this standard.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Achievement Target:

85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
97.3 % of our students in the English Education TEEMS program met "Can motivate and manage students for learning" at the expected level.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Motivate/Manage Action Plan
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportuniti...

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Assessment Action Plan
Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students’ knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicum/field experience in urban schools. In other words, we are aligning our key assessments with program curriculum so that students can explicitly see the connections between the theory in methods courses and practices in field placements. The domains of our key assessments include the following: Content Knowledge Planning Effects on P-12 Learners Pedagogical Knowledge Dispositions Clinical Practice The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment  
**Outcome/Objective:** Understands and uses assessment for learning

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.  
**Completion Date:** 06/01/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

**Community Action Plan**

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty to determine areas needing improvement; as a result, assessment opportunities are now embedded within our coursework that link communities and schools to student learning. In the future, we would like to keep this
curriculum change unchanged.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Faculty Rating STARS Standard 10: Community  
**Outcome/Objective:** Involves school and community in learning

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.

**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

**Diversity Action Plan**

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand diverse student learning needs and to create instruction that will address such needs.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
**Measure:** Faculty Rating STARS Standard 3: Diversity  | **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.

**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty

**Additional Resources Requested:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

---

**Motivate/Manage Action Plan**

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to develop and use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Terminated

**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 5: Motivate/Manage  |  
- Outcome/Objective: Can motivate and manage students for learning

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.

**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty

**Additional Resources Requested:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and
The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify varied assessment opportunities within our coursework that will allow our students to plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated  
**Priority:** Medium  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Faculty Rating STARS Standard 7: Planning  
**Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively plan for instruction

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.  
**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students’ knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicum/field experience in urban schools. In other words, we are aligning our key assessments with program curriculum so that students can explicitly see the connections between the theory in methods courses and practices in field placements. The domains of our key assessments include the following: Content Knowledge Planning Effects on P-12 Learners Pedagogical Knowledge Dispositions Clinical Practice The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Faculty Rating STARS Standard 4: Strategies | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

Implementation Description: We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.
Completion Date: 06/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS English Education Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Student Learning Action Plan

The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand a student's intellectual, social, and personal development and to
plan instruction that will support such development.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Terminated  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Faculty Rating STARS Standard 2: Student Learning  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understands student development re: learning

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.  
**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

---

**Program Assessment for 2010-2011**

Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students' knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicum/field experience in urban schools. In other words, we are aligning our key assessments with program curriculum so that students can explicitly see the connections between the theory in methods courses and practices in field placements. The domains of our key assessments include the following: Content Knowledge, Planning, Effects on P-12 Learners, Pedagogical Knowledge, Dispositions, and Clinical Practice.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

**Measure:** Faculty Rating STARS Standard 8: Assessment  | **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and uses assessment for learning

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2011 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 terms.

**Completion Date:** 06/01/2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** Michelle Zoss, Mary Deming, and Ewa McGrail

**Additional Resources Requested:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A
CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

As a faculty, we continued to refine and implement our courses and portfolio requirements. We piloted an approach in which we embedded and aligned the portfolio standards into our methods and practicum course assignments (EDLA 6550, 7550; EDCI 6600, 7660, 7670, 7680; EDRD 7630). Our reasoning for this was to allow for a seamless connection between the methods course content and practicum experiences in the field so that our students can reflect on, execute, and theorize their practice. In the upcoming year, 2010-2011, we will be aligning our key assessments with the EDCI 7660, 7670, and 7680 courses. This realignment allows us to change the portfolio requirement to focus more on developing students' professional teaching philosophies. The standards for our discipline are still met with the achievement of the key assessments. Additionally, students can see more explicitly the connection between the theory they learn in methods courses and the practices they encounter in their year-long field placements.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We see our work in this program as being a continual work in progress. That is, the changes we institute in our program are direct reflections on the urban schools that we serve, the changing needs of our diverse students at Georgia State University, and in response to innovative teaching, research, and theory in the field of English education. These data also help us understand how we might revise our course assignments to better reflect the content of the standards we use to assess our students. As a faculty, we continued to refine and implement our courses and portfolio requirements. We piloted an approach in which we embedded and aligned the portfolio standards into our methods and practicum course assignments (EDLA 6550, 7550; EDCI 6600, 7660, 7670, 7680; EDRD 7630). Our reasoning for this was to allow for a seamless connection between the methods course content and practicum experiences in the field so that our students can reflect on, execute, and theorize their practice. In the upcoming year, 2010-2011, we will be aligning our key assessments with the EDCI 7660, 7670, and 7680 courses. This realignment allows us to change the portfolio requirement to focus more on developing students' professional teaching philosophies. The standards for our discipline are still met with the achievement of the key assessments. Additionally, students can see more explicitly the connection between the theory they learn in methods courses and the practices they encounter in their year-long field placements.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:
What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

The mission for the Master of Science degree in Instructional Technology is to provide students with the basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to perform as an instructional technologist. An instructional technologist is a professional educator who can combine knowledge of the learning process, knowledge of instructional systems theory, and knowledge of various forms of media and learning environments to create the most effective and efficient learning experiences. The program is designed for individuals interested in working with adults in a wide variety of training and development areas such as those found in education, business and industry. We seek to further this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

Goals

G 1: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in P-16

The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the P-16 education sector.

G 2: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in Corp

The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the corporate, government and military sectors.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to develop instructional materials and experiences by applying principles, theories, and research related to print, audiovisual, computer-based, and integrated technologies.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1. Excellent and competitive academic programs
   1.1 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
   1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
   1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
   1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
   1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2. Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
   2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
   2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
   2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3. Contribute to the greater community good
   3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
   3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plans:**
3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)
4.3 Technology
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

**M 1: Portfolio**

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.
Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

M 2: Internship Report

All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online
M 3: End of Course Assessments

Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

**Online Degree Program**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

M 4: Comprehensive Exam

All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

Achievement Target:
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

O 2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design
Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to design conditions for learning by applying principles, theories, and research associated with instructional systems design, message design, instructional strategies, and learner characteristics.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates

2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3 Contribute to the greater community good

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

M 2: Internship Report

All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

M 3: End of Course Assessments
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.
Online Degree Program  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

**M 4: Comprehensive Exam**

All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

**M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi**
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**Achievement Target:**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

**O 3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan, organize, coordinate, and supervise instructional technology by applying principles, theories and research related to project, resource, delivery system, and information management.

**Associations:**
Institutional Priorities:

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates

2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3 Contribute to the greater community good

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:
M 1: Portfolio

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

M 2: Internship Report

All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input
Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

M 3: End of Course Assessments

Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

M 4: Comprehensive Exam

All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

Achievement Target:
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.
Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

O 4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to use processes and resources for learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to media utilization, diffusion, implementations, and policy-making.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs

1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized

1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates

2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3 Contribute to the greater community good
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online.

M 2: Internship Report
All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.
Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

M 3: End of Course Assessments
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

M 4: Comprehensive Exam
All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career
goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online.

**M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi**

Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**Achievement Target:**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

O 5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to problem analysis, criterion-referenced measurement, formative and summative evaluation, and long-range planning.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1 Excellent and competitive academic programs
1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
1.12 Global cultural perspectives infused throughout programs
1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2 Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates

2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3 Contribute to the greater community good

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plans:**

**President, Georgia State University**

3.1 New Academic Programs (& Modes of Delivery)

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio**

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards
based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

**M 2: Internship Report**

All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

M 3: End of Course Assessments
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.
Focused Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

Online Degree Program

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online.

M 4: Comprehensive Exam

All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

**M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi**

Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**Achievement Target:**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online
**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Continue to Monitor Curriculum**

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2009-2010 academic year.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** ongoing  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**

Focus the online MS degree on business and corporate students.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
  Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  
  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  
  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  
  Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

- **Measure:** End of Course Assessments  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development  
  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design
knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

**Measure:** Internship Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

**Measure:** Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

**Completion Date:** 09/01/2011
**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty
**Additional Resources Requested:** none
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Implement Certificate in Online Education Program**

We will implement our add-on certificate program in online education which is under final review.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Completion Date:** 09/01/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

**Increase Recruitment Efforts**

We will actively recruit new students and maintain our high admission standards.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Investigate Certificate Program for P-12

In order to recruit more students and better serve those students in the region, we begin developing a certificate program in expectation that the state will approve a teaching certificate in instructional technology.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Completion Date: 09/01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: All Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: One clinical Faculty line to start.
Budget Amount Requested: $65,000.00

Online Degree Program

In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we will offer our MS degree online

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi  |  Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  |  Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
Measure: Comprehensive Exam  |  Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  |  Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
Measure: End of Course Assessments  |  Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  |  Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
Measure: Internship Report  |  Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  |  Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
Measure: Portfolio  |  Outcome/Objective: Has knowledge of Instructional Development  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation  |  Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management  |  Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

Completion Date:  09/01/2011
Responsible Person/Group:  All faculty
Additional Resources Requested:  none
Budget Amount Requested:  $0.00

Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition:  How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A
CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Based on feedback from faculty and students we have decided to abandon LiveText as a Portfolio system. We will instead allow the students to use a variety of tools to create their portfolios. This should allow us to get more in-depth and creative portfolios from the students and help us assess their skills more holistically.
ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We will create a business and industry track for our online MS. We will explore creating a certificate program for P-12 certification. We will change a portion of the MS core to allow students to focus on content that more directly relates to corporate settings.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

The mission for the doctoral program in instructional technology is to provide specialization for instructional technologists in all aspects of the field, including instructional design, alternative instructional delivery systems, research, management, evaluation, and consulting for the betterment of education and human development. We seek to bring about this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

Goals

G 1: Produce Researchers in Learning Technologies

The IT Ph.D. program will produce graduates capable of conducting world-class research in Learning Technologies.

G 2: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies

The IT Ph.D. program will produce graduates capable of world-class teaching in Learning Technologies.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Understands and uses technology

The Ph.D. student understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

Associations:
Institutional Priorities:

1   Excellent and competitive academic programs
   1.11 Targeted programs of distinctiveness that are nationally and internationally recognized
   1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
   1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff

2   Recruit, retain & graduate high quality graduates
   2.21 Applied focus based upon a strong foundation of excellence in the liberal arts and sciences
   2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students
   2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

4.43 Effective utilization of resources

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

4.3 Technology

Related Measures:

M 1: Dissertation

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the disstertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Achievement Target:
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

Achievement Target:
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Monitor Standards
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student l...

M 3: Residency Report
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

**M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review**
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

**O 3: Demonstrates research expertise**
The Ph.D. student demonstrates a general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.

**Associations:**
Institutional Priorities:

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Dissertation

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Achievement Target:
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

**Seek External Funding**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**  
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty
research projects prior to their dissertation research...

Monitor Standards  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student objectives...

Seek External Funding  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 3: Residency Report

Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...
**Seek External Funding**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review**

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

**Seek External Funding**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination**
Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards on the first attempt

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination**
Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.
Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

O 4: Engages in scholarship
The Ph.D. student engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:
1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plans:**
President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Dissertation**
Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.
Increase Research Opportunities
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

Seek External Funding
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

Monitor Standards
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student l...

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 3: Residency Report**
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.
M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve “meets” or “exceeds” on all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Not Met**
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination

Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written
Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination
Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

O 5: Understands foundations of education
The Ph.D. student develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological, and economic influences that affect education today.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

4.3 Technology

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Dissertation

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Achievement Target:
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis
Achievement Target:
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Monitor Standards
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student I...

M 3: Residency Report
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time
the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets” or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

**M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination**

Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of program completers achieved "meets” or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt

**M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination**

Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

O 6: Develops a professional identity

The Ph.D. student develops an identity as a professional and contributes to a professional community of scholars and educators.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Dissertation

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee.
members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

Monitor Standards  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student...

Seek External Funding  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 3: Residency Report

Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**  
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**  
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**O 7: Develops an extended knowledge base**

The Ph.D. student develops an extended knowledge base that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Dissertation**

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee.
members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Monitor Standards
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student l...

M 3: Residency Report

Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination

Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt

M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination

Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 2: Develops leadership for the profession

The Ph.D. student provides leadership through teaching and professional development within his/her major discipline of inquiry.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation
2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Dissertation

Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary
rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**

Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Monitor Standards
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student l...

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 3: Residency Report
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review

A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Improve Post Completion Jobs
Improve the quality of the positions students accept upon graduation from the program.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Monitor student completers and mentor them through the job search process.  
Responsible Person/Group: All IT Faculty  
Additional Resources Requested: none  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Increase Number of Program Completers

We will monitor and try to increase the number of doctoral graduates per year.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Increase student monitoring in order to improve graduation rates.  
Completion Date: 09/20/2011  
Responsible Person/Group: All IT faculty.  
Additional Resources Requested: none  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Increase Research Opportunities

We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise | Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
Measure: Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise | Develops an extended knowledge base | Engages in scholarship
Measure: Oral Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise
Measure: Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise | Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship
Measure: Residency Report | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise | Engages in scholarship
Measure: Written Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise | Engages in scholarship

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Monitor Standards

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2010-2011 academic year. Due to the increasingly rapid pace of technology evolution and the core function of technology in this program, it may be necessary to shorten the syllabus review cycle to bi-annually. Additionally, faculty may need additional resources in the future to fund professional development in order to stay current with technological change.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
**Measure**: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrates research expertise | Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education

**Implementation Description**: Ongoing  
**Responsible Person/Group**: IT Unit  
**Additional Resources Requested**: Funding for Professional Development  
**Budget Amount Requested**: $3,000.00

---

**Recruit Full-time Students**

As we transition to becoming a more research oriented institution we need to recruit more full-time Ph.D. students to assist in that effort. We have added a couple of additional full-time Ph.D. students and we will continue to pursue additional students.

**Established in Cycle**: 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status**: In-Progress  
**Priority**: Medium  
**Implementation Description**: Ongoing  
**Responsible Person/Group**: All faculty

---

**Seek External Funding**

In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**Established in Cycle**: 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status**: In-Progress  
**Priority**: High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise | Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship

Measure: Dissertation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise | Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship

Measure: Oral Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise | Engages in scholarship

Measure: Ph.D. candidacy review | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise | Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship

Measure: Residency Report | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise | Engages in scholarship

Measure: Written Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates research expertise | Engages in scholarship

Implementation Description: Ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty

Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

Horrible Interface

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

Horrible Interface

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened,
what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

Horrible Interface

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

Horrible Interface

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

Horrible Interface

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have retreated from the use of Livetext as an assessment tool for our Ph.D. students to allow for greater flexibility in report formats. We found that student dis-satisfaction with LiveText led to a lower overall annual report completion rate than we would have gotten without it. This year we will allow students to complete their annual report in a variety of formats and we anticipate that this change will lead to a higher completion rate.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Based on past practice we have limited enrollment to 6 Ph.D students per faculty member. We have found however that due to the length of time students remain in the program (up to 9 years in some cases) this has had the effect of spreading the students out so that no cohort of students existed of more than 6 students. Current university enrollment policy has forced us to cancel classes that students need to graduate because too few students enrolled. We will therefore plan on modifying our overall enrollment policy to allow 6 students at the dissertation stage per faculty member. We will not limit the number students per faculty in the course stage save by qualification. Hopefully this will allow us to increase overall enrollments so classes will make.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

Horrible Interface

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Horrible Interface

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Horrible Interface
Mission/Purpose

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organization in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good. The Library Media Technology Program prepares students to serve as school library media specialists and information technologists in the Pre-K - 12 school environment. The focus is on administering media centers in modern school settings.

Goals

G 1: Goals for Candidates in Library Media Technology

The goals for candidates enrolled in the Library Media Technology Program include development of the following: The role of the school library media specialist as a teacher. The media specialist collaborates with students and other members of the learning community to analyze learning and information needs, to locate and use resources that will meet those needs, and to understand and communicate the information the resources provide. The role of the school library media specialist as an instructional partner. The media specialist joins with teachers and others to identify links across student information needs, curricular content, learning outcomes, and a wide variety of print, nonprint, and electronic information resources. The role of the school library media specialist as an information specialist. The media specialist provides leadership and expertise in acquiring and evaluating information resources in all formats. The role of the school library media specialist as a program administrator. The media specialist works collaboratively with members of the learning community to define the policies of the library media program and to guide and direct all activities related to it.
G 2: Continue to Practice Critical Reflection Skills

The students in the Library Media Technology Program will hone the theoretical foundations and practical applications as critical thinkers in their media centers. The students will use this critical reflection to make informed decisions about their instruction and curriculum choices.

G 3: Integrate Library Media Technology Content with Current Technologies

The students in the Library Media Technology Program will use a variety of technologies to prepare, teach, and assess lessons in the subject discipline. The use of technology will be a part of the instruction, curriculum, and reflection practices of the school media specialist. Furthermore, technology will become a literacy through which school media specialists communicate with their students, other teachers, school personnel, parents and the extended community.

Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Demonstrates Content Pedagogical Knowledge

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations of professional responsibilities of a school library media specialist. Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

1.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Teaching and Learning

A portfolio rating for Standard 2 from the ALA-AASL Standards for Initial Programs for School Library Media Specialist Preparation (2007). Standard 2 addresses the following: 1.) Knowledge of Learners and Learning, 2.) Effective and Knowledgeable Teacher, and 3.) Information Literacy Curriculum. This rating will be derived from each student's written rationale explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: LiveText portfolio synthesis piece.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action. (Level 3 of LiveText assessment rubric.)

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

95% of Library Media Technology (LMT) completers (18 total teacher-librarian candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of understanding of the pedagogical knowledge necessary to function as competent teacher-librarians.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Strengthening planning and instruction knowledge**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher (media specialist) candidates' knowledge and performance in planning and instr...

**O 2: Demonstrates Effective Teaching Performance**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods and curriculum materials (including print/nonprint materials and technological tools) to support the professional responsibilities of a school library media specialist. The candidate locates, comprehends, and builds rationales from curriculum guides, other applicable documents, and experienced practitioners; plans and carries out instruction based on state standards; selects and varies instructional strategies, assessing their impact on student engagement and learning; observes students closely and acknowledges how adjustments in teaching can impact learning; exploring teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for students; learns to work and plan productively...
as part of teams within the school environment. Strategic Plans: President, Georgia State University 1.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Internship Evaluation**

All supervising media specialists are required to submit evaluation forms for all students completing ELMT 7660 (Internship in Library Media Technology). Source of Evidence: Supervising library media specialists' ratings on the final evaluation forms.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students completing ELMT 7660 (Internship in Library Media Technology) will receive scores of 4 out of 5 on the final evaluation form submitted by supervising school library media specialists.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

95% of Library Media Technology (LMT) completers (18 total teacher-librarian candidates) demonstrated effective teaching performance.

**O 3: Demonstrates Use of Technology in Instruction**

Candidates demonstrate use of technology in learning and instruction in the course materials they complete for the degree or certification and in materials they create for the LiveText portfolio and for their media centers. Strategic Plans: President, Georgia State University 1.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**
M 3: Use of Technology to Complete LMT Portfolio

Passing the LiveText portfolio requirement for the MLM degree or for add-on certification requires the use of multiple technologies integrated into student reflection, artifacts, and writing. Source of Evidence: Successful completion of all portfolio requirements.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action. (Level 3 of LiveText assessment rubric.)

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
95% of Library Media Technology (LMT) completers (18 total teacher-librarian candidates) demonstrated a proficient level of understanding of the use of technology in instruction.

O 4: Demonstrates Professional Behaviors and Activities

Candidates demonstrate practices that indicate their commitment to teacher-librarian models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities. Strategic Plans: President, Georgia State University 1.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 4: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher-librarian candidates who have completed the program. Source of Evidence: STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program
Achievement Target:  
95% of program completers will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of his/her professional performance and decisions.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met  
95% of Library Media Technology (LMT) completers (18 total teacher-librarian candidates) demonstrate professional behavior and activities.

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Action Plan

Maintain and monitor.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Strengthening planning and instruction knowledge

Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher (media specialist) candidates' knowledge and performance in planning and instruction we have partially met our achievement target. We will strengthen our students' knowledge of planning and instruction via additional coursework (readings and assignments, specifically in lesson plan writing/alignment and actual teaching experiences). A teacher work sample will be required as part of the portfolio which contains several components of lesson planning and differentiation in instruction. Finally, we will devote one (or more as needed) special topics seminars to the issue of planning and instruction.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Teaching and Learning | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates Content Pedagogical Knowledge

Implementation Description: Implementation of the proposed action plan will begin immediately in all fall semester, 2010 LMT classes.
Completion Date: 05/31/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Nancy J. Brown and Dr. Edward Lomax
Additional Resources Requested: 0
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A
CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have updated our Live Text portfolio system to use the American Association of School Librarian (AASL) Standards in addition to the STARS system in order to ensure we obtain a comprehensive view of the status of the Library Media Technology Program. These changes were made to better reflect the content knowledge and demonstrated academic performance of our program completers. In the coming academic year, we hope to more completely integrate the Live Text portfolio system as a course management tool to provide pertinent data and information for program evaluation.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The Library Media Technology faculty is fully committed to implementing the Live Text Program Portfolio as a vital component of our measurement and evaluation strategies that are designed to meet the academic and professional needs of our students.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Although we have yet to identify any specific areas of the Library Media Technology (LMT) Program that require strengthening, this report verifies anecdotal evidence of the need to improve our work in the areas of Content Pedagogical Knowledge, Effective Teaching Performance, the Use of Technology, and Professional Behaviors and Activities. We have already begun improvements in our curriculum and teaching approaches which will address these issues.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
N/A
Detailed Assessment Report
2009-2010 Mathematics Education MEd

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 8: Works collaboratively with parents

Works collaboratively with parents
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

**M 10: Takes advantage of community resources**

Takes advantage of community resources.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

_Established in Cycle: 2009-2010_

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

**O 2: Unknown**

Unknown

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development**

Uses specialized knowledge to promote learning/development

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics.
Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

**M 7: Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development**

Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third year in...

M 9: Generates multiple paths to learning/development

Generates multiple paths to learning/development

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

\section{M 12: Places a premium on student learning}

Places a premium on student involvement in the process of learning/development.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

\textbf{Achievement Target:}

95\% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

\textbf{Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met}

100\% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

\textbf{Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):}

For full information, see the \textit{Action Plan Details} section of this report.
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

M 14: Recognizes individual differences in students

Recognizes individual differences in students

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

**M 15: Can promote learning/development in group settings**

Can promote learning/development in group settings.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...
M 17: Values the whole student

Values the development of the whole student (e.g., social, emotional, physical).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

M 18: Is mindful of objectives of learning
Is mindful of the principle objectives of learning/development

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

**M 19: Treats students equitably**

Treats students equitably, through understanding fariness.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

O 3: Unknown
Related Measures:

M 1: Seeks the advice of others/draws on research

Seeks the advice of others and draws on relevant research to improve his/her practice.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...
**M 2: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development**

Uses specialized knowledge to promote learning/development

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...

**M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 2 ratings**

A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**M 6: Values collaborating with others**

Values the importance of collaborating with other professionals in the school

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...
M 11: Has an understanding of how students develop
Has and understanding of how students develop and learn
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

O 4: Unknown
Unknown

Related Measures:

M 1: Seeks the advice of others/draws on research
Seeks the advice of others and draws on relevant research to improve his/her practice.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on
Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the second AY in...

**M 3: Values personal reflection in his/her professional development**

Values personal reflection in his/her professional development.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

M 4: Appreciates how knowledge field is created

Appreciates how knowledge in his/her field is created, organized and linked to other disciplines

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

**M 9: Generates multiple paths to learning/development**

Generates multiple paths to learning/development

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...

M 13: Faculty STARS Standard 4 rating

A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

O 5: Can apply expertise for learning and development

The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development.

Related Measures:

M 2: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development

Uses specialized knowledge to promote learning/development

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...

M 5: Faculty STARS Standard 2 ratings

A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

**M 7: Uses multiple methods to promote learning/devel**

Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...

**M 9: Generates multiple paths to learning/development**

Generates multiple paths to learning/development

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY...

### M 11: Has an understanding of how students develop

Has an understanding of how students develop and learn

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY...
M 15: Can promote learning/development in group settings

Can promote learning/development in group settings.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...

M 17: Values the whole student
Values the development of the whole student (e.g., social, emotional, physical).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...

**M 18: Is mindful of objectives of learning**

Is mindful of the principle objectives of learning/development

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...

O 6: Manages and monitors student learning/development

The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

Related Measures:
M 2: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development

Uses specialized knowledge to promote learning/development

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...

M 7: Uses multiple methods to promote learning/develop
Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...

**M 9: Generates multiple paths to learning/development**

Generates multiple paths to learning/development

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...

M 12: Places a premium on student learning
Places a premium on student involvement in the process of learning/development.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the third AY i...

**M 15: Can promote learning/development in group settings**
Can promote learning/development in group settings.

*Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work*

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...

M 16: Regularly assesses student progress

Regularly assesses student progress.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on
Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

**M 17: Values the whole student**

Values the development of the whole student (e.g., social, emotional, physical).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be
monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY ...

M 18: Is mindful of objectives of learning
Is mindful of the principle objectives of learning/development
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

95% of students will score at Intermediate or Advanced on measure.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2000-2010 AY marks the third AY i...

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development  | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Can promote learning/development in group settings
Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Can promote learning/development in group settings |  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Manages and monitors student learning/development

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued
monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Uses knowledge to promote learning/development  
**Outcome/Objective:** Unknown

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

**Measure:** Generates multiple paths to learning/development  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Unknown

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2009
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
**Additional Resources Requested:** None
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

**Measure:** Seeks the advice of others/draws on research  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Unknown

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Generates multiple paths to learning/development | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program
either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Generates multiple paths to learning/development  
**Outcome/Objective:** Manages and monitors student learning/development

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
**Measure:** Is mindful of objectives of learning  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Can apply expertise for learning and development

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Values the whole student  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Can apply expertise for learning and development

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Values the whole student | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2000-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Is mindful of objectives of learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Places a premium on student learning | Outcome/Objective: Manages and monitors student learning/development

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Generates multiple paths to learning/development | Outcome/Objective: Unknown

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Takes advantage of community resources | Outcome/Objective: Unknown

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Uses multiple methods to promote learning/development
Outcome/Objective: Unknown

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Regularly assesses student progress  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Manages and monitors student learning/development

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes  
**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Can promote learning/development in group settings | Outcome/Objective: Unknown
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Recognizes individual differences in students | Outcome/Objective: Unknown

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Values personal reflection in his/her professional  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Unknown

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**
Foundation for Student Development

monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Appreciates how knowledge field is created  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Unknown

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)

**Additional Resources Requested:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

**Measure**: Has an understanding of how students develop | **Outcome/Objective**: Can apply expertise for learning and development

**Implementation Description**: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

**Completion Date**: 10/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group**: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)

**Additional Resources Requested**: None

**Budget Amount Requested**: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle**: 2009-2010

**Implementation Status**: Planned

**Priority**: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

**Measure**: Uses knowledge to promote learning/development | **Outcome/Objective**: Unknown

**Implementation Description**: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

**Completion Date**: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Faculty STARS Standard 2 ratings  | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development

Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

  Measure: Is mindful of objectives of learning | Outcome/Objective: Unknown

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty
will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Places a premium on student learning | Outcome/Objective: Unknown

Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Works collaboratively with parents  | **Outcome/Objective:** Unknown

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)

**Additional Resources Requested:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Treats students equitably  | **Outcome/Objective:** Unknown

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE...
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcome.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2000-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target. There were no changes and/or modifications made or planned with assessment procedures.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2009-2010 academic cycle marks the third year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target. There are no planned changes to the program at this time; as reported, all students met target.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

This program should be listed as Mathematics Education M.Ed. Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). The mission of the Georgia State University Online M.Ed. Program in Mathematics Education is to provide an opportunity for certified teachers to build capacity by expanding their content knowledge and pedagogical practices.

Goals

G 1: Goal Statement

The goal of the MEd Online Mathematics Education program is to help certified teachers expand their content knowledge base and pedagogical practices through application where they demonstrate their knowledge and skills of advanced topics in mathematics and pedagogical practices which includes working with diverse student populations, problem solving, and literacy.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge
Students in MEd. Online Program in Mathematics Education are expected implement successful techniques to promote higher order thinking and effective problem solving skills with using student centered, technology-intensive and differentiated instruction in diverse classroom settings.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio section "Mathematical Preparation"**

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Mathematics Standards. This section of portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the majority of standards in the areas of pedagogical knowledge which will include planning, instructional skills, and content knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
Each student is required to pass the portfolio requirement in order to meet the requirements of the program. That is, each student must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for each standard.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective. 50% of the students exceed the expectations by getting 3 out of 3.

**O 2: Understands and uses effective assessment techniques**

Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program will use a variety of assessment techniques to evaluate students’ academic, social and personal development in all aspects of mathematics.

**Related Measures:**
M 2: Portfolio section "Impact on Student Learning"

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Mathematics Standards. This section of portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the majority of standards in the areas of impact on student learning and assessment.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Document:

- Rubric Unit Plan

Achievement Target:
Each student is required to pass the portfolio requirement in order to meet the requirements of the program. That is, each student must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for each standard.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective. 50% of the students exceed the expectations by getting 3 out of 3.

O 3: Demonstrates effective planning for instruction

Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program will plan and implement an active, coherent, and effective curriculum that promotes problem solving and is consistent with the goals and recommendations of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Standards.

Related Measures:

M 3: Portfolio section "Instructional Strategies"

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Mathematics Standards. This section of portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the majority of
standards in the areas of curriculum, and instructional and professional practice.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Document:**
- Rubric Curriculum Exploration Project

**Achievement Target:**
Each student is required to pass the portfolio requirement in order to meet the requirements of the program. That is, each student must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for each standard.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective. 50% of the students exceed the expectations by getting 3 out of 3

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Action Plan: Clinical Practice**

Data show that 50% of the students met the expectation and 50% of the students exceed the expectations after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing the coursework. Students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content of EDMT 7560-Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction and EDMT 7360-Integration of Technology in Mathematics Instruction.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Plan should be fully implemented by the end of the fall semester 2011.
Completion Date: 12/31/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Mathematics Education.
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Action Plan: Effects on P-12 Learning

Data show that 50% of the students met the expectation and 50% of the students exceed the expectations after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing the coursework. Students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content of EDMT 7560-Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction and EDMT 7360-Integration of Technology in Mathematics Instruction.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Plan should be fully implemented by the end of the fall semester 2011.
Completion Date: 12/31/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty teaching for MEd. in Mathematics Education (Online)
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
**Action Plan: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)**

Data show that 50% of the students met the expectation and 50% of the students exceed the expectations after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing the coursework. Students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content of EDMT 7560-Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction and EDMT 7360-Integration of Technology in Mathematics Instruction.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Plan should be fully implemented by the end of the fall semester 2011.  
**Completion Date:** 12/31/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty teaching for M.Ed in Mathematics Education (Online)  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A
CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Students in the program are required to complete a comprehensive portfolio as an exit requirement. Faculty will assign the portfolio standards as part of pedagogy courses since several students had to resubmit the required documents to achieve the expected targets.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

In order to achieve the expected targets, all students had to resubmit the required documents/artifacts. Plans have been made to embed principles of curriculum, problem solving strategies, planning lessons that focuses on diversity and multicultural issues in all of the pedagogy courses offered in the program. Faculty will develop a common approach to students understanding of planning lessons that promote problem solving skills and focus on diversity with an effective use of technology. This type of planning will be embedded in all pedagogy courses with more emphasis in EDMT 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Education, and EDMT 7360 Integration of Technology in Mathematics Instruction.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievemnt Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Unknown

Related Measures:

M 1: Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

O 2: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 2: Unknown

Unknown.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
87% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**O 3: Unknown**

Unknown

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
91% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
O 4: Unknown

Unknown

**Related Measures:**

M 4: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
87% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.
O 5: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 5: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
85% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
91% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Based on courses, e-portfolio assessments, and streamlining the field placements, students have demonstrated continuous progress in their disposition, knowledge and performance. Our implementation of two or three student teachers at a school site for their internship has proven to have some effects in our students’ performance and such placements have become our department-wide initiative. However, we will continue to monitor this effort. Relationships across the school and university communities have become stronger. Our department is utilizing the PDS sites advantageously. For next year, assessments will be mainstreamed in livetext.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

This year’s assessments based on the standards are good and improving. Our department chair encourages and supports faculty in these continued efforts. The standards that are borderline to our target will be modified for further improvement. An interdisciplinary action plan within the program was initiated and we will continue to maintain and monitor such initiatives to develop effective mathematics teachers. For next year, assessments will be mainstreamed in livetext.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

The M.Ed. major in Middle Childhood Education provides for master's level study in Middle Childhood Education and advanced content knowledge in English, Mathematics, Science, or Social Studies, and leads to T-5 certification in Middle Childhood Education (Grades 4-8). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge as well as pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content. The program’s underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban Middle Childhood education.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; empowered to serve as change agents; committed to and respectful of all learners; and engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

Goals

G 1: Is committed to student learning and development
Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.

**G 2: Can apply knowledge of learning and development**

Students in the Middle Childhood Education MEd program will draw upon their knowledge of learning theories and apply their knowledge in practical classroom contexts.

**G 3: Knows how to manage & monitor learning/development**

Students in the Middle Childhood Education MEd program will be able to monitor and manage students' learning and development effectively.

**G 4: The student is a reflective practitioner.**

Students will think systematically about their practice and will draw upon professional and practical experience to inform their teaching.

**G 5: Participate in professional learning communities**

**Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 3: Manages and monitors student learning/development**

The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning and development.
Related Measures:

M 3: Faculty STARS standard 3 rating
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 3.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
Ninety percent of completers will score at least 4 (range 1-5) or higher on this element.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
One hundred percent of completers (n=2) scored 4 (range of 1-5) or higher on this element.

Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Demonstrates commitment to learning/development
Educators are committed to the learning and development of students in urban contexts.

Related Measures:

M 1: Faculty STARS standard 1 rating
A summary rating derived from culminating papers, comps, and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 1.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations
Achievement Target:
Ninety percent of completers will score at least 4 (range 1-5) or higher on this element.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
One hundred percent of completers (n=2) scored 4 (range of 1-5) or higher on this element.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Recommend Deactivation of Program
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MED for Middle Childhood Education has been an underenrolled program for several years. Enrollment dropped even more when t...

O 2: Applies knowledge of learning and development
The educator is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning and development.

Related Measures:

M 2: Faculty STARS standard 2 rating
A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 2.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations
**Achievement Target:**
Ninety percent of completers will score at least 4 (range 1-5) or higher on this element.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
One hundred percent of completers (n=2) scored 4 (range of 1-5) or higher on this element.

**O 4: Reflects on & learns from professional experience**

The educator thinks systematically about his/her practice and learns from professional experience.

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Faculty STARS standard 4 rating**

A summary derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 4.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**
Ninety percent of completers will score at least 4 (range 1-5) or higher on this element.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
One hundred percent of completers (n=2) scored 4 (range of 1-5) or higher on this element.

**O 5: Participates in profession's learning communities**

The educator is an active member of one or more learning communities.
**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Faculty STARS standard 5 rating**

A summary rating derived from scores on comprehensive exams and key course assessments will be entered into the STARS database for Standard 5.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

Ninety percent of completers will score at least 4 (range 1-5) or higher on this element.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

One hundred percent of completers (n=2) scored 4 (range of 1-5) or higher on this element.

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Recommend Deactivation of Program**

The MED for Middle Childhood Education has been an underenrolled program for several years. Enrollment dropped even more when the Bachelor of Science in Middle Childhood Education, from which some of the MED students came, was phased out in December 2006. Currently, there are only five students who are actively enrolled. In order to use faculty resources in programs that serve a larger population of students, the program faculty are recommending that the MED program in Middle Childhood Education be deactivated. Faculty will fully support the remaining five students until completion of their degree requirements or until the program is deactivated in December 2011.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

** Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Program Deactivation

The MED for Middle Childhood Education has been an underenrolled program for several years. Enrollment dropped even more when the Bachelor of Science in Middle Childhood Education, from which some of the MED students came, was phased out in December 2006. Currently, there are only five students who are actively enrolled. In order to use faculty resources in programs that serve a larger population of students, the program faculty are recommending that the MED program in Middle Childhood Education be deactivated. Faculty will fully support the remaining five students until completion of their degree requirements or until the program is deactivated in December 2011.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
Our program faculty redesigned the program exit portfolio to more closely align with PSC standards.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We are still in the process of deactivating this M.Ed degree program in order to create a combined M.Ed with the Department of Policy Studies in the College of Education. This combined degree will focus more specifically on leadership skills, but will still retain a focus on middle grades curriculum for those who select this concentration. The proposal for this new degree program (along with the deactivation of the M.Ed program) will occur in October 2010.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Goals

G 1: Goals for teacher candidates enrolled in MCE LA/SS

The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Middle Level Education Language Arts/Social Studies program include the development of:

1) a strong knowledge base about and sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students;

2) pedagogical content knowledge in Language Arts and Social Studies with technology integration to create and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons;

3) the ability to create a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with exceptionalities; and
4) the belief that all students can learn and an efficacious attitude as a community-oriented educator who continues reflection and individual professional development throughout their career.

**Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 1: Domain 1: Content Knowledge**

Possess a strong knowledge base about and demonstrate sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

Domain 1: Content and Curriculum:

85% of teacher candidates demonstrate content knowledge; adapt content and teaching to meet observed learner needs; build teaching on a strong and current foundation in the content area(s) they teach; make content relevant to students; use available resources, including technology, to learn more about content area(s); and, follow state and local curriculum.
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
Of 10 students 6 demonstrated knowledge of content at the Exemplary level, 4 demonstrated content knowledge at the Acceptable level.

O 2: Domain 2: Knowledge of Students:

Domain 2: Knowledge of Students:

The teacher candidate believes that all students can learn; understands and uses basic theories of learning to create productive classroom instruction; communicates respect for and develops rapport with all students; analyzes student data; identifies students’ stages of development, multiple intelligences, learning styles, and areas of exceptionality and develops and uses a repertoire of strategies to accommodate individual needs; communicates with student families/guardians; understands the major principles and theories of adolescent development; understands the range of individual differences of all young adolescents and the implications of these differences for teaching and learning; and, understand issues of young adolescent health and sexuality.

Related Measures:

M 1: Faculty Ratings
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

Domain 2: Knowledge of Students:
85% of teacher candidates believe that all students can learn; understand and uses basic theories of learning to create productive classroom instruction; communicate respect for and develop rapport with all students; analyze student data; identify students’ stages of development, multiple intelligences, learning styles, and areas of exceptionality and develop and use a repertoire of strategies to accommodate individual needs; communicate with student families/guardians; understand the major principles and theories of adolescent development; understand the range of individual differences of all young adolescents and the implications of these differences for teaching and learning; and, understand issues of young adolescent health and sexuality.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

Of 10 students 8 demonstrated their ability with regard to knowledge of students at the Exemplary level, 2 demonstrated their ability with regard to knowledge of students at the Acceptable level.

**O 5: Domain 5: Planning and Instruction:**

The teacher candidate locates, comprehends, and builds rationales from curriculum guides, other applicable documents, and experienced colleagues; plans and carries out instruction based on state and local performance standards; selects and varies instructional strategies, assessing their impact on student engagement and learning; observes students closely and acknowledges how adjustments in teaching can impact learning; explores teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for assigned students; assesses individual learners’ needs and seek resources to improve instruction and learning; learns to work and plan productively as part of a team, grade level, and/or department group.

**Related Measures:**
M 1: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

Domain 5: Planning and Instruction:

85% of teacher candidates locate, comprehend, and build rationales from curriculum guides, other applicable documents, and experienced colleagues; plan and carry out instruction based on state and local performance standards; select and vary instructional strategies, assessing their impact on student engagement and learning; observe students closely and acknowledge how adjustments in teaching can impact learning; explore teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for assigned students; assess individual learners’ needs and seek resources to improve instruction and learning; learn to work and plan productively as part of a team, grade level, and/or department group.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
Of 10 students 7 demonstrated their ability with regard to Planning and Instruction at the Exemplary level, 3 demonstrated their ability with regard to Planning and Instruction at the Acceptable level.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
Strengthening planning and instruction knowledge

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher candidates' knowledge and performance in planning and instruction we have pa...

O 6: Domain 6: Professionalism:

Domain 6: Professionalism:

The teacher candidate learns basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education; learns about, locate resources for, and follows laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families; adheres to state and local Codes of Ethics, and models ethical behavior for students; reflects on teaching practice and examines the connections to student learning; self-assesses teaching strengths and areas for improvement, seeking and using guidance from mentors and instructional leaders; works through appropriate channels to seek answers to questions, voice concerns, explore ideas, and speak out about issues that matter to them and their students; accepts entry-level leadership roles (e.g., clubs, special topics, coaching) with support of identified mentors, administrators, coaches, and facilitators.

Related Measures:

M 1: Faculty Ratings
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

Domain 6: Professionalism:

85% of teacher candidates learn basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education; learn about, locate resources for, and follow laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families; adhere to state and local Codes of Ethics, and model ethical behavior for students; reflect on teaching practice and examine the connections to student learning; self-assess teaching strengths and areas for improvement, seek and use guidance from mentors and instructional leaders; work through appropriate channels to seek answers to questions, voice concerns, explore ideas, and speak out about issues that matter to them and their students; accept entry-level leadership roles (e.g., clubs, special topics, coaching) with support of identified mentors, administrators, coaches, and facilitators.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

Of 10 students 6 demonstrated their ability with regard to Professionalism at the Exemplary level, 4 demonstrated their ability with regard to Professionalism at the Acceptable level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Strengthening knowledge of professionalism**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher candidates' knowledge and performance in assessment we have partially met ou...

Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 3: Domain 3: Learning Environments:

Domain 3: Learning Environments:

The teacher candidate creates a learning environment in which students can learn both independently and collaboratively; organizes and manages time, space, activities, technology, software, and other resources; understands the importance of and builds a functional classroom management plan; seeks, uses, and refines strategies for motivating learners; creates a culturally responsive classroom; seeks, uses, and refines strategies for motivating learners; creates a culturally responsive classroom; learns about and uses resources specific to the school, district, and community; develops appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster supportive learning-based interactions in the classroom.

Related Measures:

M 1: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
Domain 3: Learning Environments:

85% of teacher candidates create a learning environment in which students can learn both independently and collaboratively; organize and manages time, space, activities, technology, software, and other resources; understand the importance of and builds a functional classroom management plan; seek, use, and refine strategies for motivating learners; create a culturally responsive classroom; learn about and uses resources specific to the school, district, and community; develop appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster supportive learning-based interactions in the classroom.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
Of 10 students 6 demonstrated their ability with regard to learning environments at the Exemplary level, 4 demonstrated their ability with regard to learning environments at the Acceptable level.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Strengthening assessment knowledge
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher candidates' knowledge and performance in assessment we have partially met our...

Strengthening knowledge of Learning Environments
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher candidates' knowledge and performance in assessment we have partially met ou...
O 4: Domain 4: Assessment:

Domain 4: Assessment:

The teacher candidate will have a basic understanding of assessment and measurement theory; collect and use pre-assessment data to select student learning goals; use formative and summative assessments at appropriate points in the learning process; identify students' learning needs and provide students with goals for learning; develop and implement consistent, fair, and accurate grading procedures; report student progress to students, families, and administrators; use required resources to keep accurate and up-to-date records and reports of student work and behavior; examine ways to identify student strengths and weaknesses through various assessment processes and methods.

Related Measures:

M 1: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

Domain 4: Assessment:

85% of teacher candidates will have a basic understanding of assessment and measurement theory; collect and use pre-assessment data to select student learning goals; use formative and summative assessments at appropriate points in the learning process; identify students' learning needs and provide students with goals for learning; develop and implement consistent, fair, and accurate grading procedures; report student progress to students, families, and
administrators; use required resources to keep accurate and up-to-date records and reports of student work and behavior; examine ways to identify student strengths and weaknesses through various assessment processes and methods.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
Of 10 students 4 demonstrated their ability with regard to assessment at the Exemplary level, 6 demonstrated their ability with regard to assessment at the Acceptable level.

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Strengthening assessment knowledge
Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher candidates' knowledge and performance in assessment we have partially met our achievement target. We will strengthen our students knowledge of assessment via additional coursework (readings and assignments) in the area of student assessment. A teacher work sample will further be required as part of the portfolio, which contains several components of student assessment. Finally, we will devote one (or more as needed) special topics seminars to the issue of student assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: Domain 3: Learning Environments:

Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohort of teacher candidates' MLE TEEMS LA/SS initial teacher preparation program.
Completion Date: 06/01/2011
 Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MLE TEEMS LA/SS program.
Additional Resources Requested: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
Strengthening knowledge of Learning Environments

Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher candidates' knowledge and performance in assessment we have partially met our achievement target. We will strengthen our students knowledge of learning environments via additional coursework (readings and assignments, particularly in classroom management and English for Second Language Learners). Our revised curriculum includes more technological pedagogical approaches using technology. Finally, we will devote one (or more as needed) special topics seminars to the issue of learning environments.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Faculty Ratings  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Domain 3: Learning Environments

**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohort of teacher candidates' MLE TEEMS LA/SS initial teacher preparation program.

**Completion Date:** 06/01/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MLE TEEMS LA/SS program.

**Additional Resources Requested:** n/a

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

Strengthening knowledge of professionalism

Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher candidates' knowledge and performance in assessment we have partially met our achievement target. We will
strengthen our students knowledge of professionalism via additional coursework (readings and assignments, specifically in the history of education). A revised plan of submitting and responding to reflections will further be required as part of the course assignments as well as studying models for applying appropriate efforts to corrective/improve practice based on reflective exercises. Finally, we will devote one (or more as needed) special topics seminars to the issue of professionalism.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: Domain 6: Professionalism:

Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohort of teacher candidates' MLE TEEMS LA/SS initial teacher preparation program.
Completion Date: 06/01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MLE TEEMS LA/SS program.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Strengthening planning and instruction knowledge

Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher candidates' knowledge and performance in planning and instruction we have partially met our achievement target. We will strengthen our students knowledge of planning and instruction via additional coursework (readings and assignments, specifically in lesson plan writing/alignment) and changing the materials used to Understanding by Design by Wiggins McTighe. A teacher work sample will further be required as part of the portfolio, which contains several components of lesson planning and differentiation in instruction.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Faculty Ratings | Outcome/Objective: Domain 5: Planning and Instruction:

Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohort of teacher candidates’ MLE TEEMS LA/SS initial teacher preparation program.
Completion Date: 06/01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MLE TEEMS LA/SS program.
Additional Resources Requested: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A
CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No changes have been made in a procedural manner to the assessment process with the exception of using LiveText for data collection of all of the domains (instead of the STARS system). We will continue to improve the data collection system as designed by departmental collaboration.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The curriculum changes made are with specific materials and assignments which are designed to be used consistently throughout the coursework and practicum to reinforce principles of planning/instruction and assessment.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

n/a
Goals

G 4: Pedagogical Content Knowledge

To develop pedagogical content knowledge in mathematics and science with technology integration to create and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Content and Curriculum

The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge; adapts content and teaching to meet observed learner needs; builds teaching on a strong and current foundation in the content area(s) they teach; makes content relevant to students; uses available resources, including technology, to learn more about content area(s); and, follows state and local curriculum.

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio Standard 1-Content and Curriculum

Demonstrates a strong knowledge of content and curriculum that are appropriate in assigned content areas through satisfactory completion of portfolio standard 1.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
**Achievement Target:**
100% of completers will achieve a rating of Satisfactory or higher on portfolio standard 1.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
Achievement target of 100% was met. All completers achieved a score of Satisfactory or higher on Standard 1.

**O 2: Knowledge of Students and Learning**

The teacher candidate believes that all students can learn; understands and uses basic theories of learning to create productive classroom instruction; communicates respect for and develops rapport with all students; analyzes student data; identifies students’ stages of development, multiple intelligences, learning styles, and areas of exceptionality and develops and uses a repertoire of strategies to accommodate individual needs; communicates with student families/guardians; understands the major principles and theories of adolescent development; understands the range of individual differences of all young adolescents and the implications of these differences for teaching and learning; and, understand issues of young adolescent health and sexuality.

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Portfolio Standard 2-Knowledge of Student and Learning**

Demonstrates knowledge of students and their learning to support all students' intellectual, social, physical and personal development.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
100% of completers will achieve a rating of Satisfactory or higher on portfolio standard 2.
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
Achievement target of 100% was met. All completers achieved a score of Satisfactory or higher on Standard 2.

O 3: Planning and Instruction

The teacher candidate locates, comprehends, and builds rationales from curriculum guides, other applicable documents, and experienced colleagues; plans and carries out instruction based on state and local performance standards; selects and varies instructional strategies, assessing their impact on student engagement and learning; observes students closely and acknowledges how adjustments in teaching can impact learning; explores teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for assigned students; assesses individual learners’ needs and seek resources to improve instruction and learning; learns to work and plan productively as part of a team, grade level, and/or department group.

Related Measures:

M 5: Portfolio Standard 5-Planning and Instruction
Demonstrate knowledge and skills to design and create instructional experiences based on their knowledge of content and curriculum, students, learning environments, and assessments.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of completers will achieve a rating of Satisfactory or higher on portfolio standard 5.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
Achievement target of 100% was met. All completers achieved a score of Satisfactory or higher on Standard 5.
O 4: Professionalism

The teacher candidate learns basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education; learns about, locate resources for, and follows laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families; adheres to state and local Codes of Ethics, and models ethical behavior for students; reflects on teaching practice and examines the connections to student learning; self-assesses teaching strengths and areas for improvement, seeking and using guidance from mentors and instructional leaders; works through appropriate channels to seek answers to questions, voice concerns, explore ideas, and speak out about issues that matter to them and their students; accepts entry-level leadership roles (e.g., clubs, special topics, coaching) with support of identified mentors, administrators, coaches, and facilitators.

Related Measures:

M 6: Portfolio Standard 6-Professionalism

Recognize, participate in, and contribute to teaching as a profession by systematically and continuously reflecting on teaching and learning to improve their own practice and seeking opportunities to learn based upon reflection, input from others, and career goals.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of completers will achieve a rating of Satisfactory or higher on portfolio standard 6.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
Achievement target of 100% was met. All completers achieved a score of Satisfactory or higher on Standard 6.

O 5: Learning Environments
The teacher candidate creates a learning environment in which students can learn both independently and collaboratively; organizes and manages time, space, activities, technology, software, and other resources; understands the importance of and builds a functional classroom management plan; seeks, uses, and refines strategies for motivating learners; creates a culturally responsive classroom; learns about and uses resources specific to the school, district, and community; develops appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster supportive learning-based interactions in the classroom.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Portfolio Standard 3-Learning Environments**

Demonstrates knowledge to create learning environments that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of completers will achieve a rating of Satisfactory or higher on portfolio standard 3.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

Achievement target of 100% was met. All completers achieved a score of Satisfactory or higher on Standard 3.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Provide more support for students related to classroom management**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
The MAT MCE Math and Science students take two methods courses: One with a math focus and one with a science focus. It is diffic...
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
Achievement target of 100% was met. All completers achieved a score of Satisfactory or higher on Standard 4.

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Additional support in professionalism**

Faculty will provide additional support to students through focused assignments. Student handbook will clearly describe expectations for professionalism.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** The target date of October 2010 will give faculty adequate time to implement the additional support structures.
- **Completion Date:** 10/01/2010
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Program faculty; field experiences director
- **Additional Resources Requested:** none
- **Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Strengthening knowledge of professionalism**

While faculty ratings on professionalism of teacher candidates (via the STARS system) have met our achievement target, our assessment results based on portfolio evaluation have indicated we have partially met our achievement target. To strengthen our teacher candidates' knowledge of professionalism, we will provide a revised coursework (added learning modules on legal and ethical issues) which will guide our teacher candidates to develop basic knowledge of professionalism. Also teacher candidates will be required to submit weekly reflections as part of their coursework which will offer continued communication and guidance between university supervisors and teacher candidates, thus will foster our teacher candidates' understanding and reflective practices of professionalism.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
Provide more support for students related to classroom management

The MAT MCE Math and Science students take two methods courses: One with a math focus and one with a science focus. It is difficult as it is for the instructors to prepare students in the methodologies specific to those two disciplines in single courses. And without a third course which could introduce general features of pedagogy such as notions of lesson planning, classroom management, etc., it falls on the instructors of the two methods courses to try to add that content in as well. As a result, it is likely that insufficient attention is being paid to those areas, because students have provided feedback to that effect. The preferred solution would be to find a way to add a third methods course such as exists in the MAT SCE Science program. However, until a way to do that with a schedule which is already over-crowded is determined, some kind of patchwork solutions will be required. One is to require students to read a book related to classroom management to go along with the discipline-specific methods books they are now required to read. Another is something that will be tried this semester: Bringing in a guest speaker (in this case a teacher trained in behavior management techniques). We will continue to look for other options.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Portfolio Standard 3-Learning Environments | Outcome/Objective: Learning Environments

Implementation Description: The program coordinator will sit down with individuals responsible for the two methods courses and find ways to weave in sufficient material related to classroom management without pushing out other critical content in these courses.
Completion Date: 07/29/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program coordinator in conjunction with methods course instructors
Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?
ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

There were no changes to the assessment process of which the previous coordinator was aware. As a new coordinator for this program, I will be trying to determine how well the assessments capture things that I recognize are of fundamental importance to individuals on a track to become middle-school teachers. I have placed a lot of emphasis on the classroom learning environment so that candidates realize that classroom management is just one aspect of a larger entity (the CLE). I have given a specific assignment in the EDCI 7540 course related to this and will watch carefully to see how the candidates' performances on this assignment align (or fail to do so) with other assessments that look at the CLE. I also have devoted much attention to structuring meaningful classroom interactions including how to design effective cooperative learning experiences and how to facilitate productive disciplinary discussions. Again, I will be looking to see if our assessment data captures the candidates' levels of proficiency with respect to these aspects of the teaching practice.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

No changes to the curriculum have been made or even proposed. However, there is one thing I will be watching carefully: The effect of having two methods classes (in different disciplines in the MCE program vs. having three methods classes (all in the same
discipline) in the SCE program. I am wondering if this may result in deficiencies in the area of classroom management and curriculum planning for the MCE students since both myself and the instructor for the summer (Math Methods) course have tried to get away with weaving these topics into other discussions instead of giving significant blocks of time to them. It may be that we have to think about changes that would allow us to give students sufficient PCK within the two discipline-methods courses while still attending to these critical areas of teaching. I know that there is not room in the schedule for another course in the program, but it seems that a course focused on the basics of curriculum, assessment and evaluation would allow the discipline-specific methods courses to provide more substantiative math- and science-education content to candidates.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

Goals

G 1: G1: Knowledge and Expertise

G 1: Subject and pedagogical knowledge

Candidates in the MEd Reading Specialist program are to become experts in literacy processes and development for students grades pre-K through 12. Additionally, candidates are to gain the expertise in delivering high quality lessons for student success.

G 2: G2: Commitment to urban education and students

G 2: Commitment to urban education and students
Candidates in the MEd Reading Specialist program are committed to the successful learning and achievement of students in urban settings.

**G 3: Critical Reflection**

**G 3: Critical reflection skills**

Candidates in the MEd Reading Specialist program will hone the theoretical foundations and practical applications as critical thinkers in their classrooms. Candidates will use this critical reflection to make informed decisions about their instruction and curriculum choices.

**Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 1: History of Reading**

Candidates are knowledgeable of reading research and histories of reading.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History**

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the history of reading research and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

O 2: Foundations of Reading and Writing
Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

Related Measures:

M 2: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations
In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Redesigned Portfolio**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

**O 3: SBRR**
Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the SBRR principles (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) as related to literacy development.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBRR**
In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the SBRR principles and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...
Achievement Target:
students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

O 5: Range of Curricular Materials
Candidates use a wide range of curricular materials in effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Related Measures:

M 5: Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials
In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the range of curricular materials for providing effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Redesigned Portfolio**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

**O 6: Professional Development**
Candidates view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.

**Related Measures:**

**M 6: Portfolio Rating Standard 6: Prof Dev**

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of how to view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.
Achievement Target:
Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

O 7: Variety of Assessment Tools
Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction.

Related Measures:

M 7: Portfolio Rating Standard 7: Assessment
In the exit portfolio, candidates articulate their understanding of how to use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

O 8: Evaluate Practice
Candidates work with colleagues to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other's practice.

Related Measures:

M 8: Portfolio Rating Standard 8: Evaluate Practice
In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of how to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other's practice, and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on this standard

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Redesigned Portfolio**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Redesigned Portfolio**

Portfolio will be re-designed with professional standards aligned with courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Completion Date:** 05/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lori Elliott  
**Additional Resources Requested:** none  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00
Redesigned Portfolio

The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the 2010 International Reading Standards for reading specialists. Students will create a video document that provides opportunities for synthesis and analysis of the reading process, diagnosis, and instructional decision making.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History | Outcome/Objective: History of Reading
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations | Outcome/Objective: Foundations of Reading and Writing
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBRR | Outcome/Objective: SBRR
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 4: Literate Environments | Outcome/Objective: Creates a Literate Environment
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials | Outcome/Objective: Range of Curricular Materials
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 6: Prof Dev | Outcome/Objective: Professional Development
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 7: Assessment | Outcome/Objective: Variety of Assessment Tools
Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 8: Evaluate Practice | Outcome/Objective: Evaluate Practice

Completion Date: 09/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: MEd faculty in Reading, Language and Literacy Education
Video Portfolio

The MEd students currently submit video portfolios that are based on the IRA standards (2004). There are new standards (2010) that will be utilized in the future based on acceptance from the PSC.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Completion Date: 09/01/2011

Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you
suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The changes made in the MEd Reading Specialist assessment process is to have students submit a video portfolio (12-15 minutes in length) that demonstrates their knowledge and understandings of the following standards: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the history of reading research and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

2: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework. 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBRR
In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the SBRR principles and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4: Literate Environments

In the exit portfolio, candidates articulate their understanding how to integrate knowledge and dispositions of instructional practices, curricular materials, assessment and evaluation to create a literate environment that fosters both reading and writing.

5: Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of the range of curricular materials for providing effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

6: Portfolio Rating Standard 6: Prof Dev

In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of how to view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.

7: Portfolio Rating Standard 7: Assessment

In the exit portfolio, candidates articulate their understanding of how to use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction.
8: Portfolio Rating Standard 8: Evaluate Practice In the exit portfolio candidates articulate their understanding of how to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other's practice, and provide supporting evidence from their program coursework.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

At this point, we do not anticipate any changes to the program in terms of curriculum or structure. The assessment data indicates that the students do well on the video portfolio and informal comments indicate they appreciate the video format.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
**Mission/Purpose**

Note: This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy ESOL - Online MAT Degree Program (Georgia On My Line).

Our online TEEMS-ESOL program is a nontraditional approach to teacher education at the graduate level and leads to certification in Pre-K-12. It is built upon cutting edge research and best practices in preparing teachers to work in urban environments with students who are linguistically and culturally diverse. Our mission is to prepare teachers who are leaders in the field in their knowledge, teaching and dispositions so as to enable their students to attain the highest standards in their literacy, language and emotional development. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In this online program, we strive to realize a vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.
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Strengthening Professional Standard

Compared to other standards in the portfolio, the reading endorsement standard 10, "students view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility" has been ranked the lowest. This result indicates that students need to be better prepared to address this standard in the course work as well as in the program. Therefore, the coordinator of the program will communicate with each of the students and course instructors to encourage the students to participate in various professional development opportunities and to document their activities throughout the program.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi

Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A
CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Since this program is new, there were no completers last year. Therefore, there were no assessment data for last year's assessment report. For the coming academic year, we plan to embed the assessments in the students' required courses. We believe that this change will make the assessment process more relevant and manageable. We hope that this way
of assessing students will be more authentic and meaningful, leading to information that will inform both faculty and students.

**ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:**

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The data from this year’s report help us understand how we might revise our course assignments to better reflect the content of the standards we use to assess our students. As a faculty, we will continue to refine and implement our courses and portfolio requirements as we pilot an approach in which we will embed and align the portfolio standards into our course assignments. The findings of this year’s assessment indicate that the program has prepared students to be successful through an online delivery system. This success may encourage the development of additional online programs.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy M.Ed. with ESOL Concentration - Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line).

The M.Ed. major in English Speakers of Other Languages provides for master's level study in ESOL Education and Reading Education and leads to T-5 certification in ESOL (grades K-12). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing K-12 students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content.

The program's underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in ESOL education.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.
Goals

G 1: Content Knowledge

Students will have knowledge of reading and ESOL.

G 2: Planning

Students will have pedagogical knowledge and skills to plan effective instruction.

G 3: P-12 Student Learning

Students will demonstrate the effectiveness of their teaching/instruction on P-12 student learning.

G 4: Clinical Practice

Students will demonstrate their pedagogical knowledge in their practice.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans
O 1: ESOL STANDARD 1

Students understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to nature and acquisition of language.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio Standard 1**

Integration of references to relevant theory/research is embedded throughout. Detailed explanation given with examples cited to support contentions. All issues or aspects of the question covered clearly.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of students will score a 3 or higher on this measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students scored a 3 or higher on this measure.

O 2: ESOL STANDARD 2

Students understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture and cultural groups in creating effective learning environments

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Portfolio Standard 2**

Integration of references to relevant theory/research is embedded throughout. Detailed explanation given with examples cited to support contentions. All issues or
aspects of the question covered clearly

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher on this measure.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**O 3: ESOL STANDARD 3**

Candidates are knowledgeable of histories of ESL Teaching

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Portfolio Standard 3**

Students use their extensive knowledge of the research and evolution of the field of ESL to make instructional decisions and conduct their own classroom based research.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.
O 4: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 4

Candidates have knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

Related Measures:

M 4: Portfolio Standard 4

Know a wide range of theories and how they relate to practices and materials in the reading and writing classroom. They can summarize empirical evidence related to these foundational theories. They can conduct and publish research (including teacher-research inquiries) and contribute to the development of the knowledge base in the area of reading.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

O 5: ESOL STANDARD 5

Students know, understand, and use the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture and cultural groups to construct learning environments that support ESOL students' cultural identifies.

Related Measures:
**M 5: Portfolio Standard 5**

Students continually expand their knowledge of their students’ cultures and consistently integrate knowledge of cultural groups into their teaching. Students consistently provide in-class opportunities for students to make connections to their cultural backgrounds.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**O 6: ESOL STANDARD 6**

Students know, understand, and use standards-based practices and strategies related to planning, implementing, and managing ESL and content instruction, in terms of using effective classroom organizational approaches, resources, and teaching strategies for developing and integrating language skills.

**Related Measures:**

**M 6: Portfolio Standard 6**

Students consistently demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and use of standards-based practices and strategies in planning, implementing, and managing ESL and content instruction for successfully developing and integrating language skills.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

O 7: ESOL STANDARD 7

Students demonstrate a disposition indicating that teachers should support and advocate for ESOL students and their families and work collaboratively to improve the learning environment.

Related Measures:

M 7: Portfolio Standard 7

Students demonstrate sustained and consistent support and advocacy for ESOL students and their families. Candidates always work collaboratively to improve the learning environment.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.
O 8: Reading Endorsement Standard 8

Students are knowledgeable about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness.

Related Measures:

M 8: Portfolio Standard 8

Students are knowledgeable about all areas of phonemic awareness (ie. phoneme blending, isolation, segmentation, deletion and categorization) and demonstrate an ability to design instructional approaches that are engaging and varied and which are designed in light of the needs of students. Students recognize the importance of embedding phonemic awareness within a total reading program. Students demonstrate PA instruction that is engaging and varied

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

O 9: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 9

Students integrate knowledge and dispositions of instructional practices, curricular materials, assessment and evaluation to create a literate environment that fosters reading.

Related Measures:

M 9: Portfolio Standard 9

Students use a wide range of instructional practices, including technology-based practices, that promote reading. They can provide a critical rationale for their practices. Students use a wide range of print and nonprint materials and make appropriate use of new technology. Students design reading instruction to be multi-level to meet the needs of students at varying reading levels. Students design effective reading instruction for children from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

O 10: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 10

Students view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.

Related Measures:

M 10: Portfolio Standard 10

Students identify specific questions related to knowledge, skills and/or dispositions related to his or her teaching of reading and writing. They plan specific strategies for finding answers to those questions. They carry out those plans and articulate the answers derived. Students participate in professional organizations and use professional resources related to reading and writing.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Strengthening Professional Standard
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Compared to other standards in the portfolio, the reading endorsement standard 10, "students view professional development as ...

O 11: ESOL STANDARD 11

Students know, understand, and use the major concepts, theories, and research related to nature and acquisition of language to construct learning environments that support ESOL students' language and literacy development.

Related Measures:

M 11: Portfolio Standard 11

Students consistently apply their knowledge of nature and acquisition of language in language and literacy instruction and other language learning opportunities.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.
**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**O 12: ESOL STANDARD 12**

Students understand issues of assessment and use standards-based assessment measures with ESOL students (Assessment/instruction resulting in Literacy Gain - One on One ESOL Student).

**Related Measures:**

**M 12: Portfolio Standard 12**

Student illustrates how assessment results were compared, contrasted, and analyzed to plan and revise effective instruction for the student within an assessment/instruction cycle. Meaningful interpretations and appropriate conclusions are determined based on a range of data collected. Analysis of student learning includes clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the literacy achievement of the target student.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

**O 13: READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 13**

Students use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction
M 13: Portfolio Standard 13

Student illustrates how assessment results were compared, contrasted, and analyzed to plan and revise effective instruction for the student within an assessment/instruction cycle. Meaningful interpretations and appropriate conclusions are determined based on a range of data collected. Analysis of student learning includes clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the literacy achievement of the target student.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

100% of the students will score a 3 or higher.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 3 or higher.

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Embed

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard
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Embed standards for portfolio

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.
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Embed standards for portfolio

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Strengthening Professional Standard

Compared to other standards in the portfolio, the reading endorsement standard 10, “students view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility” has
been ranked the lowest. This result indicates that students need to be better prepared to address this standard in the course work as well as in the program. Therefore, the coordinator of the program will communicate with each of the students and course instructors to encourage the students to participate in various professional development opportunities and to document their activities throughout the program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Portfolio Standard 10  
**Outcome/Objective:** READING ENDORSEMENT STANDARD 10

**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi

**Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training:** How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened,
what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Since this program is new, there were no completers last year. Therefore, there were no assessment data for last year’s assessment report. For the coming academic year, we plan to embed the assessments in the students’ required courses. We believe that this change will make the assessment process more relevant and manageable. We hope that this way of assessing students will be more authentic and meaningful, leading to information that will inform both faculty and students.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The data from this year’s report help us understand how we might revise our course assignments to better reflect the content of the standards we use to assess our students. As a faculty, we will continue to refine and implement our courses and portfolio requirements as we pilot an approach in which we will embed and align the portfolio standards into our course assignments. The findings of this year’s assessment indicate that the program has prepared students to be successful through an online delivery system. This success may encourage the development of additional online programs.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Mission/Purpose

This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy M.Ed. Degree with ESOL Concentration.

The mission for the major in reading, language, and literacy program is to provide educators with a master's level study of literacy processes and literacy instruction for culturally diverse learners with specialization in one of three options: reading instruction, early literacy, or teaching. English as a second language. Our purpose is to develop teachers as critical inquirers in multicultural, urban settings. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity and social justice where individuals have access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge for the greater good.

Goals

G 1: Become a Subject and Pedagogical Knowledge Expert

Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will become experts in Reading, Language, Literacy and the Early Literacy and/or ESOL subject disciplines.
G 2: Promote Student Language and Literacy Development

Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will apply the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to planning, managing, and evaluating instruction to promote student language and literacy development.

G 3: Become Reflective Practitioners

Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will think critically and reflectively about his/her practice and develop appropriate dispositions with learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

G 4: Become Members of Professional Communities

Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will become members of one or more professional learning communities.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Candidates are knowledgeable about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension (SBRR principles).

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience
Related Measures:

**M 1: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading**

100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced" rating on this standard. While the majority of our students met this standard, three failed to do so.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
One hundred percent (100%) will score at the Proficient or Advanced level on this standard.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
Our targets were not realized for this standard as only 56% of our students (4) scored at the proficient level, 1 at the advanced level, while 42% or 3, scored at the basic level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**For all candidates to attain above intermediate standard**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

**The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures....

**Goal partially met more monitoring will be done of weak students**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their
course work and over the duration of the program to bet...

**More support for weak students**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to bet...

**Weak students will be monitored closely.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
While the majority of our students met all the goals there was still a small number who lagged behind in meeting the highest sta...

**O 2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL**

Candidates will understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and acquisition of language learning and teaching.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL**

100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced " rating on this standard. The majority of our students met this standard while 2 achieved passing.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
100% of our candidates will achieve advance or proficient levels in this standard.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
71.4% or 5 of our students achieved an advance (1) or proficient (4) on this standard with 2 students or 28.5% achieving a pass

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measure...

More support for weak students
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to bet...

O 3: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture

Candidates will understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to culture, language teaching and learning.

Associations:
Strategic Plans:
President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 3: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture

100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced " rating on this standard.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of our students will achieve an advance or proficient on this standard.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
Only four or 57.14 % of our students achieved an advanced (1) or proficient (3) on this standard while 3 students or 42.85% achieved a pass.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measure...

**More support for weak students**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to bet...

**O 5: Demonstrate Advocacy on Behalf of Learners**
Candidates will demonstrate a disposition indicating that teachers should reflect on, support and advocate for ESOL students and their families and work collaboratively to improve their learning environment.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Achievement of Reflective Action**

100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced " rating on this standard.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of our students will achieve an advanced or proficient on this standard.
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of our students attained an advanced (4 or 57.14%) or a proficient (3 or 42.85%) on this standard.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measure...

Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 4: Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development

Candidates will know, manage, and implement a variety of standards-based teaching strategies and techniques for developing and integrating English listening, speaking, reading and writing, and for accessing the core curriculum. Candidates will support ESOL students in accessing the core curriculum as they learn language and academic content together.

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Achievement of Instructional Practices**

100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced" rating on this standard.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of our students will achieve an advanced or proficient on this standard.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

71.4% of our students achieved an advanced (2) and proficient (5) on this standard while 28.57% or 2 students achieved a passing.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measure...

**More support for weak students**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to bet...

O 6: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities

Candidates are members of various learning and professional communities and organizations. Candidates will collaborate with and are prepared to serve as a resource to all staff, including paraprofessionals, to improve learning for all ESOL students.

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 6: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership

100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced " rating on this standard.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

100% of our students will achieve an advanced or proficient on this standard.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
85.7% of our students achieved an advanced (3 or 42.85%) or proficient (3 or 42.85%) on this standard while 1 (or 14.28%) achieved a pass.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures...

**More support for weak students through close monitoring.**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to bet...

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High
For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.  
**Completion Date:** 08/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL  
**Additional Resources Requested:** All ESOL faculty  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00
For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Achievement of Reflective Action | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Advocacy on Behalf of Learners  

Implementation Description: These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.  
Completion Date: 08/01/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL  
Additional Resources Requested: All ESOL faculty  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.
**Measure:** Achievement of Instructional Practices | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development

**Implementation Description:** These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.

**Completion Date:** 08/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL

**Additional Resources Requested:** All ESOL faculty

**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures**

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL

**Implementation Description:** These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.

**Completion Date:** 08/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL

**Additional Resources Requested:** All ESOL faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

For all candidates to attain above intermediate standard

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Completion Date: 08/01/2010

The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures

In today’s world teachers of English Langauge Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading
Implementation Description: One year from this date we hope for the majority of our new cohort to attain this level of "highly qualified."
Completion Date: 08/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator of our MAT-ESOL.
Additional Resources Requested: All ESOL faculty.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Goal partially met more monitoring will be done of weak students

We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: More support from the onset of the program
Completion Date: 05/29/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

More support for weak students

We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status:  Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.
Completion Date: 05/29/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

More support for weak students
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL

Implementation Description: We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.
Completion Date: 05/29/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL faculty
Additional Resources Requested: nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
More support for weak students

We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of Instructional Practices | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development

Implementation Description: We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.
Completion Date: 05/29/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

More support for weak students

We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture

Implementation Description: We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.
Completion Date: 05/29/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

More support for weak students through close monitoring.

We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities

Implementation Description: We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.
Completion Date: 05/29/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: nil
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Weak students will be monitored closely.
While the majority of our students met all the goals there was still a small number who lagged behind in meeting the highest standard possible. The action plan calls for closer monitoring and more support offered so that these students too might excel.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading  
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

**Implementation Description:** There will be close tracking of students who appear to be lagging behind in submitting and completing coursework. Students who also do not achieve high standards in their course work will be given more support to complete submissions at a higher standard.

**Completion Date:** 05/29/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** ESOL faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested:** NA  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Definition:** How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Achievements:** What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A
CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

NA

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

NA

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

NA

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

In lieu of our goal to push our students to higher standards, we instituted more feedback mechanisms which allowed students to achieve a higher standard. We have also given greater emphasis to issues of assessment. These changes were directly attributed to the scores students attained in their portfolio assessment. Over the coming year we continue to focus heavily on assessments but will institute more built-in class reporting mechanisms for the overall improvement of our portfolio scores. We will work harder with weaker students.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We will continue to support the development of the portfolio through our coursework so that students are given more support in excelling on their portfolios. We will also work harder with our weaker students and build-in more reporting mechanisms for them. This year's data has singled out the weak students who obtained "passes" in some areas. This signals more work with students who have the greatest needs.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

NA

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

NA

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

NA
Mission/Purpose

The exact title of this degree program should be: Reading, Language and Literacy TEEMS ESOL MAT. Our TEEMS-ESOL program is a nontraditional approach to teacher education at the graduate level and leads to certification in Pre-K-12. It is built upon cutting edge research and best practices in preparing teachers to work in urban environments with students who are linguistically and culturally diverse. Our mission is to prepare teachers who are leaders in the field in their knowledge, teaching and dispositions so as to enable their students to attain the highest standards in their literacy, language and emotional development. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

Goals

G 1: Become subject and pedagogical knowledge expert

Students in the TEEMS-ESOL program will become experts in Reading, Language Literacy and ESOL subject disciplines.

G 2: Promote student language and literacy development
Students in the TEEMS-ESOL program will apply the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to planning, managing, and evaluating instruction to promote student language and literacy development.

**G 3: Become reflective practitioners**

Students in the TEEMS-ESOL program will think critically and reflectively about his/her practice and develop appropriate dispositions for working with learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

**G 4: Become members of professional communities.**

Students in the TEEMS-ESOL program will become members of one or more professional learning communities.

**Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 1: Understands student development and learning**

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social, and personal development.

**Associations:**
Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

100% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a satisfactory grade (score of 3 or higher) per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of TEEMS-ESOL candidates (n=14) demonstrated proficiency at understanding the foundations of language acquisition and learning.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures...
M 2: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. * Data for students who pursue a certification only is included.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:

75 % of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met

100 % of the candidates demonstrated an "understanding of student development re: learning."

O 3: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Associations:

Strategic Plans:
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures...

**M 2: Faculty Ratings**
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. * Data for students who pursue a certification only is included.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75 % of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100 % of the candidates knew and used "multiple instructional strategies."

**O 4: Can motivate and manage students for learning**

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience
Related Measures:

**M 1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures...

**M 2: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. * Data for students who pursue a certification only is included.
Achievement Target:

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of the candidates were able to "motivate and manage students for learning."

O 5: Understands and uses assessment for learning

The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:
**M 1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures...

**M 2: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. * Data for students who pursue a certification only is included.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Achievement Target:

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the candidates "understood and used assessment for learning."

O 6: Can effectively plan for instruction

The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Associations:

Strategic Plans:
President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio
Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures...

**M 2: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. * Data for students who pursue a certification only is included.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of candidates were able to "effectively plan for instruction."

**O 7: Uses communication skills and technology**

The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of language, literacy, and content area instruction through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures...

M 2: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. * Data for students who pursue a certification only is included.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:
75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the candidates used "communication skills and technology."

O 8: Practices professional reflection

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio
Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of advocacy and collaboration through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures...

M 2: Faculty Ratings
Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system.  * Data for students who pursue a certification only is included.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a
professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100 % of students "practiced personal reflection."

**O 9: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners**

The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

**Associations:**

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio**

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of cultural issues in the teaching and learning through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In today’s world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures...

M 2: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. * Data for students who pursue a certification only is included.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Achievement Target:

75% of teacher candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100 % of the candidates were able to "effectively teacher diverse groups of learners."

O 10: Involves school and community in learning

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students` learning and well-being.

Associations:

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio

Portfolio evaluations collected via LiveText rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
75% of student candidate’s portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100 % of TEEMS-ESOL completers (n=14) demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge (level 3) of the standard on foundations of
professional development through portfolio artifacts and either written or oral rationale.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures...

**M 2: Faculty Ratings**

Faculty ratings of teacher candidates who have completed the program obtained via the STARS evaluation system. * Data for students who pursue a certification only is included.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Achievement Target:**

75% of student candidate's portfolios submitted via LiveText will receive a passing grade per domain based on the established rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of our candidates demonstrated proficiency at "involving school and community in learning."

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**
The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure**: Portfolio
- **Outcome/Objective**: Can effectively plan for instruction | Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners | Can motivate and manage students for learning | Involves school and community in learning | Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies | Practices professional reflection | Understands and uses assessment for learning | Understands student development and learning | Uses communication skills and technology

Implementation Description: Teacher candidates will continue to improve their understanding of the teaching of English Language learners until August 2010.
Completion Date: 08/31/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator of our MAT-ESOL
Additional Resources Requested: All ESOL faculty.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A
CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have not made any particular change in the assessment process, but it seems that reordering of the courses to be taught allowed for greater uptake of key ESOL content. We will phase portfolio assessment into the courses throughout the program so that we will be able to see the progress of students learning in the program.
ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The findings indicate that we are doing well generally, but we would like to do better. Our scores in reading reflected some weaknesses with some of our students so this is an area which we have targeted for more specific instructional emphasis. All ESOL faculty are reinforcing this area in their respective courses.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 2: Unknown

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

O 2: Unknown
**Related Measures:**

**M 9: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit**

Teacher candidates develop an SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment. The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of 6 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
**Pk-12 involvement**

_Established in Cycle: 2008-2009_

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, but explore and implement ways to involve th...

**O 3: Unknown**

Unknown

**Related Measures:**

**M 10: Professional Growth Plan**

Teacher candidates will submit at least three documents/artifacts demonstrating professional growth activities/plan within the last two years. Teacher candidates will be given choices in terms selecting the artifacts such as becoming active members of NSTA/GSTA (National Science Teachers Association/ Georgia Science Teachers Association), in-service professional development workshops, presentations at conferences, and publications in scholarly journals etc. Teacher candidates will describe what they learnt from their experiences with the help of a reflection paper. They will describe the artifacts that document their professional growth. They will evaluate their own professional growth, list their ongoing goals and design a plan to meet these goals. The professional growth plan and the reflection paper will be graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the student exceeds expectation), 2 indicates that the student meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the students has not met the criteria.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of students attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of 6 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Pk-12 involvement**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, but explore and implement ways to involve th...

**O 4: Unknown**

Unknown

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of 6 teachers scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Pk-12 involvement**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, but explore and implement ways to involve th...

**M 6: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit (Nature of Science)**

Teacher candidates develop a SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment). The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage their students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of 6 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**O 5: Unknown**

Unknown

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100 % of teacher candidates will attend and 90 % will successfully complete the safety certification workshop.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of 6 students attended and successfully completed the safety certification workshop. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Pk-12 involvement
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, but explore and implement ways to involve th...

O 6: Unknown

Unknown

Related Measures:

M 7: Portfolio element: Curriculum Exploration/Analysis

The curriculum exploration and analysis paper will require teacher candidates to generate a list of criteria after consulting professional documents to evaluate curriculum materials. Using these criteria, the teacher candidates will examine two science curricula: one traditional curriculum developed by textbook publishing companies and one NSF reform based curriculum. The teacher candidates will write a report based on the criteria highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of each curriculum. The curriculum explorations paper is graded using a rubric on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates exceeds expectations, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the teacher candidates has not met the criteria.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of 6 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**M 8: Student portfolio element: Lesson Plan**

Demonstration of content skills through a lesson plan. The Content knowledge section of the portfolio focuses on candidates' understanding of the foundations of science (NSTA standard 1) through the development of a Socio-Scientific Issues Science (SSI) Unit that covers a science topic of social relevance. These units include all lesson plans, assessments, and resources for teaching the unit. The lesson plan is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates exceeds expectations, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the teacher candidates has not met the criteria.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work.

**Achievement Target:**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric and met expectations.

**O 7: Unknown**

Unknown
Related Measures:

**M 9: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit**

Teacher candidates develop an SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment. The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of 6 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

**O 8: Unknown**

Unknown
Related Measures:

**M 4: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher on element rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher on element rubric and exceeded expectations

**O 9: Can plan and implement science curriculum**

Teachers of science plan and implement an active, coherent, and effective curriculum that is consistent with the goals and recommendations of the National Science Education Standards. They begin with the end in mind and effectively incorporate contemporary practices and resources into their planning and teaching.

Related Measures:

**M 5: Unknown**

Unknown

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `4` or higher on element rubric.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of 6 students scored a 3 on element rubric. Therefore, all teacher candidates exceeded expectations.

O 10: Unknown

Unknown

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Pk-12 involvement**

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, but explore and implement ways to involve the engagement of pk-12 faculty to provide their input in the program design during the 2008-2009 academic year.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Unknown
- **Measure:** Professional Growth Plan  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Unknown
- **Measure:** Unknown  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Can plan and implement science
Providing diverse experiences in the program

Our student population comprises of in-service teachers that may be working with a specific student population. We need to formalize ways of providing diverse learning experiences to our students and collect data on this process.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: This action plan will be developed further by this date.
Completion Date: 10/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All program faculty. We have implemented two changes discussed in our actions plan for 2006-2007. For providing diverse experiences to our students (in-service teachers), we now require the students to do a revised program assessment (peer teaching). We need to meet as a group to further discuss and develop ideas for integrating diverse learning experiences for our students.
Additional Resources Requested: None

Implementation Notes:

9/16/2010 As reflected in the outcomes, action plan has been implemented successfully.
Communication between faculty and candidates

The program plan to improve communication between faculty and candidates to better support and guide candidates. The faculty will host a meeting with candidates at least once a semester in addition to various informal interactions and communication.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The faculty will host a meeting with candidates at least once a semester in addition to various informal interactions and communication.
Completion Date: 10/07/2011

Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A
CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No specific changes were made in the assessment process while specific emphasis was given to K-12 involvement through peer interactions and reflections based on our action plans. There is no plan to change our assessment process in the coming year.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
There will be no changes to the program. All the candidates met the expected outcomes and successfully completed the program. However, the program plan to focus on improving communication between faculty and candidates throughout the program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:**

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:**

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:**

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

This program should be listed as Science Education M.Ed. Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). The mission of the Georgia State University M.Ed. Online Program in Science Education is to provide an opportunity for certified teachers to build capacity by expanding their content knowledge and pedagogical practices.

Goals

G 1: Goal/Purpose Statement

The goal of the MEd. Online Science Education program is to help certified teachers expand their content knowledge base and pedagogical practices through application where they demonstrate their knowledge and skills of advanced topics in the natural sciences and pedagogical practices which includes inquiry, working with diverse student populations, and literacy.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)
Students in the MEd. Online Program in Science Education are expected to use the skills of teaching to plan instructional activities that support students’ interests and learning.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Measure for Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)**

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Science Education Standards. This section of the portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the major standards in the areas of pedagogical knowledge which will include planning, instructional skills, and content knowledge. Students must achieve a rating of at least “2” out of a possible “3” for this measure.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

One hundred percent of the students will complete this target. It is expected that all students will score 66% (2/3) or higher on this section of the portfolio assessment.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

Fifty percent of the students scored 100% (3/3 Far Exceeds Expectation Level) on this target and 50% scored 66.66% (2/3 Meets Expectation Level) on this target. Data show that half of the students exceeded the expected level on this target.

**O 2: Effects on P-12 Student Learning Action Plan for Science**
Students in the MEd. Online Program in Science Education will use a variety of contemporary assessment strategies to evaluate the performance and achievement of the learner in science.

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning**

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Science Education Standards. This section of the portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the major standards in the areas of impact on student learning and assessment. Students must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for this measure.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

One hundred percent of the students will complete this target. It is expected that all students will score 66% (2/3) or higher on this section of the portfolio assessment.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

Fifty percent of the students scored 100% (3/3 Far Exceeds Expectation Level) on this target and 50% scored 66.66% (2/3 Meets Expectation Level) on this target. Data show that 50% of the students exceeded the expected level on this target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.
**Effects on P-12 Learning**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

Linked to the Effects on P-12 Learning

Data show that 50% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and ...

**Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 3: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)**

Students in the MEd. Online Program in Science Education will plan and implement an active, coherent, and effective curriculum that promotes scientific inquiry, safe and orderly environment for learning, reflective practice, and is consistent with the goals and recommendations of the National Science Education Standards.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Measure for Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)**

Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Science Education Standards. This section of the portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the major standards in the areas of curriculum, social context, safe and orderly environment, and professional practice. Students must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for this measure.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

One hundred percent of the students will complete this target. It is expected that all students will score 66% (2/3) or higher on this section of the portfolio assessment.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

Thirty-three percent of the students scored 100% (3/3 Far Exceeds Expectation Level), 33% scored 83.33% (2.5/3 Exceeds Expectation Level) on this target, and 33% scored 66.66% (2/3 Meets Expectation) on this target. Data show that 66% of the students exceeded the expected level on this target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Clinical Practice**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

Linked to Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)

Data show that 33% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation...

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**
Clinical Practice

Linked to Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)

Data show that 33% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level, 33% scored at the exceeds expectation level, and 33% scored at the exceeds level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, EDSC 8430, and EDSC 8400.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Measure for Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)
- Outcome/Objective: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)

Implementation Description: Plan should be fully implemented at the end of the fall semester 2010.
Completion Date: 12/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Science.
Additional Resources Requested: No additional resources needed.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Effects on P-12 Learning
Linked to the Effects on P-12 Learning

Data show that 50% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 50% scored at the meets level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, and EDSC 8400.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Effects on P-12 Student Learning Action Plan for Science

**Implementation Description:** Plan should be fully implemented at the end of the fall semester 2010.  
**Completion Date:** 12/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Science.  
**Additional Resources Requested:** No additional resources needed.  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Planning - Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills**

Linked to Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)

Data show that 50% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 50% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550 and EDSC 8400.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Plan should be fully implemented at the end of the fall semester 2010.  
Completion Date: 12/01/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Science.  
Additional Resources Requested: None  
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

NA

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

NA

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

NA
CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

NA

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

NA

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The assessment process has changed in that students enrolled in the MEd. Online Program in Science Education must complete three assessment pieces. These assessment documents evaluate students in the areas of planning, clinical practice, and effects on P-12 learners. As students progress in the program, they receive feedback on their work, make revisions and submit a summative assessment document. The summative document, an electronic portfolio, must be completed by the last semester that the student is enrolled in the program. Changes were made in the program to improve performance of students and to provide continuous feedback to them. During the upcoming academic year, the new process for assessing the work of students will be evaluated to determine the effectiveness of the new process. Once the process has been investigated, appropriate changes will be made.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:
What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The assessment process has changed. Students enrolled in the MEd. Online Program in science will continue to submit an exit portfolio. In addition to submitting the exit portfolio, students will document their knowledge of planning, clinical practice, and effects of their teaching on P-12 learners. Documents in the three areas will be submitted as class assignments which may or may not become a part of the exit portfolio. These changes were made to improve student performance and to enable them to successfully document their knowledge of the three areas to be assessed.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

NA

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year's assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

NA

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
NA
Mission/Purpose

The mission of the MAT science program is to prepare high quality urban science teachers who understand and implement reform based practices.

Goals

G 1: Can teach using culturally relevant pedagogy

To prepare science teachers who can implement culturally relevant pedagogy

G 2: Uses reform science methods

To prepare reform minded teachers (e.g., inquiry problem-based learning, socio-scientific issues)

G 3: Uses technology competently

To prepare technologically competent teachers to meet the needs of a variety of their learners.
O 1: Uses communication skills and technology

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students exhibit knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

4.43 Effective utilization of resources

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: MAT Science Portfolio and online PAAR rating

Supervisors' internship (practicum) evaluations, course assignment, student interviews and overall portfolio evaluation are combined into faculty ratings of completers and entered into the STARS/PAARS database for Standard 6.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and
understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students have passed this standard.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Continue current actions.**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Continue current actions.

**Related Action Plan(s):**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Faculty members teaching in the MAT science program will revisit standard #6 and revise the activities targeting these areas.

**O 2: Understands and uses assessment for learning**

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students show they understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 2: Uses assessment for learning

Portfolio: Includes artifacts and mentor/supervisor evaluations describing different types of assessment and the appropriate use of them in the classroom

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students have passed this standard.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
**Continue current actions.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
Continue current actions.

**Extended practica**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

**O 3: Motivates and manages students for learning**

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students show the understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University  
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Motivation and Management of Students**
The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target:** Met
100% of students have passed this standard.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Extended practica**
*Established in Cycle:* 2008-2009

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

**O 6: School and Community Involvement**

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate purposeful and effective relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.
Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 6: School and Community Involvement

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of students have passed this standard.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Continue current actions.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Continue current actions.

Concern about technology implementation and assessment
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Concern over issues in the community and its assessment
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Even though the portfolio data indicates that this objective has been met, there was conflicting data coming from the observation...

O 7: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate an understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) they teach and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:
6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students have passed this standard.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Continue current actions.**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Continue current actions.

O 8: Practices professional reflection
Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate continuous evaluation of the effects her/his choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures:**

**M 8: Reflective Practice**

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of
his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students have passed this standard.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Extended Practica**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

**O 9: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies**

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate their understands and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation
Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 9: Instructional Variety

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students have passed this standard.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Extended Practica

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

O 10: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students demonstrate their understandings of how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

3 Contribute to the greater community good
3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students
3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.3 Graduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 10: Effectively teaches diverse learners

The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students have passed this standard.

**Related Action Plans (byEstablished cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Continue current actions.**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Continue current actions.

**Continue current actions.**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Continue current actions.

**Extended Practica**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pract...

**Extended Practicum**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...
Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 4: Can effectively plan for instruction

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students preservice teachers plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community and curriculum goals.

Associations:

Institutional Priorities:

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Related Measures:

M 4: Instructional Planning

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students have passed this standard.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Extended Practica**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

**O 5: Understands student development re: learning**

Through an online portfolio (embedded in courses EDSC 6550, EDSC 7550, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680) and rating system by faculty, students show they understand how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.

**Associations:**

**Institutional Priorities:**

3.31 Use of our unique location and environment to offer a distinctive education to our students

**Strategic Plans:**

President, Georgia State University

6.3 Graduate Experience
**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Student Learning and Development**

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social, and personal development.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students have passed this standard.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Extended Practica**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**
Continue current actions.

Continue current actions.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Effectively teaches diverse learners | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
Measure: Pedagogical Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge
Measure: Uses assessment for learning | Outcome/Objective: Understands and uses assessment for learning

Completion Date: 05/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen

Continue current actions.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Effectively teaches diverse learners | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners
Measure: MAT Science Portfolio and online PAAR rating | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology
Measure: School and Community Involvement | Outcome/Objective: School and Community Involvement

Completion Date: 05/01/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen

Extended practica

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

  Measure: Motivation and Management of Students | Outcome/Objective: Motivates and manages students for learning

Completion Date: 05/01/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen

Extended practica
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Uses assessment for learning  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understands and uses assessment for learning

**Completion Date:** 05/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen

---

**Extended Practica**

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Student Learning and Development  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understands student development re: learning
Extended Practica

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Instructional Variety | Outcome/Objective: Knows and uses multiple instructional strategies

Completion Date: 05/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen

Extended Practica

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide
for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Instructional Planning  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Can effectively plan for instruction

**Completion Date:** 05/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen

**Extended Practica**

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Reflective Practice  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Practices professional reflection

**Completion Date:** 05/01/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen
Extended Practica

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Effectively teaches diverse learners | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

Completion Date: 05/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen

Extended Practicum

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Effectively teaches diverse learners | Outcome/Objective: Can effectively teach diverse groups of learners

Completion Date: 05/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen

Plan to reexamine technology competency

There is either a misunderstanding by faculty by the term "developing" or our students need more guided experiences with technology implementation, or our program is not gatekeeping preservice teachers properly to hold them in the program if they are not adequately progressing. It will be necessary to have discussions with faculty regarding course and practicum expectations, revisit the ties to the INTASC standards, and to determine what more could be done to prevent preservice teachers from completing a program if they are not yet ready to teach. Despite training faculty supervisors on the administration of PAARS, ratings are still reporting below average when in reality all students who remained in the program have met or exceeded all expectations.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: We hope to see students navigating technology in the field more appropriately in fall, 2009.
Completion Date: 05/01/2008
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen and Science MAT faculty

Related Action Plan(s):

Faculty members teaching in the MAT science program will revisit standard #6 and revise the activities targeting these areas
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: MAT Science Portfolio and online PAAR rating  | Outcome/Objective: Uses communication skills and technology

Implementation Description: Faculty member teaching in the MAT science program will revisit standard #6 and revise the activities targeting these areas
Completion Date: 08/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: MAT Science Ed Unit

Implementation Notes:

9/15/2010 Review process for assessing technology use in the classroom. There was a discrepancy between the portfolio data and the practicum supervisor data.

Concern about technology implementation and assessment

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: School and Community Involvement  | Outcome/Objective: School and Community Involvement

Completion Date: 07/29/2011

Concern over issues in the community and its assessment
Even though the portfolio data indicates that this objective has been met, there was conflicting data coming from the observations. The issue seemed to be that if a supervisor did not see direct evidence of this objective in the lesson observed, the candidate was given a low score on the observation. In the portfolios, the candidates were able to show evidence in the artifacts they provided of meeting this objective. The point needs to be communicated to the supervisors that this objective needs to be assessed in the larger context of the whole practicum experience and not within the thin slice of a few observations.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

  Measure: School and Community Involvement | Outcome/Objective: School and Community Involvement

Implementation Description: Certainly, the supervisors and faculty need to continue to emphasize this area of teaching practice. However, it seems important that the supervisors need to be given some guidance in how to think about assessing this objective. This guidance will be communicated by science education faculty, particularly the program coordinator.

Completion Date: 07/29/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All science education faculty can help in terms of communicating the significance of this objective to the candidates -- which they have been doing effectively. It will be a priority for the program coordinator to discuss the guidelines for assessing this objective with the supervisors.

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A
CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The key change in the assessment process centered around the evaluation of the candidate's use of technology. There were issues with candidates being scored low on this
rubric element simply as a result of the fact that the school they were in did not have sufficient resources in this area, not because the candidate was not capable of utilizing technology. Supervisors were made aware of the need to take into account the available resources when evaluating this component of the observation protocol. As a result, the candidates have been receiving more appropriate feedback on their use of technology relative to the school context in which they find themselves. The area of focus for this year is with regards to connections made within the curriculum to issues of local importance. Last year’s data indicated discrepancies between the evaluations being given in the observation forms and the evidence being provided in the portfolio. The problem likely is that the supervisors are focusing their evaluations on what they see in the individual lessons they observe whereas the portfolio provides a broad overview of a candidate’s body of work. What will be helpful to overcome this disconnect is to have the candidates show the supervisor’s relevant examples of bringing local / community issues into their teaching during lessons for which the supervisor may not have been present.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

As noted in the response to academic question 1, there will be more discussion with the candidates about ways to bring issues of local / community relevance into their practicum experiences and, more importantly, to make their supervisors aware of such integration of these topics in the cases where this integration might not be apparent in individual lessons. This concern will be addressed in all of the methods courses taken in the program. We have put in a proposal to convert the IT 7360 (Instructional Technology) course from a requirement to an elective (along with other electives such as an ESOL option and a Nature of Science course). The use of instructional technology has become embedded in all of the methods courses required of students in this program and so there is less of a need for a stand-alone course (particularly given that the state requirement for such a course has been removed). If individuals feel that this is an area of weakness, they are still able to take the IT 7360 course, but for those that feel more proficient in this area, they get to focus on specific examples of how to apply instructional technology to their
discipline. This context-relevant integration of IT should help candidates in the program better understand the pedagogy of using IT and not just the mechanics.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Goals

G 1: Social Studies M.Ed. goals

The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Social Studies program include their development as: 1) Leaders in their Social Studies communities; 2) Creators of democratic, socioconstructivist learning environments for diverse students using appropriate pedagogical content knowledge; and, 3) Scholars of educational theory and research as applied to curriculum and instruction, and social studies education.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Student Learning/Development
The educator is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Learning and Development (Standard 3)**

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for learning and development (Standard 3).

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**
85% of educators evaluated will meet standard for management and monitoring student learning/development.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
Of 2 total educators one demonstrates meeting this standard at the accomplished level and one demonstrates competence at the basic level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Recruitment**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We need to look at how students are recruited for this program and work on some materials and/or processes to increase enrollment...

**Revise Portfolio Assessment**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We need to look at the portfolio assessment plan and revise it to better meet the GA frameworks and students' coursework.

**O 2: Reflects on & learns from professional experience**

The educator thinks systematically about her/his practice and learns from professional experience.

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Reflection (Standard 4)**

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for reflection (Standard 4).

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

85% of educators evaluated will meet standard for thinking systematically about her/his practice and learns from professional experience.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

Of 2 total educators one demonstrates meeting this standard at the exemplary level and one demonstrates competence at the basic level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Recruitment**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
We need to look at how students are recruited for this program and work on some materials and/or processes to increase enrollmen...

**Revise Portfolio Assessment**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
We need to look at the portfolio assessment plan and revise it to better meet the GA frameworks and students' coursework.

**O 3: Participates in professional learning communities**

The educator is a member of one or more learning communities.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Professional Learning Communities (Standard 5)**

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for professional learning communities (Standard 5).

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

85% of educators evaluated will meet standard for being a member of one or more learning communities.
Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
Of 2 total educators one demonstrates meeting this standard at the accomplished level and one demonstrates competence at the basic level.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Recruitment
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We need to look at how students are recruited for this program and work on some materials and/or processes to increase enrollmen...

Revise Portfolio Assessment
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We need to look at the portfolio assessment plan and revise it to better meet the GA frameworks and students' coursework.

O 4: Committed to student learning and development

Educators are committed to students and their learning and/or development.

Related Measures:

M 4: Commitment to S. Lrng. & Dev. (Standard 1)
A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for commitment to student learning and development (Standard 1).

Source of Evidence: Evaluations
Achievement Target:
85% of educators evaluated will meet the standard for commitment to students and their learning and/or development.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
Of 2 total educators one demonstrates meeting this standard at the accomplished level and one demonstrates competence at the basic level.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Recruitment
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We need to look at how students are recruited for this program and work on some materials and/or processes to increase enrollmen...

Revise Portfolio Assessment
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We need to look at the portfolio assessment plan and revise it to better meet the GA frameworks and students' coursework.

O 5: Can apply expertise for learning and development

The educator is an expert in her/his field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote student learning/development.

Related Measures:
M 5: Expertise to learning and development

A summary rating derived from portfolio assessment obtained from the STARS system for applying expertise to student learning and development (Standard 2).

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
85% of educators evaluated will meet standard of being an expert in her/his field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote student learning/development.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
Of 2 total educators one demonstrates meeting this standard at the accomplished level and one demonstrates competence at the basic level.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Recruitment
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We need to look at how students are recruited for this program and work on some materials and/or processes to increase enrollment...

Revise Portfolio Assessment
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We need to look at the portfolio assessment plan and revise it to better meet the GA frameworks and students' coursework.

Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
**M.Ed. Collaboration**

MSIT is in the process of combining the master's degree programs in the department with the Educational Leadership department to create an innovative master's degree program highlighting the social studies as well as urban teaching and leadership with a coaching and / or leadership endorsement.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progess  
**Priority:** High

**Completion Date:** 10/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Ad Hoc Committee  
**Additional Resources Requested:** n/a  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Recruitment**

We need to look at how students are recruited for this program and work on some materials and/or processes to increase enrollment.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Commitment to S. Lrng. & Dev. (Standard 1) | **Outcome/Objective:** Committed to student learning and development
- **Measure:** Expertise to learning and development | **Outcome/Objective:** Can apply expertise for learning and development
- **Measure:** Learning and Development (Standard 3) | **Outcome/Objective:** Student Learning/Development
- **Measure:** Professional Learning Communities (Standard 5) | **Outcome/Objective:** Participates in professional learning communities
- **Measure:** Reflection (Standard 4) | **Outcome/Objective:** Reflects on & learns from
professional experience

Completion Date: 05/01/2009
Responsible Person/Group: Social Studies Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Revise Portfolio Assessment

We need to look at the portfolio assessment plan and revise it to better meet the GA frameworks and students' coursework.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Commitment to S. Lrng. & Dev. (Standard 1) | Outcome/Objective: Committed to student learning and development
Measure: Expertise to learning and development | Outcome/Objective: Can apply expertise for learning and development
Measure: Learning and Development (Standard 3) | Outcome/Objective: Student Learning/Development
Measure: Professional Learning Communities (Standard 5) | Outcome/Objective: Participates in professional learning communities
Measure: Reflection (Standard 4) | Outcome/Objective: Reflects on & learns from professional experience

Completion Date: 05/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Social Studies Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

It was determined that no changes were necessary at the basic level of the assessment process for this program as it was newly revised last year and worked well for students and faculty. We will improve upon the process by collaborating with the Educational Leadership program to design an innovative degree program which will encompass the social studies into a department-wide masters degree.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We do not anticipate curriculum or coursework changes to the program in the upcoming year, although we are collaborating to create an innovative M.Ed. which is inclusive of the social studies as a separate concentration.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year's assessment report (based on last year's action plan and/or data from this year's assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

n/a
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

n/a

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

n/a
Mission/Purpose

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

Goals

G 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will develop broad content knowledge that is transformed given the multiple contexts, purposes, and ends of education as well as specific pedagogical aims and interests.
G 2: Purpose/History of Social Studies

Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will develop an understanding of the purposes and history of the field of social studies.

G 3: Diverse Learning Environments
Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will develop the ability to create a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with special needs.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Content and Curriculum

The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge; adapts content and teaching to meet observed learner needs; builds teaching on a strong and current foundation in the content area(s) they teach; makes content relevant to students; uses available resources, including technology, to learn more about content area(s); and, follows state and local curriculum.

Related Measures:

M 1: Content and Curriculum

Students’ knowledge of Content and Curriculum will be based on data from program portfolio ratings for students earning their MAT degree in Social Studies Education in Summer 2009-Spring 2010 - standard 1.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of students would score at the level of Acceptable or Exceeds Expectations on this standard.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
A total of 100% of students scored at the level of acceptable or exceeds on this standard. There were 52 students that scored acceptable and 1 student
that exceeded expectations. The mean was 2.02 with a standard deviation of 0.14.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Maintain Student Performance**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency...

**Maintain Student Performance**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to maintain 100% competency on all s...

**O 2: Knowledge of Students**

The teacher candidate believes that all students can learn; understands and uses basic theories of learning to create productive classroom instruction; communicates respect for and develops rapport with all students; analyzes student achievement data to improve instruction; identifies students’ stages of development, multiple intelligences, learning styles, and areas of exceptionality; communicates with families regarding student progress through required school and district procedures.

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Knowledge of Students**
Students’ knowledge of Knowledge of Students will be based on data from program portfolio ratings for students earning their MAT degree in Social Studies Education in Summer 2009-Spring 2010 - standard 2.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

100% of students would score at the level of Acceptable or Exceeds Expectations on this standard.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
A total of 100% of students scored at the level of acceptable or exceeds on this standard. There were 52 students that scored acceptable and 1 student that exceeded expectations. The mean was 2.02 with a standard deviation of 0.14.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Maintain Student Performance
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competen...

O 3: Learning Environments

The teacher candidate creates a learning environment in which students can learn both independently and collaboratively; organizes and manages time, space, activities, technology, software, and other resources; understands the importance of and builds a
functional classroom management plan; seeks, uses, and refines strategies for motivating learners; creates a culturally responsive classroom; learns about and uses resources specific to the school, district, and community; develops appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster supportive learning-based interactions in the classroom.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Learning Environments**

Students' knowledge of Learning Environments will be based on data from program portfolio ratings for students earning their MAT degree in Social Studies Education in Summer 2009-Spring 2010 - standard 3.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
100% of students will score at the level of Acceptable or Exceeds on this standard.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
There were 50 students that scored acceptable and 3 students that exceeded expectations. The mean was 2.06 with a standard deviation of 0.23.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Maintain Performance**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competen...

**O 6: Professionalism**
The teacher candidate learns basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education; learns about, locates resources for, and follows laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families; adheres to state and local Codes of Ethics, and models ethical behavior for students; reflects on teaching practice and examines the connections to student learning; self-assesses teaching strengths and areas for improvement, seeking and using guidance from mentors and instructional leaders; works through appropriate channels to seek answers to questions, voice concerns, explore ideas, and speak out about issues that matter to them and their students; accepts entry-level leadership roles (e.g., clubs, special topics, coaching) with support of identified mentors, administrators, coaches, and facilitators.

Related Measures:

M 6: Professionalism

Students' knowledge of Professionalism will be based on data from program portfolio ratings for students earning their MAT degree in Social Studies Education in Summer 2009-Spring 2010 - standard 6.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of students will score at the level of acceptable or exceeds on this standard.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
There were 53 students that scored acceptable. The mean was 2.23 with a standard deviation of 0.42.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
Maintain Student Performance

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency...
meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.  
**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.  
**Additional Resources Requested:** n/a  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Maintain Student Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.  
**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.  
**Additional Resources Requested:** n/a  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Maintain Student Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will
meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Professionalism  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Professionalism

**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates’ MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.  
**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.  
**Additional Resources Requested:** n/a  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Maintain Student Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Knowledge of Students  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of Students

**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates’ MAT TEEMS SS initial preparation program.  
**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT
Maintain Student Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Content and Curriculum | Outcome/Objective: Content and Curriculum

Implementation Description: At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates’ MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.
Completion Date: 06/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.
Additional Resources Requested: n/a
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Maintain Student Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to maintain 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to continue to promote 100% competency. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Content and Curriculum  | **Outcome/Objective:** Content and Curriculum

**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.

**Completion Date:** 06/01/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.

**Additional Resources Requested:** n/a  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

---

**Classroom Management**

The results of student exit survey data indicated student need for more classroom management instruction and skills. Many students stated that more experiences and training in effective classroom management would greatly benefit their teaching and improve their overall instruction. We will devout more instructional time and focus field experiences on the use of effective classroom management strategies.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** Within our methods courses and field experiences, instructors will provide additional concentrated instruction on the use of various effective classroom management strategies.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Chantee Earl McBride

**Additional Resources Requested:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00
Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The portfolio is used to assess student practicum experience and also serve as a professional tool to showcase various student created coursework, lesson plans, and other important professional materials. The portfolio assessment should be a document that serves as an effective professional tool that students can use to illustrate their work within the practicum and also share with prospective employers. After reviewing the portfolio assessment, it was determined that additional improvements in the overall portfolio assessment requirements were needed. In the upcoming academic year, comprehensive changes will be made to streamline the portfolio assessment requirements in order to provide students with a complete assessment tool that serves as an effective representation of their teaching.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Initial teacher preparation student survey data indicated the need for more instruction on lesson planning and preparation. In response to the data, within program methods courses offered, students will receive instruction on effective lesson planning. Instructors will provide extensive instruction and practice for students using the Backward Design Lesson Plan model. Students will be required to submit their lesson plans for review and feedback. University supervisors will also be encouraged to emphasize lesson planning within their evaluation of students' teaching. Planning and preparation are the initial steps needed for effective instructional delivery, and focused instruction in these areas will help initial teacher preparation students master a critical component of teaching.
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
Mission/Purpose

The Ed.S. program with a major in Teaching and Learning is intended for professional educators who demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration and wish both to develop those areas further and to develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders and instructional specialists. The purpose of this applied degree is to extend the academic preparation and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers and instructional leaders and to foster the application of these skills and abilities to a variety of educational settings.

In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.
Goals

G 1: Develop Education Experts in Concentrations

Accomplished graduates of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning will demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration. Concentration areas include Art Education, English Education, English as a Second Language Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Childhood Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education.

G 2: Develop Education Experts, Inquirers & Leaders

Accomplished graduates of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning will develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders, and instructional specialists in their areas of concentration. Concentration areas include Art Education, English Education, English as a Second Language Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Childhood Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education.

Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O 1: Committed to Student Learning and Development

Accomplished Ed.S. graduates are committed to student learning and development.

Related Measures:
M 1: M1: Faculty Rating: Commitment to Student Learning

Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 1.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Future of Ed.S.**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and L...

O 2: O2: Applies Expertise to Promote Student Learning

Accomplished Ed.S. graduates are experts in their areas of concentration and can effectively apply that expertise to promote student learning and development.
Related Measures:

M 2: M2: Faculty Rating: Expertise in Student Learning

Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 2.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met

100% of program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Future of Ed.S.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and L...

O 3: O3: Manages/Monitors Student Learning/Development
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates demonstrate responsibility and expertise in managing and monitoring student learning and development.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: M3: Faculty Rating: Monitoring Student Learning**

Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 3.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**Future of Ed.S.**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and L...
O 4: Reflects on and Learns from Experience

Accomplished Ed.S. graduates reflect systematically about their practice and learn from their professional experiences.

Related Measures:

M 4: Faculty Rating: Ability to Reflect

Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 4.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

Future of Ed.S.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and L...

O 5: O5: Participates in Learning Communities

Accomplished Ed.S. graduates demonstrate how their professional growth is impacted through participation in one or more learning communities.

Related Measures:

M 5: M5: Faculty Rating: Learning Communities

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:

100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers demonstrated at least an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
**Future of Ed.S.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and L...

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Future of Ed.S.**

We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to make a decision regarding our commitment to the future of the program during 2009-2010.

---

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** End of Spring Semester 2010  
**Completion Date:** 05/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair and Ed.S. Faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00

**Implementation Notes:**

9/20/2010 For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree because of the persistent low enrollment within individual concentration areas. In September 2010, we are submitting curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education.
Once the curriculum review process is completed, the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree will be officially de-activated.

Future of Ed.S.

We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to make a decision regarding our commitment to the future of the program during 2009-2010.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of Spring Semester 2010
Completion Date: 05/01/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair and Ed.S. Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00

Implementation Notes:

9/20/2010 For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree because of the persistent low enrollment within individual concentration areas. In September 2010, we are submitting curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education.

Once the curriculum review process is completed, the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree will be officially de-activated.
Future of Ed.S.

For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree because of the persistent low enrollment within individual concentration areas. In September 2010, we are submitting curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: M1: Faculty Rating: Commitment to Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: O1: Committed to Student Learning and Development
Measure: M2: Faculty Rating: Expertise in Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: O2: Applies Expertise to Promote Student Learning
Measure: M3: Faculty Rating: Monitoring Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: O3: Manages/Monitors Student Learning/Development
Measure: M4: Faculty Rating: Ability to Reflect | Outcome/Objective: O4: Reflects on and Learns from Experience
Measure: M5: Faculty Rating: Learning Communities | Outcome/Objective: O5: Participates in Learning Communities

Implementation Description: Once the curriculum review process is completed, the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree will be officially de-activated.
Completion Date: 12/31/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Department Faculty and Department Chair
Additional Resources Requested: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00
Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year's CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A
ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have continued to update our assessment system using the LiveText portfolio system. Most concentrations are using LiveText for student exit portfolios. All completers met the target performance expectations for measures 1-5. Ed.S. students demonstrate high levels of content knowledge, teaching performance, and ability to impact student achievement. They are engaged in professional growth and participate in learning communities.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

1. Core Content and Delivery. We have re-sequenced and implemented hybrid models of the core courses (i.e., part face-to-face, part online). We have continued to discuss the possibility of fully online options of the core courses, but because of the tentative nature of the future of the Ed.S. program, we have delayed making the investment in creating online courses. We have also considered incorporating the Teacher Support Specialist courses into the program, but again, we have not moved forward with this due to the tentative nature of the future of the program.
2. Increase Recruitment and Retention. We have completely updated the relevant sections of the MSIT website for the Ed.S. degree. However, several sections of the College of Education website remain outdated (e.g., the OAA site). We have sent changes/updates that are needed to the appropriate individuals, but updates are not yet completed. We have continued to offer orientation sessions (program-specific and department-wide) for new Ed.S. students. We also
continue to advise students formally twice a year in MSIT’s Professional Advisement Week (PAW). Some Ed.S. concentrations have increased in enrollment, but the completer rate has remained low. Thus, the Ed.S. is being de-activated in 2010-2011.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree because of the persistent low enrollment within individual concentration areas. In September 2010, we are submitting curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education. Once the curriculum review process is complete, the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree will be officially de-activated.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

All completers met the target performance expectations for measures 1-5. Ed.S. students demonstrate high levels of content knowledge, teaching performance, and ability to impact student achievement. They are engaged in professional growth and participate in learning communities. However, for the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree because of the persistent low enrollment within individual concentration areas. In September 2010, we are submitting curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education. Once the curriculum review process is complete, the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree will be officially de-activated.
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree because of the persistent low enrollment within individual concentration areas. In September 2010, we are submitting curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, and Science Education. Once the curriculum review process is complete, the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree will be officially de-activated.
Mission/Purpose

MISSION: To engage preservice teachers in assignments, activities, and field experiences that enhance critical thinking skills. To create teachers who can apply critical thinking skills to their current and future practices.

PURPOSE: The Middle Grades Education BSE program, in the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, considers the development critical thinking skills to be one of the most important goals of the program. For middle grades teachers, critical thinking skills are essential in the design of and reflection on selected teaching strategies, the analysis of student work and assessment data, and the adjustment of instruction based on local socio-cultural contexts. For the purposes of our program, and in conjunction with our Professional Education Faculty Conceptual Framework, we define critical thinking as "(1) the ability to reflect upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development, (2) the ability to identify and critically analyze educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan context, and (3) the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments for or against major theories of teaching and learning."

Goals

G 1: Critical Thinking through Recursive Data Analysis

To enhance middle grades preservice teachers’ ability to reflect upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing, and assessing teaching, learning, and development.

G 1: General Description of Student Goals
Goals should be a simple overarching idea like reflection, evaluation, thinking skills, etc.

**G 3: Critical Thinking through Argument Development**

To enhance middle grades preservice teachers’ ability to formulate and present convincing arguments for or against major theories of teaching and learning.

**Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 1: Book Groups**

In groups of 3 or 4, students will read one of the professional books outlined in the CTW syllabus. The groups will meet three or four times across the semester to discuss book ideas, make reasonable decisions about teaching and learning based upon the book, and challenge assumptions and bias across group members. Students will then synthesis their own ideas, other group member ideas, and information from the text as it relates to being a classroom teacher.

**Associations:**

**Standards:**

SACS Assessment Requirements

1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**General Education or Core Curriculum:**

1 Written Communication

2 Oral Communication

4 Critical Thinking

5 Contemporary Issues
Institutional Priorities:

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

1.14 Dynamic, intellectual and physical environment that stimulates scholarship, creativity, & innovation

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

2.23 Educational support systems that foster student access and success

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: CTW Rubric

We have no assessment data to share as we have not yet offered any CTW courses (first course to be offered Fall 2010).
We will use the following rubric sections to evaluate all CTW writing assignments beginning Fall 2010: Reading Comprehension (0-4 points): It is clear that all material was carefully read and processed. Depth of Response (0-4 points): Written responses indicates critical consideration of issues and concepts presented in the readings. Connections (0-4 points): When possible, the written response includes significant text-to-text and text-to-life connections. Depth of Thinking (0-4 points): Written responses include significant writings about what squared the authors thinking, what pointed them in new directions, and what questions are still circling. Content Knowledge (0-4 points): Students demonstrate full content knowledge in a deep and connected way. Organization (0-4 points): Information is in a logical, interesting sequence which the reader can follow

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Achievement Target:**
80% of students score 3 or better on rubric

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

We have not yet offered this course (and associated assignment). We will offer the first course in Fall 2010.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Assignment Outcomes**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
80% of students will receive a 3 or better on all CTW rubric sections.
The B.S.E. in Middle Grades Education is a new program in the College of Education. The first cohort of students, who started ...

O 2: Research Groups and Paper

Collaborative groups will be formed to research in-depth one critical issue in education (i.e. assessment, gender and education, technology, NCLB, parent communication, tracking, etc). Each group will be responsible for conducting student-led discussions focusing on assigned readings from journal articles of their choosing (found through library databases). Group members will serve as group leaders on subtopics of interest within the larger topic being researched and will share information with the group. At the end of each session, group members will evaluate the effectiveness of the session and make plans regarding what to include in their final presentation to the class based on their research topic. Students will be evaluated on their group research presentation and on their final research paper.

Associations:

Standards:

SACS Assessment Requirements

4 Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

General Education or Core Curriculum:

1 Written Communication

2 Oral Communication

3 Collaboration
Institutional Priorities:

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline

2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

3.32 Participation in partnerships that have a positive impact on the community, state, and nation

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University

3.2 Interdisciplinary Programs

6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: CTW Rubric

We have no assessment data to share as we have not yet offered any CTW courses (first course to be offered Fall 2010).

We will use the following rubric sections to evaluate all CTW writing assignments beginning Fall 2010:  Reading Comprehension (0-4 points): It is clear that all material
was carefully read and processed. Depth of Response (0-4 points): Written responses indicates critical consideration of issues and concepts presented in the readings. Connections (0-4 points): When possible, the written response includes significant text-to-text and text-to-life connections. Depth of Thinking (0-4 points): Written responses include significant writings about what squared the authors thinking, what pointed them in new directions, and what questions are still circling. Content Knowledge (0-4 points): Students demonstrate full content knowledge in a deep and connected way. Organization (0-4 points): Information is in a logical, interesting sequence which the reader can follow.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Achievement Target:**

80% of students score 3 or better on rubric

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

We have not yet offered this course (and associated assignment). We will offer the first course in Fall 2010.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Details* section of this report.

**CTW Course Plan to Implement Fall 2010**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The B.S.E. in Middle Grades Education is a new program in the College of Education. The first cohort of students, who started ...
O 3: Critical Reflection

Deep and meaningful reflective practice is essential as you enter into the field of education. Every week, students will be asked to submit a response to the following questions:

What was the best moment this week? Why?
What was the most difficult moment this week? How can you work to improve it?
Respond to the feedback/comments/questions from your instructor or field supervisor from your reflection from last week.

In addition to questions related to the weekly readings and practicum experiences, students may also use the following questions as a guide:

How can you improve your relationship with students?
How have your readings confirmed what you see in the field? How are your readings contradictory to what you see in the field? How do you make sense of this in your work?
What is the purpose of classroom management?
What is the purpose of education within your content area? What 3 things do you want your students to walk away with this year?

Associations:

Standards:

SACS Assessment Requirements
1 Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
5 Outcomes of community/public service (3.3.1.5)
General Education or Core Curriculum:

1 Written Communication
4 Critical Thinking
5 Contemporary Issues

Institutional Priorities:

1.13 Undergraduate programs use writing to improve critical thinking skills in the discipline
1.15 Recruitment, retention, development and promotion of high-quality faculty and staff
2.22 Learning-centered environment that supports individual styles & life circumstances of students

Strategic Plans:

President, Georgia State University
6.2 Undergraduate Experience

Related Measures:

M 1: CTW Rubric

We have no assessment data to share as we have not yet offered any CTW courses (first course to be offered Fall 2010).
We will use the following rubric sections to evaluate all CTW writing assignments beginning Fall 2010: Reading Comprehension (0-4 points): It is clear that all material was carefully read and processed. Depth of Response (0-4 points): Written responses indicates critical consideration of issues and concepts presented in the readings. Connections (0-4 points): When possible, the written response includes significant text-to-text and text-to-life connections. Depth of Thinking (0-4 points): Written responses include significant writings about what squared the authors thinking, what pointed them in new directions, and what questions are still circling. Content Knowledge (0-4 points): Students demonstrate full content knowledge in a deep and connected way. Organization (0-4 points): Information is in a logical, interesting sequence which the reader can follow.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Achievement Target:**

80% of students score 3 or better on rubric

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Not Met**

We have not yet offered this course (and associated assignment). We will offer the first course in Fall 2010.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.
The B.S.E. in Middle Grades Education is a new program in the College of Education. The first cohort of students, who started ...

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Assignment Outcomes**

80% of students will receive a 3 or better on all CTW rubric sections.

---

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** CTW Rubric  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Book Groups

**Implementation Description:** During Fall 2010, Dr. Yarbrough and Dr. Cross will work on fleshing out rubric descriptions and determining appropriate assignment outcomes and target goals.

**Completion Date:** 06/01/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Stephanie Behm Cross (CTW Ambassador and Course 2 instructor)

---

CTW Course Plan to Implement Fall 2010
The B.S.E. in Middle Grades Education is a new program in the College of Education. The first cohort of students, who started in Spring 2010, will take their first CTW course this Fall 2010 and their second CTW course in Spring 2011. Because our program is new, this action plan relates to what we have done and will continue to do related to course development.

Assignment Development:

During Fall 2009 and Spring 2010, our BSE MLE faculty developed course assignments for the two CTW courses. Both courses include informal writing assignments (such as journals and weekly reflections) and formal writing assignments (such as research papers and text development).

Rubric Development:

During Spring 2010, we developed rubrics for specific writing assignments, in addition to an overall CTW assignment rubric included in this report.

Faculty Development:

The CTW coordinator has met with the other CTW instructor (a reading/writing specialist) three times over the past two semesters to refine our program CTW definitions, write program goals, and create course assignments. We will continue to meet in Fall 2010 and
Spring 2011 to evaluate CTW course assignments and make adjustments for future courses.

Collection/Analysis of Student Work:

During Fall 2010 and Spring 2011, the CTW instructors will work to evaluate CTW assignments based on our included rubric. With student permission, we will share assignments across instructors in order to evaluate student work and the overall effectiveness of assignments.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: CTW Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Book Groups | Critical Reflection | Research Groups and Paper

Implementation Description: see above
Completion Date: 06/01/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Stephanie Behm Cross (CTW Ambassador and CTW instructor for course 2) and Gladys Yarborough (CTW Instructor for course 1)
Additional Resources Requested: Because our first BSE Middle Level Education cohort will have 34 students, we will need the help of a graduate teaching assistant to grade CTW assignments.

Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

For the 2008-2009 academic year, our CTW definition was simply the University Senate definition. Starting the year (Fall 2009), we worked on editing the definition to better fit our Middle Grades BSE program. We utilized our own program goals, along with the newly released Professional Education Faculty Conceptual Framework document, to rewrite our CTW definition. All assignment goals and outcomes follow out of this definition.

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

Our major accomplishments for this year include developing CTW assignments and a rubric. We will continue to flesh out the rubric (but adding more detail in particular) and modify assignments. We did not have an action plan last year, so we are not able to compare.

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

Because we are a small program (with only 4 faculty!), our CTW meetings were generally very small. We met three times across the year to discuss CTW assignments and develop rubrics. The most substantial decisions related to assignment restructuring/rewriting. I believe these meetings were somewhat successful, but I plan to provide more written documentation for CTW participants in the future.

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

Most changes to assignments included the addition of multiple drafts and layered feedback to critical writing assignments. Because we have not yet had the chance to implement any assignments (first CTW course to run in Fall 2010), I do not yet have feedback for my faculty.
CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

Because there was no report submitted last year, the first part of this question is not relevant. So far, through assignment development, I believe the CTW initiative has opened up significant dialogue in our program about what constitutes "critical analysis" in written and oral work. We will continue to discuss what this "critical analysis" means for our faculty and students.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

N/A

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:
What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A
**Mission/Purpose**

The mission of the Ph.D. degree program in Teaching and Learning is to prepare accomplished graduates who demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

**Goals**

**G 1: Develop Researchers in Teaching and Learning**

Accomplished graduates of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning degree program will demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

**Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O 1: O1: Research Competence**

The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.

**Document:**

- Program Standards and Student Rating System for the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning

**Related Measures:**
M 1: M1: Faculty Rating of Research Competence

A summary rating describing the candidate's research competence will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated research competence in at least one paradigm. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

Document:
- Ph.D. TLG - Program Eval Data Averages 2009-2010

O 2: O2: Knowledge of Foundations of Education

The Ph.D. candidate develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological and economic influences that affect education today.
Related Measures:

M 2: M2: Faculty Rating of Foundational Knowledge

A summary rating describing the candidate’s foundational knowledge will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological, and economic influences that affect education today. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).
O 3: O3: Creates New Knowledge in Major

The Ph.D. candidate engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.

**Document:**

- *Program Standards and Student Rating System for the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning*

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: M3: Faculty Rating of Scholarship within Major**

A summary rating describing the candidate’s scholarship within the major will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.
**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated the creation of new knowledge and scholarship in their disciplines or majors. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**Document:**

- *Ph.D. TLG - Program Eval Data Averages 2009-2010*

**O 4: O4: Extensive Knowledge of Major Field**

The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in the major discipline of inquiry.

**Document:**

- *Program Standards and Student Rating System for the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning*

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: M4: Faculty Rating of Knowledge of Major**

A summary rating describing the candidate’s knowledge of the major will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations
Achievement Target:

On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated an extended knowledge base in the major discipline. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**Document:**

- Ph.D. TLG - Program Eval Data Averages 2009-2010

**O 5: O5: Extensive Knowledge in Cognate Area**

The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in a cognate area that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry.

**Document:**

- Program Standards and Student Rating System for the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: M5: Faculty Rating of Knowledge of Cognate**
A summary rating describing the candidate's knowledge of the cognate area will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated an extended knowledge base in a cognate area associated with the major discipline. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**Document:**
- Ph.D. TLG - Program Eval Data Averages 2009-2010

**O 6: O6: Professional Identity and Contributions**

The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates a professional identity by his/her contributions to the community of scholars and educators.

**Document:**
- Program Standards and Student Rating System for the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning
Related Measures:

M 6: M6: Faculty Rating of Identity and Contributions

A summary rating describing the candidate’s professional identity and his/her contributions to the profession will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:

On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated a developing professional identity through their contributions to the community of scholars in their field. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

Document:
- Ph.D. TLG - Program Eval Data Averages 2009-2010

O 7: O7: Teaching and Professional Development
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates leadership through teaching and professional development within his/her major discipline of inquiry.

**Document:**

- Program Standards and Student Rating System for the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: M7: Faculty Rating of Teaching and Prof Dev**

A summary rating describing the candidate’s teaching and professional development will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated leadership through teaching and professional developing in the major discipline of inquiry. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).
O 8: O8: Technology as Tool for Inquiry

The Ph.D. candidate understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

Related Measures:

M 8: M8: Faculty Rating of Technology Skills

A summary rating describing the candidate’s technology skills will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings (2009-2010) - Achievement Target: Met**
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated an in-depth understanding of and expertise in technology as a tool for inquiry for teaching and learning. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**Document:**
- *Ph.D. TLG - Program Eval Data Averages 2009-2010*

---

**Action Plan Details for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Tracking Our Graduates' Positions in Higher Ed**

We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-intensive positions (e.g., an appointment as a faculty member in a research institution of higher education).

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** End of Spring Semester 2010  
**Completion Date:** 05/01/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair and Department Faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00  

**Implementation Notes:**

---
As of 2008-2009, we have begun to document the degree to which our Ph.D. concentrations are preparing researchers/scholars who draw upon their preparation in the Ph.D. degree to become actively involved in academia or in positions as researchers. We have also begun to document the position titles/affiliations of our graduates.

In 2008-2009, we graduated 11 doctoral students in this program, and 5 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 45%).

In 2009-2010, we graduated 17 doctoral students in this program, and 9 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 53%, a slight increase from the previous year).

We will continue to document our students' job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

**Tracking Our Graduates' Positions in Higher Ed**

We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-intensive positions (e.g., an appointment as a faculty member in a research institution of higher education).

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** At the end of each semester, faculty will submit to the department chair the following: (1) name of Ph.D. graduate, (2) graduate's new position title, and (3) graduate's new institutional affiliation. This information will be compiled by the chair and submitted in the department annual report each year.  
**Completion Date:** 05/13/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Faculty and Department Chair  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None
Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Definition: How has the definition of critical thinking evolved in your degree major over the last two years?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Achievements: What were the major CTW accomplishments in your degree major for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plan(s) that you specified last year? What worked this year that you want to continue doing?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Workshops and Training: How did the workshops and/or training you provided for faculty and consultants go this year? Who attended, what happened, what was decided? Summarize your general impressions of the success of the meetings.

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Assignments: How have the CTW assignments in your degree major evolved since the initiative started? What changes to the assignments will you suggest to faculty for next year based on your observations and assessments of this year’s CTW student learning?

N/A

CTW Reflection 5: Overall, what changes has your degree major made to its implementation of the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? What would you say has been the primary impact of CTW on your degree major, as well as on the students and faculty involved in the initiative?

N/A
ACADEMIC QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

As of 2008-2009, we have begun to document the degree to which our Ph.D. concentrations are preparing researchers/scholars who draw upon their preparation in the Ph.D. degree to become actively involved in academia or in positions as researchers. We have also begun to document the position titles/affiliations of our graduates. In 2008-2009, we graduated 11 doctoral students in this program, and 5 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 45%). In 2009-2010, we graduated 17 doctoral students in this program, and 9 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 53%, a slight increase from the previous year). We will continue to document our students’ job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

ACADEMIC QUESTION 2:

What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (In other words, what is the impact on your educational degree program of the data obtained from assessment findings?) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

As of 2008-2009, we have begun to document the degree to which our Ph.D. concentrations are preparing researchers/scholars who draw upon their preparation in the Ph.D. degree to become actively involved in academia or in positions as researchers. We have also begun to document the position titles/affiliations of our graduates. In 2008-2009, we graduated 11 doctoral students in this program, and 5 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 45%). In 2009-2010, we graduated 17 doctoral students in this program, and 9 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 53%, a slight increase from the previous year). We will continue to document our students’ job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.
ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 1:

What operational improvements has your unit made since last year’s assessment report (based on last year’s action plan and/or data from this year’s assessment)? How have those changes affected your outcome?

In 2009-2010, we developed a new department policy on Doctoral Student Mentoring to help guide both students and faculty in this important mentoring process. We plan to continue to document our students’ job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

Document:

- MSIT Doctoral Student Mentoring Policy Effective 2-15-10

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 2:

What do the findings for this year’s assessment mean for your department? What are the implications? How useful is this information for facilitating operational improvements?

Findings indicate that our students are performing well in the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program. In 2009-2010, we developed a new department policy on Doctoral Student Mentoring to help guide both students and faculty in this important mentoring process. We plan to continue to document our students’ job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

Document:

- MSIT Doctoral Student Mentoring Policy Effective 2-15-10

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTION 3:

What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
We plan to continue to document our students' job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

2010-2011 Assessment Report

Georgia State University
Detailed Assessment Report
2010-2011 1 Academic Test Program

Mission / Purpose
To foster a transformative global academic community in mathematics and science through critical research, emancipatory pedagogy, and scholarship of engagement, developing scholars and inspiring learners who value the diversity and difference of our communities and act as agents of change.

Goals without Outcome/Objective Relationships Specified
G 1: Secure revenue for the university
One of the goals of Si is to offer an opportunity for academic improvement, but it can also serve the important purpose of helping students bond to each other and the institution. Tinto (1993) contends that both social and academic integration into institutions of high education have an impact on student persistence. Because SI sessions consist of small group work, they provide an opportunity for collaborative learning and may help foster a sense of community. Our goal is to provide a connection to GSU though small-group contact with fellow class members and individual SI Leader which has shown to reduce withdrawals and improve graduation rates thus securing revenue for the university.

Other Outcome/Objective, without Goals, along with Any Associations and Related Goals, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings
O/O 1: Course grade, retention, and participation
1. Higher student final course grade average. 2. Improve retention of students 3. Increased participation rates

2010-2011 CTW Middle Level Education

Mission / Purpose
MISSION: To engage preservice teachers in assignments, activities, and field experiences that enhance critical thinking skills. To create teachers who can apply critical thinking skills to their current and future practices. PURPOSE: The Middle Grades Education BSE program, in the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, considers the development critical thinking skills to be one of the most important goals of the program. For middle grades teachers, critical thinking skills are essential in the design of and reflection on selected teaching strategies, the analysis of student work and assessment data, and the adjustment of instruction based on local socio-cultural contexts. For the purposes of our program, and in conjunction with our Professional Education Faculty Conceptual Framework, we define critical thinking as "(1) the ability to reflect upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development, (2) the ability to identify and critically analyze various educational practices and strategies that affect learners in metropolitan
contexts, and (3) the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments for or against major theories of teaching and learning."

**Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**

**G 1: Candidates are Experts in Recursive Data Analysis**
Candidates are able to reflect upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing, and assessing teaching, learning, and development.

**Document:**
- [Action Research Paper Assessment Report](#)

**SLO 1: Students demonstrate the ability to collect and critically analyze data**
Students are able to collect and analyze data. They are able to provide an in-depth explanation of their data collection process, followed by a detailed description and analysis of their findings. They give detailed explanations with examples cited to support conclusions and connections. They critically reflect upon the data collection and analysis process, and talk specifically about how this process informs their teaching practices.

**Documents:**
- [Action Research Paper Assessment Report](#)
- [EDCI 4640 Syllabus](#)
- [EDRD 4600 Syllabus](#)

**Relevant Associations:**

**Standards**

**SACS Assessment Requirements**
1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)
4. Outcomes of research (3.3.1.4)

**General Education/Core Curriculum**
1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.
3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Strategic Plans**
- President, Georgia State University
- 1.1 Increase the level of scholarship support for undergraduate students.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Action Research Paper Rubric**
Action research paper rubric from EDRD 4600
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Document:**

- Action Research Paper Assessment Report

**Achievement Target:**
100% of students will score at the "proficient" level or higher.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
All but one student scored "proficient" or higher in all aspects of the action research report. However, one student (out of 12) scored only "partially proficient" in three areas: literature review, research methods, and results. 100% of the students scored at the highest level of "exemplary" in the focus and rationale section of the paper. This is exciting, given that they were able to carefully articulate the reason behind their action research project. 11 out of 12 students also scored exemplary on the conclusions and recommendations portion of the paper, which is also very exciting. This part of the paper exemplifies students' ability to critically analyze data through written reflection. See report here:

https://c1.livetext.com/misk5/xcreports/view_report/sid/73750?key=1fb6c0ce7cc51ea01bfbe2b82165cb14

**Document:**

- Action Research Paper Assessment Report

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Improved instruction related to action research**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Although most of our students did well on the action research project, not everyone was at the proficient or partially proficient...

**G 2: Candidates are Experts at Critical Written Reflection**
Candidates are able to identify and critically analyze various educational practices and strategies that affect learners in metropolitan contexts.

**Document:**

- EDCI 4640 Syllabus

**SLO 2: Students demonstrate the ability to think critically through written reflection**
Students demonstrate critical thinking processes through written reflection. Student reflections include (1) discussions of how they make decisions about teaching and learning, (2) how they challenge assumptions and bias they come across with group members, fellow teachers or professional readings, (3) analysis of critical events that led to changes in thinking about teaching and learning, and (4) a description of what was learned (or yet to be learned) related to the teaching and how that effects their professional development.

**Documents:**

- EDCI 4640 Syllabus
- EDRD 4600 Syllabus
**Relevant Associations:**

**Standards**

**SACS Assessment Requirements**

1. Outcomes of educational programs, including student learning outcomes (3.3.1.1)

**General Education/Core Curriculum**

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Critical Incident Video Rubric**

Critical Incident Video Rubric from EDCI 4640:

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

90% of students will score at the "proficient" level or higher.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

90% of students did score at the "proficient" level or higher on all components of the critical incident video rubric.

**G 3: Candidates are Experts at Argument Development**

Candidates are able to formulate and present convincing arguments for or against major theories of teaching and learning.

**Documents:**

- [Book Group Discussion Paper Assessment Report](#)
- [Book Group Discussion Reflection Assessment Report](#)
- [EDRD 4600 Syllabus](#)

**SLO 3: Students demonstrate the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments**

Students demonstrate the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments for or against major theories of teaching and learning. Students demonstrate the ability to communicate their opinions and uses of teaching and learning strategies presented in professional texts and journals. Students demonstrate the ability to use data to support or refute specific teaching and learning strategies for specific students, and write about those data findings with a critical lens. Students demonstrate an ability to analyze their own teaching as it relates to major theories of teaching and learning.

**Documents:**

- [Book Group Discussion Paper Assessment Report](#)
- [Book Group Discussion Reflection Assessment Report](#)
- [EDCI 4640 Syllabus](#)
- [EDRD 4600 Syllabus](#)
General Education/Core Curriculum

1.0 Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

3.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

9.0 Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Strategic Plans

- President, Georgia State University
- 3.1 Enhance a research culture.

Related Measures

M 3: Professional Book Group Discussion Reflection Rubric
From EDRD 4600: Professional Book Group Discussion Reflection Rubric (https://c1.livetext.com/misk5/xcreports/view_report/sid/73745?key=de7b8dd7d4e38a5ae135fc07231f53f1)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Documents:

- Book Group Discussion Paper Assessment Report
- Book Group Discussion Reflection Assessment Report

Achievement Target:
100% of students will score at the "proficient" level or better.

Documents:

- Book Group Discussion Paper Assessment Report
- Book Group Discussion Reflection Assessment Report

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
All students scored at the "exemplary" level, which exceeds our achievement target. See report here: https://c1.livetext.com/misk5/xcreports/view_report/sid/73745?key=de7b8dd7d4e38a5ae135fc07231f53f1

Documents:

- Book Group Discussion Paper Assessment Report
- Book Group Discussion Reflection Assessment Report

M 4: Professional Book Group Discussion Paper Rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Document:

- Book Group Discussion Reflection Assessment Report

Achievement Target:
100% of students will score at the "proficient" level or higher.

Documents:
- Book Group Discussion Paper Assessment Report
- Book Group Discussion Reflection Assessment Report

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
While 100% of the students scored at the "exemplary" level in their reactions to the book and citations, only 60% of the students were able to articulate the reasons behind why certain aspects of the book were useful or not useful in their professional development as teachers at the "exemplary" level. 40% of the students scored either "proficient" or "partially proficient." See report here: https://c1.livetext.com/misk5/xcreports/view_report/sid/73744?key=6b1af9a16dec877376b439351702a6b8

Documents:
- Book Group Discussion Paper Assessment Report
- Book Group Discussion Reflection Assessment Report

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

More instruction related to argument development
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Only 60% of the students were able to carefully articulate the reasons behind why certain aspects of a professional book were us...

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Assignment Outcomes
During Fall 2010, Dr. Yarbrough and Dr. Cross will work on fleshing out rubric descriptions and determining appropriate assignment outcomes and target goals.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Stephanie Behm Cross (CTW Ambassador and Course 2 instructor)

CTW Course Plan to Implement Fall 2010
The B.S.E. in Middle Grades Education is a new program in the College of Education. The first cohort of students, who started in Spring 2010, will take their first CTW course this Fall 2010 and their second CTW course in Spring 2011. Because our program is new, this action plan relates to what we have done and will continue to do related to course development. Assignment Development: During Fall 2009 and Spring 2010, our BSE MLE faculty developed course assignments for the two CTW courses. Both courses include informal writing assignments (such as journals and weekly reflections) and formal writing assignments (such as research papers and text development). Rubric Development: During Spring 2010, we developed rubrics for specific writing assignments, in addition to an overall CTW assignment rubric included in this report. Faculty Development: The CTW coordinator has met with the other CTW instructor (a reading/writing specialist) three times over the past two semesters to refine our program CTW definitions, write program goals, and create course assignments. We will continue to meet in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 to evaluate CTW course assignments and make adjustments for future courses. Collection/Analysis of Student Work: During Fall 2010 and Spring 2011, the CTW instructors will work to evaluate CTW assignments based on our included rubric. With student permission, we will
share assignments across instructors in order to evaluate student work and the overall effectiveness of assignments.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: see above
Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Stephanie Behm Cross (CTW Ambassador and CTW instructor for course 2) and Gladys Yarborough (CTW Instructor for course 1)
Additional Resources: Because our first BSE Middle Level Education cohort will have 34 students, we will need the help of a graduate teaching assistant to grade CTW assignments.

Improved instruction related to action research
Although most of our students did well on the action research project, not everyone was at the proficient or partially proficient level. We plan to add more instruction related to action research to both CTW courses (EDRD 4600 and EDCI 4640) in order to help students better understand the importance of each required component of action research.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Action Research Paper Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Students demonstrate the ability to collect and critically analyze data

Implementation Description: The instructor of EDRD 4600 will devote one full class session and two partial class sessions to action research methods.
Completion Date: 08/2011
Responsible Person/Group: EDRD 4600 instructor and CTW ambassador.

More instruction related to argument development
Only 60% of the students were able to carefully articulate the reasons behind why certain aspects of a professional book were useful or not useful in their professional development as teachers. This critical thinking skill is necessary, given that teachers will be asked to defend, orally and in writing, their instructional decisions. They should be able to critically analyze new teaching strategies and argue for or against their use in the classroom. We will make sure to focus more instructional time to this critical thinking skill.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Professional Book Group Discussion Paper Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Students demonstrate the ability to formulate and present convincing arguments

Implementation Description: The instructor of EDRD 4600 will focus more instructional time on argument development.
Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: EDRD 4600 instructor and CTW ambassador.
Documents:

- Book Group Discussion Paper Assessment Report
## CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

Last year, both of our action plans related to CTW course assignment and rubric development. Our CTW courses were not implemented until Fall 2010 and Spring 2011, so while we had begun planning two years ago, the bulk of the detailed course planning began last summer. The CTW course instructors and the CTW ambassador sat down together and developed the assignments and assignment rubrics for both CTW courses. See the document repository for reference.

## CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Students in the first CTW course appeared to have difficulty articulating their stance on varying topics in the teaching and learning of young adolescents. For example, not all students were proficient at defending topics and content in professional books and journals, and also had a hard time articulating why they wanted to implement certain strategies and action research plans in their classrooms. At the end of the second CTW course, however, all but one student was proficient at articulating their stance on specific strategies in teaching and learning with specific groups of students. We are pleased with this progression.

## CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

Because different instructors teach the CTW courses, it is hard to make sense of students’ progression to becoming more critical thinkers. It has also been hard to maintain a focus on critical thinking throughout both courses, as there are so many other skills and topics to discuss. One fear of the faculty is that students really don't leave the courses with the ability to articulate what it means to be critical thinkers through their writing, and why this is important to them as professional educators. We hope to make this more of a focus of the courses in the future.

## CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

Because we are at the beginning phase of CTW for our program (first course offered in Fall 2010), the greatest impact we have seen so far has been on faculty. This initiative has pushed us to come together and really think about what critical thinking means for our students, and how to best measure their critical thinking progress through the program. These conversations have allowed us all to think more carefully about our course assignments, readings, and in-class activities, in CTW and in other required program courses.

### ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

This year’s assessment report is much different from last year’s report. We made changes in our learning outcomes, measures, and targets. This is most likely due to the fact that our outcomes, measures, and targets were simply projections last year, as we did not start teaching the CTW courses until Fall 2010. We needed to more carefully and specifically align our outcomes and measures in particular, so that our findings and action plans for next year will make more sense and better inform our CTW courses.
**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

**Detailed Assessment Report**
2010-2011 English Education MEd

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Master of Education (MED) in English is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the MED English program is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: • informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; • empowered to serve as change agents; • committed to and respectful of all learners; and • engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities. The M.Ed. major in English Education provides for master’s level study in English Education and English content and leads to T-5 certification in secondary English (grades 6-12). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle and high school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content. The program’s underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban English education.

**Goals and Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**G 1:** Are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach English Language Arts in Grades 6-12

Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach English Language Arts in Grades 6-12

**O/O 1: Demonstrates Content Knowledge**

Candidates have knowledge and understanding of English grammars, the history and evolution of the English language, the foundations of reading and writing processes, an extensive range of literature, and a wide range of literary theories. (Key Assessment - Content Knowledge: Portfolio Standards 1-4)
Related Measures

**M 1: Content Knowledge: Portfolio Standard 1**
A portfolio rating for Standard 1 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in content knowledge of English grammars and the history and evolution of the English language.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year's report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in content knowledge of English grammars and the history and evolution of the English language.

**M 2: Content Knowledge: Portfolio Standard 2**
A portfolio rating for Standard 2 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in content knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year's report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in content knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes.

**M 3: Content Knowledge: Portfolio Standard 3**
A portfolio rating for Standard 3 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in content knowledge of an extensive range of literature, including US literature, British literature, world literature, and multicultural literature as well as literature written specifically for children and young adults.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year's report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in content knowledge of an extensive range of literature, including US literature, British literature, world literature, and multicultural literature as well as literature written specifically for children and young adults.

**M 4: Content Knowledge: Portfolio Standard 4**
A portfolio rating for Standard 4 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in content knowledge of a wide range of literary theories and how these theories inform instructional planning and pedagogy.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year’s report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a basic level of knowledge and skill in content knowledge of a wide range of literary theories and how these theories inform instructional planning and pedagogy. 0% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in this area.

**G 2: Are professional educators with knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to teach English Lang. Arts in grades 6-12**

Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching English Language Arts in Grades 6-12.

**O/O 2: Demonstrates Professional and Pedagogical Skills**

Candidates create learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials and view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities. (Key Assessment - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills: Portfolio Standards 5-8)

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Professional & Pedagogical Skills: Portfolio Standard 5**

A portfolio rating for Standard 5 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods, and curriculum materials (including non-print media and technological tools) to support writing instruction and the teaching of literature.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year's report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in planning for instruction based on their knowledge of the subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**M 6: Professional & Pedagogical Skills: Portfolio Standard 6**

A portfolio rating for Standard 6 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in planning for instruction based on their knowledge of the subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year's report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in planning for instruction based on their knowledge of the subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.
M 7: Professional & Pedagogical Skills: Portfolio Standard 7
A portfolio rating for Standard 7 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in creating learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year's report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in creating learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability.

M 8: Professional & Pedagogical Skills: Portfolio Standard 8
A portfolio rating for Standard 8 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in viewing teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year's report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a basic level of knowledge and skill in viewing teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities. 0% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in this area.

O/O 3: Demonstrates Professional Dispositions
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

Related Measures

M 9: Professional Dispositions
Students will be rated on their professional dispositions using the Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year's report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric.

G 3: Are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English Language Arts learning
Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English Language Arts learning of their students.
O/O 4: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on P-12 students
Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning. (Key Assessment - Impact on Student Learning: Portfolio Standard 9)

Related Measures
M 10: Effects on P-12 Student Learning: Portfolio Standard 9
A portfolio rating for Standard 9 will be derived from each student’s written and oral responses explaining how their portfolio artifacts and essays demonstrate his or her competency in using a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of program completers will demonstrate a basic level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action (Score 3 or higher) and 40% will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and skill (Score 4 or higher).

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
In 2010-2011, one student completed the MEd English (advanced) program. Thus, all findings for this year’s report will reflect a population of n=1. 100% of program completers demonstrated a proficient level of knowledge and skill in using a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning.

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Continued innovation in teaching for urban sites and technological savvy
All of the target measures for the 2009-2010 group of English education MEd students were met. We, the English education faculty, are interested in fostering innovation in our students' work as teachers. To that end, we are committed to including a focus on urban education sites and the students and communities served by those sites. We are also committed to infusing our courses with technology so that our students can bring technological savvy to their teaching practices in their own urban and metropolitan schools. Our action plan, then, is to continue to find ways to bring issues specific to urban education into coursework and portfolio reflections, while also weaving thoughtful uses of technologies into both course and portfolio requirements. Our digital portfolio and all of its embedded standards will continue to support this action plan. As we consider the long term view of our courses in the program, we are aware that the MEd in English Education is a program that may dissolve with the creation of the MEd in Urban Teacher Leadership. Our commitment, however, will remain focused on urban education and embedding technological savvy into our courses in English education at the graduate level.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: English Education Faculty

Content Knowledge of Literary Theories Action Plan
While the number of graduates in the program for 2010-2011 was quite small (N=1), our action plan is based on not achieving a goal for at least 40% of our graduates to achieve a proficient level of content knowledge of a wide range of literary theories and how these theories inform instructional planning and pedagogy. We plan to continue our emphasis in the EDLA 7550 course to teach students about literary theories. The course materials include readings, activities, and course assignments explicitly about literary theories and provide opportunities for students to talk about the theories, write about the theories, and develop curriculum plans that implement the theories so that secondary English language arts students might also understand these theories.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Professional and Pedagogical Skills with Teacher Research and Collaboration

While the number of graduates in the program for 2010-2011 was quite small (N=1), our action plan is based on not achieving a goal for at least 40% of our graduates to achieve a proficient level of competency in viewing teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities. We plan to continue our emphasis throughout all of the courses specific to English Education (EDLA 7150, 7440, 7460, 7480) that include components of research and inquiry within the activities assigned to students. The requirements in all of these courses provide opportunities for students to collaborate with their colleagues as means for developing their thinking, writing, and teaching philosophies. Likewise, we also advise our students in both the spring and fall terms during our Professional Advising Week about opportunities to attend conferences, courses for further development of their professional goals, as well as discussions about their programs of study. The program of study for the MEd degree includes a research methods course that comes with two options: an introduction to research methods (EPRS 7900) and action research (EPRS 7910), a course that specifically engages in understanding teacher inquiry. Given the performance on this measure, we will advise students to consider taking the EPRS 7910 option when possible, and continue to foster communities of inquiry and scholarship within our courses so that students can have opportunities to use research methods throughout their coursework.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

This year we set different targets for our assessments. That is, we developed targets that seek to show a higher level of proficiency, knowledge, and development among our students. To this end,
rather than looking only to see if 100% of our students passed each objective at the basic level, we now seek to see if, in addition to 100% showing performance at the basic level, that at least 40% of the students also show that they can achieve levels at a proficient, or more expert level, than we have in the past. Our shift in looking for a higher level of performance yielded two objectives not being met: content knowledge of literary theories, and pedagogical and professional skills with teacher inquiry, collaboration, and professional development. As we move into the coming academic year, we plan to continue to maintain the expectation that students will perform at a higher level.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We carefully review the assessment data each year. Since our students do so well on the majority of our objectives, we only need to fine tune our courses to ensure that students are achieving strong understandings of literary theories and professional skills related to inquiry, development, and collaboration. We will use this data to further support students' learning in the English Education courses (EDLA 7150, 7440, 7460, 7480) so that they may continue to achieve the objectives not only at the basic level, but beyond that to show that they are becoming experts in their field. This support will come in the explicit inclusion of activities for students to use literary theories, collaborate with their colleagues, conduct inquiry projects in areas of language, literature, reading, and composing; as well as in specific advising from the faculty to students about the methods of research courses to help them understand their teaching experiences a spaces for further reflection, research, and scholarship.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:** What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

**Mission / Purpose**

2010-2011 English Education--TEEMS MAT

The M.A.T. major in English Education provides initial teacher preparation for individuals holding bachelor’s degrees in English. It leads to both a master's degree and certification for teaching secondary English language arts (grades 6-12). The program's underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program is a cohort program that encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban English education. The program ensures that candidates gain sufficient subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle and high school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content, and manage classrooms effectively.
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

In our department, MSIT, our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta, the nation, and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity to push the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

**Goals and Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**G 1: Content knowledge for teaching English Language Arts**
Candidates are informed educators who have knowledge of the content needed to teach English Language Arts in Grades 6-12.

**O/O 1: Content knowledge**
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the content needed to teach English language arts. (Key Assessments - GACE performance and Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric Overall Assessment Score for Content & Curriculum)

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Content Knowledge GACE Scores**
Candidate performance on GACE tests for English Language Arts, forms 020 and 021.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
100% of candidates will pass the required GACE II tests for English language arts education.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Met**
GACE Scores are still pending as of 5/5/2011.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Community Action Plan**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty to determine areas needing improvement; as a result, assessment opportunities are no...

**Score explanation**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Scores are unavailable at this time.

**M 2: Content Knowledge via Coursework**
Final Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Section on Overall Assessment Score for Content & Curriculum
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English language arts content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of candidates in 2010-11 met the target of demonstrating adequately proficiency (Score 3) or higher levels of knowledge in the English language arts content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. On the four categories for content knowledge, a minimum of 58% and a maximum of 65% of candidates scored at the effectively proficient level (Score 4).

G 2: Knowledge, skills, & dispositions to teach English Language Arts
Candidates are professional educators with knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching English Language Arts in Grades 6-12.

O/O 2: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)
Candidates demonstrate their knowledge and skills through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods and curriculum materials for teaching English language arts. (Key Assessment - Planning: Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction)

Related Measures
M 3: Planning performance
Teacher Work Sample rubric: Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction). These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
The following results are for each area: Contextual Factors: 97% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 88% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) Learning Goals: 97% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 95% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) Assessment Plan: 94% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 96% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) Design for Instruction: 100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 89% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher)

O/O 4: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)
Candidates create learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials. (Key Assessment - Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge): Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument and Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric)

Related Measures
M 5: Clinical Practice at Midpoint
Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as
shown on their scores of the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the midpoint of the practicum internship.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

The following results are for each area on the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument: Knowledge of Students and Learning: 99% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 88% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Learning Environments: 97% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 35% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). On both subcategories of classroom management and classroom environment, 35% scored at the effective level, while 87% scored at the effective level for communication. Further analysis also shows that 46% scored at the effective level in an overall score regarding their skills and professional knowledge with learning environments. Assessment: 97% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 22% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Planning and Instruction: 94% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 36% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher)

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Mid-point teaching evaluation**

*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011

In order to raise scores on the two lowest levels of this assessment: classroom management and learning environments, we are devo...

**M 6: Clinical Practice at Endpoint**

*Source of Evidence:* Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric *Achievement Target:* 90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

The following results are for each area on the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument: Knowledge of Students and Learning: 99% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 62% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Learning Environments: 97% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 67% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Assessment: 99% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 55% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Planning and Instruction: 97% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 65% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Professionalism: 97% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 60% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher)

**O/O 5: Dispositions**

Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Dispositions**

*Source of Evidence:* Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric *Achievement Target:* 90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric. These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
Among the five categories assessed for dispositions (Empathy, Positive View of Others, Positive View of Self, Authenticity, and Meaningful and Purposeful Vision), candidates scored 99% of candidates demonstrated an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and a minimum of 68% of candidates demonstrated an exceptional level (Score 4).

G 3: Impact on student learning in English Language Arts
Candidates are effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English Language Arts learning of their students.

O/O 3: Effects on P-12 Student Learning
Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning. (Key Assessment - Effects on P-12 Student Learning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning)

Related Measures
M 4: Effects on P-12 Student Learning
Teacher Work Sample rubric: Section on Analysis of Student Learning
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning as shown on their scores of the Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning). This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 71% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning as shown on their scores of the Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning).

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Assessment Action Plan
Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students' knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicum/field experience in urban schools. In other words, we are aligning our key assessments with program curriculum so that students can explicitly see the connections between the theory in methods courses and practices in field placements. The domains of our key assessments include the following: Content Knowledge Planning Effects on P-12 Learners Pedagogical Knowledge Dispositions Clinical Practice The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)

Implementation Description: We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.
Completion Date: 05/2012
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS English Education Faculty
Additional Resources: Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Community Action Plan
The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty to determine areas needing improvement; as a result, assessment opportunities are now embedded within our coursework that link communities and schools to student learning. In the future, we would like to keep this curriculum change unchanged.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Content Knowledge GACE Scores | **Outcome/Objective**: Content knowledge

Implementation Description: We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.

Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS English Education Faculty
Additional Resources: Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Diversity Action Plan
The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand diverse student learning needs and to create instruction that will address such needs.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Planning performance | **Outcome/Objective**: Effects on P-12 Student Learning

Implementation Description: We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.

Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS English Education Faculty
Additional Resources: Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Motivate/Manage Action Plan
The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to develop and use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.

Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS English Education Faculty
Additional Resources: Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Planning Action Plan
The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify varied assessment opportunities within our coursework that will allow our students to plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.
Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS English Education Faculty

Additional Resources: Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Strategies Action Plan
Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students' knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicum/field experience in urban schools. In other words, we are aligning our key assessments with program curriculum so that students can explicitly see the connections between the theory in methods courses and practices in field placements. The domains of our key assessments include the following: Content Knowledge Planning Effects on P-12 Learners Pedagogical Knowledge Dispositions Clinical Practice The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.
Completion Date: 05/2010
Responsible Person/Group: TEEMS English Education Faculty
Additional Resources: Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Student Learning Action Plan
The STARS tool helped the TEEMS faculty see the areas needing improvement; however, we want to identify assessment opportunities within our coursework that will help our students to understand a student’s intellectual, social, and personal development and to plan instruction that will support such development.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Content Knowledge via Coursework | **Outcome/Objective**: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)

Implementation Description: We want to begin this process with the 2010 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 terms.
Completion Date: 05/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** Support from Field Placement Office in MSIT and Associate Chair of MSIT, as well as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

**Program Assessment for 2010-2011**  
Update (Fall 2010): We are changing our key assessments for 2010-11 and beyond to reflect students’ knowledge, learning, and practices as they work in their practicum/field experience in urban schools. In other words, we are aligning our key assessments with program curriculum so that students can explicitly see the connections between the theory in methods courses and practices in field placements. The domains of our key assessments include the following: Content Knowledge, Planning, Effects on P-12 Learners, Pedagogical Knowledge, Dispositions, and Clinical Practice.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Effects on P-12 Student Learning  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)

**Implementation Description:** We want to begin this process with the 2011 cohort, therefore we will be seeking instruments for measuring this standard during the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 terms.

**Completion Date:** 05/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Michelle Zoss, Mary Deming, and Ewa McGrail  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Mid-point teaching evaluation**

In order to raise scores on the two lowest levels of this assessment: classroom management and learning environments, we are devoting more attention to these topics in our first methodology course, EDCI 6600, offered in the summer semester. Presently, students create classroom management plans including designing an effective learning environment. We will include more classroom management strategies and practice scenarios. We will also invite classroom management experts, special education professors and practicing teachers, to visit our methodology classes to offer advice and practical solutions to the students during the other methodology courses. A classroom management module during the students' practicum experience is being developed.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Clinical Practice at Midpoint  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge)

**Completion Date:** 08/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** TEEMS English faculty and the Office of Student Teaching in MSIT

**Score explanation**

Scores are unavailable at this time.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure: Content Knowledge GACE Scores | Outcome/Objective: Content knowledge

Implementation Description: Faculty will obtain scores from data manager.
Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: English education faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have made two major changes. First, we have adapted four department-wide assessments to measure our students’ learning and dispositions: The GACE content knowledge examination; Planning: Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Teacher Work Samples; Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge): Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument and Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric); and the Dispositions Survey. Secondly, we have embedded the Standards into our four methodology courses with accompanying assignments. As a result, our portfolio has become more of a capstone assignment synthesizing students’ theoretical and pedagogical knowledge and skills in a teaching philosophy narrative and a listing and a description of artifacts reflecting these beliefs. Based on our assessment results, we are implementing the inclusion of more classroom management and learning environment strategies into our methodology courses. In addition, we will provide more information on the English GACE Content Examination.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We carefully review the assessment data each year. Since our students did so well on the four key assessments, we only had to finetune our work with the GACE Content Examination and the results from the mid-point teacher evaluation. We are increasing our attention to classroom management in our graduate classes and student practicum experiences. The Office of Student Achievement is preparing classroom management modules for the students to complete. Also, we will include more information about the GACE Content Examination in our methodology courses.
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
NA

Detailed Assessment Report
2010-2011 Instructional Technology MS

Mission / Purpose
The mission for the Master of Science degree in Instructional Technology is to provide students with the basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to perform as an instructional technologist. An instructional technologist is a professional educator who can combine knowledge of the learning process, knowledge of instructional systems theory, and knowledge of various forms of media and learning environments to create the most effective and efficient learning experiences. The program is designed for individuals interested in working with adults in a wide variety of training and development areas such as those found in education, business and industry. We seek to further this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings

G 1: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in P-16
The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the P-16 education sector.

SLO 1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development
Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to develop instructional materials and experiences by applying principles, theories, and research related to print, audiovisual, computer-based, and integrated technologies.

Related Measures

M 1: Portfolio
All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010

In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 2: Internship Report**

All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**

95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

---

Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010

In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 3: End of Course Assessments**

Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**

95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

---

Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010

In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 4: Comprehensive Exam**

All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**

95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards. 

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi**
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

**Source of Evidence:** Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**Achievement Target:**
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**SLO 2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design**
Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to design conditions for learning by applying principles, theories, and research associated with instructional systems design, message design, instructional strategies, and learner characteristics.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Portfolio**
All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.
Online Degree Program  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 2: Internship Report**  
All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.  
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation  
*Achievement Target:*
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.  
*Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met*  
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports  
*Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):*  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 3: End of Course Assessments**  
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.  
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery  
*Achievement Target:*
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.  
*Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met*  
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.  
*Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):*  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 4: Comprehensive Exam**  
All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.  
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam  
*Achievement Target:*
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.  
*Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met*  
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010  
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi**
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.  
Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program  
**Achievement Target:**  
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010  
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**SLO 3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management**
Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan, organize, coordinate, and supervise instructional technology by applying principles, theories and research related to project, resource, delivery system, and information management.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Portfolio**
All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work  
**Achievement Target:**  
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010  
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.
Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 2: Internship Report
All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 3: End of Course Assessments
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 4: Comprehensive Exam
All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.
Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program
Achievement Target:
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

SLO 4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning
Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to use processes and resources for learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to media utilization, diffusion, implementations, and policy-making.

Related Measures
M 1: Portfolio
All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.
Online Degree Program

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

Virtual Presentation of Exit Portfolio

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

Students create their exit portfolio and virtually present it to the instructional technology faculty and their peers.

**M 2: Internship Report**

All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

*Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation*

**Achievement Target:**

95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 3: End of Course Assessments**

Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

*Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery*

**Achievement Target:**

95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 4: Comprehensive Exam**

All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

*Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam*
Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.
Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

Achievement Target:
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

SLO 5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to problem analysis, criterion-referenced measurement, formative and summative evaluation, and long-range planning.

Related Measures
M 1: Portfolio
All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.
Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 2: Internship Report**
All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

*Source of Evidence:* Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 3: End of Course Assessments**
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

*Source of Evidence:* Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 4: Comprehensive Exam**
All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

*Source of Evidence:* Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi**  
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.  
*Source of Evidence:* Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program  
**Achievement Target:**  
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**G 2: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies in Corp**  
The MS program aims to increase the number and improve the skills of practitioners in the Learning Technologies in the corporate, government and military sectors.

**SLO 1: Has knowledge of Instructional Development**  
Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to develop instructional materials and experiences by applying principles, theories, and research related to print, audiovisual, computer-based, and integrated technologies.  
**Related Measures**  
**M 1: Portfolio**  
All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.  
*Source of Evidence:* Portfolio, showing skill development or best work  
**Achievement Target:**  
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.
Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 2: Internship Report
All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 3: End of Course Assessments
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery
Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 4: Comprehensive Exam
All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.
Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

Achievement Target:
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

SLO 2: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design
Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to design conditions for learning by applying principles, theories, and research associated with instructional systems design, message design, instructional strategies, and learner characteristics.

Related Measures
M 1: Portfolio
All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 2: Internship Report**
All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.
*Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation*

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 3: End of Course Assessments**
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.
*Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery*

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 4: Comprehensive Exam**
All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.
*Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam*

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.
Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program
Achievement Target:
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

SLO 3: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management
Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan, organize, coordinate, and supervise instructional technology by applying principles, theories and research related to project, resource, delivery system, and information management.

Related Measures
M 1: Portfolio
All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 2: Internship Report**  
All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.  
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation  
**Achievement Target:**  
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**M 3: End of Course Assessments**  
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.  
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery  
**Achievement Target:**  
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 4: Comprehensive Exam**  
All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.  
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam  
**Achievement Target:**  
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards. **Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**

*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010

Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**

*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010

In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi**

Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.

**Source of Evidence:** Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

**Achievement Target:**

100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**

*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010

Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**

*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010

In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**SLO 4: Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning**

Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to use processes and resources for learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to media utilization, diffusion, implementations, and policy-making.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Portfolio**

All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**

*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010

Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.
Online Degree Program
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**Virtual Presentation of Exit Portfolio**
*Established in Cycle*: 2010-2011
Students create their exit portfolio and virtually present it to the instructional technology faculty and their peers

**M 2: Internship Report**
All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.
*Source of Evidence*: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 3: End of Course Assessments**
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.
*Source of Evidence*: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers achieved at least 80% in every course.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**
*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 4: Comprehensive Exam**
All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.
*Source of Evidence*: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Achievement Target:
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.
Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

Achievement Target:
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

SLO 5: Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation
Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to problem analysis, criterion-referenced measurement, formative and summative evaluation, and long-range planning.

Related Measures
M 1: Portfolio
All majors create an electronic portfolio of their work and present it to the faculty at the end of their program. The portfolio should provide evidence of accomplishment in all program areas. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through portfolio development and presentation.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.
Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 2: Internship Report
All students complete an internship and prepare a written report of their activities, particularly noting how the activities relate to their program of study. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the report and on input provided by the internship supervisor.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will demonstrate target knowledge.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers demonstrated target knowledge through internship reports.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 3: End of Course Assessments
Students complete tests and other written assessments for each course in their program of study.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will achieve at least 80% in every course.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

Online Degree Program
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

M 4: Comprehensive Exam
All students in this program complete a written comprehensive exam. The exam is prepared for each student individually, based upon his or her course work and career goals. Faculty will compile a summary rating of all relevant standards based on the exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of completers will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards. **Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):** For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**M 5: Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi**  
Faculty will review syllabi and other curricular materials for currency and depth.  
**Source of Evidence:** Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program  
**Achievement Target:**  
100% of the reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflect current practice in the field.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
100% of syllabi and curriculum materials adequately reflected current practice in the field, minor revisions were made to syllabi in order to achieve this objective.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

**Online Degree Program**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this...

**Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha) - **  
**Continue to Monitor Curriculum**  
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2010-2011 academic year.  
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
*Implementation Status:* In-Progress  
*Priority:* Medium  
*Implementation Description:* ongoing  
*Responsible Person/Group:* All faculty

**Focus Online Degree Program On Corporate Settings**  
Focus the online MS degree on students interested in business and corporate sectors.

*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* High  
*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*

- **Measure:** Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
| Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning |

- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development

| Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning |

- **Measure:** End of Course Assessments | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development

| Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning |

- **Measure:** Internship Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development

| Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning |

- **Measure:** Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development

**Completion Date:** 08/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty  
**Additional Resources:** none  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Implement Certificate in Online Education Program**
We implement our add-on certificate program in online education.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Completion Date:** 08/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty  

**Increase Recruitment Efforts**
We will actively recruit new students and maintain our high admission standards.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Ongoing  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty  

**Investigate Certificate Program for P-12**
In order to recruit more students and better serve those students in the region, we begin exploring the possibility of a certificate program in expectation that the state will approve a teaching certificate in instructional technology.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Completion Date:** 08/2012
**Responsible Person/Group:** All Faculty
**Additional Resources:** One clinical Faculty line to start.
**Budget Amount Requested:** 65000

**Online Degree Program**
In order to increase enrollment and better serve students in the region, we offer our MS degree online. We continue to grow this degree program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Analysis of Curriculum and Syllabi | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development

  | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

- **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development

  | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

- **Measure:** End of Course Assessments | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development

  | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

- **Measure:** Internship Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development

  | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

- **Measure:** Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Has knowledge of Instructional Development
Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Design | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Evaluation | Has knowledge of Instructional Systems Management | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion Date:</th>
<th>08/2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>All faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Virtual Presentation of Exit Portfolio**
Students create their exit portfolio and virtually present it to the instructional technology faculty and their peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Measure: | Portfolio |
| Outcome/Objective: | Utilizes Processes & Resources for Learning |

**Implementation Description:** Use of learning and communication resources such as Elluminate and uLearn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion Date:</th>
<th>08/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>All faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements** - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

Our students consistently demonstrate a high level of competency across all standards. In addition, the masters students exhibited a high proficiency in their coursework, portfolios, and comprehensive exams. These related to the action plans, i.e Revise Curriculum to Include Current Content and Continue to Monitor Curriculum.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment** - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

By the time students take the comprehensive exam and portfolio, as well as complete their internship, they have demonstrated that they are able to fuse together concepts gathered in the classes taken. They have also demonstrated that they have knowledge on how these concepts can be practically applied in a professional setting.

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs** - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection** - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

Detailed Assessment Report 2010-2011 Instructional Technology PhD

Mission / Purpose

The mission for the doctoral program in instructional technology is to provide specialization for instructional technologists in all aspects of the field, including instructional design, alternative instructional delivery systems, research, management, evaluation, and consulting for the betterment of education and human development. We seek to bring about this mission by enhancing and facilitating learning and problem solving through the systemic and systematic application of creative thought.

Goals without Outcome/Objective Relationships Specified

G 1: Produce Researchers in Learning Technologies
The IT Ph.D. program will produce graduates capable of conducting world-class research in Learning Technologies.

G 2: Produce Educators in Learning Technologies
The IT Ph.D. program will produce graduates capable of world-class teaching in Learning Technologies.

Student Learning Outcome/Objective, without Goals, along with Any Associations and Related Goals, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings

SLO 1: Understands and uses technology
The Ph.D. student understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

Related Measures

M 1: Dissertation
Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Achievement Target:
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Monitor Standards**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student l...

**M 3: Residency Report**
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded the standard.

**M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review**
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

**SLO 3: Demonstrates research expertise**
The Ph.D. student demonstrates a general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Dissertation**
Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

**Seek External Funding**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**  
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.  
Source of Evidence: Document Analysis  
**Achievement Target:**  
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to ensure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

**Monitor Standards**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student l...

**Seek External Funding**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 3: Residency Report**  
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.  
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery  
**Achievement Target:**  
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  

We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination
Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written exam.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination
Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.

**Source of Evidence:** Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**SLO 4: Engages in scholarship**
The Ph.D. student engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Dissertation**
Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

**Source of Evidence:** Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Source of Evidence:** Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

**Monitor Standards**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student l...

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 3: Residency Report**
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery
**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review**
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination
Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written exam.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):  
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination
Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Achievement Target:
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):  
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

Seek External Funding
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**SLO 5: Understands foundations of education**
The Ph.D. student develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological, and economic influences that affect education today.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Dissertation**
Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Monitor Standards**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student l...

**M 3: Residency Report**
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review**
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

**M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination**
Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

**M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination**
Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**SLO 6: Develops a professional identity**
The Ph.D. student develops an identity as a professional and contributes to a professional community of scholars and educators.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Dissertation**
Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Achievement Target:**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

Monitor Standards
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student...

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 3: Residency Report
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery
Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research...

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Increase Research Opportunities
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

**Seek External Funding**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**SLO 7: Develops an extended knowledge base**  
The Ph.D. student develops an extended knowledge base that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry.

**Related Measures**  
**M 1: Dissertation**  
Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.  
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project  
**Achievement Target:**  
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Increase Research Opportunities**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

**M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis**  
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.  
Source of Evidence: Document Analysis  
**Achievement Target:**  
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Monitor Standards**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student l...
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.

**M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review**
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.

**M 5: Written Comprehensive Examination**
Each student will complete a written comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place over three days and will not exceed four hours per day in length. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the written exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve meets or exceeds on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards on the first attempt.

**M 6: Oral Comprehensive Examination**
Each student will complete an oral comprehensive examination, prepared specifically for him or her by the members of his or her committee. The examination will take place in one session and will begin as a defense of the written exam and then proceed to other areas of interest to the committee. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the oral exam.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers achieved "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.

**Other Outcome/Objective, without Goals, along with Any Associations and Related Goals, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**

**O/O 2: Develops leadership for the profession**
The Ph.D. student provides leadership through teaching and professional development within his/her major discipline of inquiry.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Dissertation**
Each student will write and successfully defend a dissertation based on a study which he or she conducts. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee members, the department chair, and the college dean. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the dissertation.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**
95% of program completers will meet or exceed all standards.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of program completers met or exceeded all standards.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Seek External Funding**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 2: Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis
Faculty will review syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.
Source of Evidence: Document Analysis
Achievement Target:
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
Faculty reviewed syllabi and curriculum materials and updated them appropriately to insure they adequately reflect current practice in the field.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Monitor Standards
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student l...

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 3: Residency Report
Each student will prepare a written report detailing their accomplishments in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty will compile a summary rating of the relevant standards based on the residency report.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery
Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met or exceeded all standards.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Seek External Funding
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

M 4: Ph.D. candidacy review
A summary rating derived from residency report, comps, internship and dissertation performance will be determined for each standard. This rating will occur at the time the student is admitted into candidacy.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
95% of Ph.D. students will achieve "meets" or "exceeds" on all standards.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students admitted into candidacy met or exceeded all standards.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.
Seek External Funding

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Improve Post Completion Jobs

Improve the quality of the positions students accept upon graduation from the program.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Monitor student completers and mentor them through the job search process.
Responsible Person/Group: All IT Faculty
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Increase Number of Program Completers

We will monitor and try to increase the number of doctoral graduates per year.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Increase student monitoring in order to improve graduation rates.
Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: All IT faculty.
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Increase Research Opportunities

We will seek to engage all Ph.D. students more actively in ongoing faculty research projects prior to their dissertation research.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure:** Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  | Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship

- **Measure:** Dissertation | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  | Develops an extended knowledge base | Engages in scholarship

- **Measure:** Oral Comprehensive Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
  | Engages in scholarship

- **Measure:** Ph.D. candidacy review | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise
| Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship | Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship |

- **Measure:** Residency Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise

- **Measure:** Written Comprehensive Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise

| Engages in scholarship | Develops a professional identity | Engages in scholarship |

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing

**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

**Monitor Standards**

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, and continue to monitor the stated student learning outcomes during the 2010-2011 academic year. Due to the increasingly rapid pace of technology evolution and the core function of technology in this program, it may be necessary to shorten the syllabus review cycle to bi-annually. Additionally, faculty may need additional resources in the future to fund professional development in order to stay current with technological change.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise

| Develops a professional identity | Develops an extended knowledge base | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship | Understands and uses technology | Understands foundations of education |

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing

**Responsible Person/Group:** IT Unit

**Additional Resources:** Funding for Professional Development

**Budget Amount Requested:** 3000

**Recruit Full-time Students**

As we transition to becoming a more research oriented institution we need to recruit more full-time Ph.D. students to assist in that effort. We have added a couple of additional full-time Ph.D. students and we will continue to pursue additional students.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** Medium

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing

**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

**Seek External Funding**

In order to support more full-time Ph.D. students we will seek more external funding for faculty research.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
**Measure:** Curriculum and Syllabi Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise

| Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship

**Measure:** Dissertation | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise

| Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship

**Measure:** Oral Comprehensive Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise

| Engages in scholarship

**Measure:** Ph.D. candidacy review | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise

| Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship

**Measure:** Residency Report | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise

| Develops a professional identity | Develops leadership for the profession | Engages in scholarship

**Measure:** Written Comprehensive Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates research expertise

| Engages in scholarship

**Implementation Description:** Ongoing

**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty

**Review Program Length**

In order to improve time to completion rates and enhance the research skills and marketability of our graduates, we will review the entire Ph.d program with an eye to shortening it overall and including more research experience. Such a change is now possible thanks to recent revisions in college policy.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** In-process.

**Responsible Person/Group:** All Faculty

**Additional Resources:** none

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements** - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

N/A
CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

At this time we have not made changes to the assessment process. Based on last years' findings our process is working efficiently. We will continue to assess in the same manner, but are considering program changes designed to enhance research competency and promote higher matriculation rates.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

We increased the number of students graduating with their Ph.D. This was directly attributable to our plan for moving students more rapidly through the program and reducing attrition. We are on track to continue this pace for next year. Additionally we began transitioning to a cohort model for the Ph.D. program through once a year admission. This has the effect of 1.) making sure Ph.D. only classes are large enough to make given the university's current standards for class size, and 2). providing a more stable support group for students once they are in the program. We anticipate further revising the Ph.D. program to increase the emphasis on practical research experience and to continue to encourage students to make real and consistent progress toward degree completion.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
N/A

Detailed Assessment Report
2010-2011 Library Media Technology MLM

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organization in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good. The Library Media Technology Program prepares students to serve as school library media specialists and information technologists in the Pre-K - 12 school environment. The focus is on administering media centers in modern school settings.

**Goals without Outcome/Objective Relationships Specified**

**G 1: Goals for Candidates in Library Media Technology**

The goals for candidates enrolled in the Library Media Technology Program include development of the following: The role of the school library media specialist as a teacher. The media specialist collaborates with students and other members of the learning community to analyze learning and information needs, to locate and use resources that will meet those needs, and to understand and communicate the information the resources provide. The role of the school library media specialist as an instructional partner. The media specialist joins with teachers and others to identify links across student information needs, curricular content, learning outcomes, and a wide variety of print, nonprint, and electronic information resources. The role of the school library media specialist as an information specialist. The media specialist provides leadership and expertise in acquiring and evaluating information resources in all formats. The role of the school library media specialist as a program administrator. The media specialist works collaboratively with members of the learning community to define the policies of the library media program and to guide and direct all activities related to it.

**Other Outcome/Objective, without Goals, along with Any Associations and Related Goals, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**

**O/O 1: Demonstrates Content Pedagogical Knowledge**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations of professional responsibilities of a school library media specialist. Strategic Plans: President, Georgia State University 1.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Teaching and Learning**

A portfolio rating for Standard 2 from the ALA-AASL Standards for Initial Programs for School Library Media Specialist Preparation (2007). Standard 2 addresses the following: 1.) Knowledge of Learners and Learning, 2.) Effective and Knowledgeable Teacher, and 3.) Information Literacy Curriculum. This rating will be derived from each student's written rationale explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competency. Source of Evidence: LiveText portfolio synthesis piece. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

95% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action. (Level 3 of LiveText assessment rubric.)

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated.

**Document:**

- [LMT Deactivation Information](#)
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Strengthening planning and instruction knowledge**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher (media specialist) candidates’ knowledge and performance in planning and instr...

**O/O 2: Demonstrates Effective Teaching Performance**
Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods and curriculum materials (including print/nonprint materials and technological tools) to support the professional responsibilities of a school library media specialist. The candidate locates, comprehends, and builds rationales from curriculum guides, other applicable documents, and experienced practitioners; plans and carries out instruction based on state standards; selects and varies instructional strategies, assessing their impact on student engagement and learning; observes students closely and acknowledges how adjustments in teaching can impact learning; exploring teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for students; learns to work and plan productively as part of teams within the school environment. Strategic Plans: President, Georgia State University 1.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Internship Evaluation**
All supervising media specialists are required to submit evaluation forms for all students completing ELMT 7660 (Internship in Library Media Technology). Source of Evidence: Supervising library media specialists’ ratings on the final evaluation forms.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Achievement Target:**
95% of students completing ELMT 7660 (Internship in Library Media Technology) will receive scores of 4 out of 5 on the final evaluation form submitted by supervising school library media specialists.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated.

**Document:**

- LMT Deactivation Information

**O/O 3: Demonstrates Use of Technology in Instruction**
Candidates demonstrate use of technology in learning and instruction in the course materials they complete for the degree or certification and in materials they create for the LiveText portfolio and for their media centers. Strategic Plans: President, Georgia State University 1.3 Graduate Experience

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Use of Technology to Complete LMT Portfolio**
Passing the LiveText portfolio requirement for the MLM degree or for add-on certification requires the use of multiple technologies integrated into student reflection, artifacts, and writing. Source of Evidence: Successful completion of all portfolio requirements .
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
95% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this standard through independent and autonomous planning and action. (Level 3 of LiveText assessment rubric.)

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated.

**Document:**
## O/O 4: Demonstrates Professional Behaviors and Activities

Candidates demonstrate practices that indicate their commitment to teacher-librarian models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities. Strategic Plans: President, Georgia State University 1.3 Graduate Experience

### Related Measures

#### M 4: Faculty Ratings

Faculty ratings of teacher-librarian candidates who have completed the program. Source of Evidence: STARS evaluation system.

Source of Evidence: Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

**Achievement Target:**

95% of program completers will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the domain. The candidate can reflect upon, assess, and take appropriate action regarding effectiveness of his/her professional performance and decisions.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated.

**Document:**

### Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Action Plan

Maintain and monitor.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Strengthening planning and instruction knowledge**

Based upon the faculty ratings (STARS) of teacher (media specialist) candidates’ knowledge and performance in planning and instruction we have partially met our achievement target. We will strengthen our students’ knowledge of planning and instruction via additional coursework (readings and assignments, specifically in lesson plan writing/alignment and actual teaching experiences). A teacher work sample will be required as part of the portfolio which contains several components of lesson planning and differentiation in instruction. Finally, we will devote one (or more as needed) special topics seminars to the issue of planning and instruction.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Teaching and Learning
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates Content Pedagogical Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Implementation of the proposed action plan will begin immediately in all fall semester, 2010 LMT classes.

**Completion Date:** 05/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Nancy J. Brown and Dr. Edward Lomax

**Additional Resources:** 0

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**LMT Deactivation In-Progress**
The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being accepted into the program. Department faculty are ensuring that all current students matriculate through the completion of their program. See attachments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>LMT Deactivation Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** In-Progress  
**Completion Date:** 05/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair and Department Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0  
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements**  
What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?  
NA

**CTW Reflection 2:**  
Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?  
NA

**CTW Reflection 3:**  
Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?  
NA

**CTW Reflection 4:**  
Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?  
NA

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**  
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated. Faculty are currently working to ensure that all current students matriculate through the completion of their program.  

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**  
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated. Faculty are currently working to ensure that all current students matriculate through the completion of their program.  

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**  
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated. Faculty are currently working to ensure that all current students matriculate through the completion of their program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated. Faculty are currently working to ensure that all current students matriculate through the completion of their program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The Library Media Technology MLM program is currently being deactivated. Faculty are currently working to ensure that all current students matriculate through the completion of their program.

---

**Detailed Assessment Report**
**2010-2011 Mathematics Education MEd**

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Master of Education (MED) in Mathematics Education (MTE) is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the MED-MTE program is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: • informed by research, knowledge, and reflective practice; • empowered to serve as change agents; • committed to and respectful of all learners; and • engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities. The MED-MTE provides for master’s level study in mathematics education pedagogy and mathematics content and leads to T-5 certification in secondary Mathematics Education (grades 6-12). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle and high school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content. The program’s underlying framework is constructivism (and aligned with the NCTM Standards), which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban mathematics education.

**Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**

**G 1: Informed and Knowledgeable to Teach**
Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach Mathematics in Grades 6-12.

**SLO 1: Knowledge of Mathematics and NCTM Standards**
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of mathematics content and process skills (NCTM Standards), the history and evolution of the mathematics, the philosophical foundations, an extensive range of advance mathematics content. (Goal 1) (Key Assessment - Content Knowledge: Portfolio Standards 1-4)

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Portfolio Standard 3 and 8**
Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY ...

M 2: Portfolio Standard 5, 6, and 7
Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY ...

G 2: Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions
Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching Mathematics in Grades 6-12.

SLO 2: Diverse Learning Environments
Candidates create learning environments which promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials and view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities. (Goal 2) (Key Assessment - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills: Portfolio Standards 5-8)

Related Measures
M 2: Portfolio Standard 5, 6, and 7
Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

---

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY ...

---

**M 4: Portfolio Standard 2, 4, 11**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

---

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY ...

---

**SLO 3: Dispositions**

Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. (Goal 2) (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Portfolio)

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Portfolio Standard 5, 6, and 7**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be
monitor to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY ...

**M 4: Portfolio Standard 2, 4, 11**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY ...

**G 3: Highly Effective Educators**

Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the Mathematics learning of their students.

**SLO 4: Student Learning and Assessment**

Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning. (Goal 3) (Key Assessment - Impact on Student Learning: Portfolio Standard 9)

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Portfolio 9**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

Students will average 2.5 or higher, with 90% of students scoring a 2 or higher and no more than 10% of students scoring a 1 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% of students met target, scoring either Exceeds or Meets on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

*Established in Cycle*: 2010-2011

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY ...

**Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle**: 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status**: Planned  
**Priority**: High  
**Implementation Description**: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes  
**Completion Date**: 09/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group**: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources**: None  
**Budget Amount Requested**: 0

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle**: 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status**: Planned  
**Priority**: High  
**Implementation Description**: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes  
**Completion Date**: 09/2009  
**Responsible Person/Group**: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)  
**Additional Resources**: None  
**Budget Amount Requested**: 0

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle**: 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status**: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2009
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0
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**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
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**Budget Amount Requested:** 0
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The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

**Completion Date:** 09/2009

**Responsible Person/Group:** All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2000-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** To continue to monitor student/program outcomes

**Completion Date:** 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)

Additional Resources: None

Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2008-2009 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
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Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0
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The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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Implementation Status: Planned
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Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2010

Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0
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The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)

Additional Resources: None

Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2010

Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)

Additional Resources: None

Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2010

Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)

Additional Resources: None

Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2010
 Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)

Additional Resources: None

Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2010

Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)

Additional Resources: None

Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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Additional Resources: None
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To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.
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To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
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To continue monitoring student/program outcomes

The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2009-2010 AY marks the second AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
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Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2000-2010 AY marks the third AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except for continued monitoring of student/program outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: To continue to monitor student/program outcomes
Completion Date: 09/2010

Responsible Person/Group: All MED-MTE faculty, specifically the MED-MTE coordinator (currently, Dr. David W. Stinson)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Portfolio Standard 2, 4, 11 | **Outcome/Objective**: Dispositions

Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David Stinson
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Portfolio Standard 5, 6, and 7 | **Outcome/Objective**: Dispositions

**Implementation Description**: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
**Completion Date**: 09/2012
**Responsible Person/Group**: Dr. David Stinson
**Additional Resources**: None
**Budget Amount Requested**: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Portfolio Standard 5, 6, and 7 | **Outcome/Objective**: Knowledge of Mathematics and NCTM Standards

**Implementation Description**: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
**Completion Date**: 09/2012
**Responsible Person/Group**: Dr. David Stinson
**Additional Resources**: None
**Budget Amount Requested**: 0

To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Portfolio Standard 5, 6, and 7</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Diverse Learning Environments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date: 09/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David Stinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Portfolio 9</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Student Learning and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date: 09/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David Stinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Amount Requested: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To continue monitoring student/program outcomes**
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Low  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Portfolio Standard 3 and 8</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of Mathematics and NCTM Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date: 09/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To continue monitoring student/program outcomes
The MED-MTE is a new program design that went into full implementation during 2007-2008; the 2010-2011 AY marks the fourth AY in which all students completed the program redesign. Currently, all students who completed the MED-MTE redesign program either met or exceeded the goals/objectives of the new program redesign. The MED-MTE faculty will continue to monitor the impact of the redesigned program. At this time, given that all MED-MTE program completers/graduates are meeting or exceeding the program goals/objectives, there are no new Action Plans required at this time, except to continue monitoring student/program outcomes. Moreover, as of fall semester 2011, the MED-MTE degree program is deactivated.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Portfolio Standard 2, 4, 11 | **Outcome/Objective**: Diverse Learning Environments

Implementation Description: To continue monitoring student/program outcomes; program deactivated fall semester 2011
Completion Date: 09/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. David Stinson
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements** - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment** - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs** - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection** - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign
in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired targets. There were no changes and/or modifications made or planned with assessment procedures. Moreover, the program is being deactivated in the fall semester of 2011.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

100% of students met target, scoring either Intermediate or Advanced on Learning Outcome/Objective. The 2010-2011 academic cycle marks the fourth year of the program redesign in the Master of Education-Mathematics Education (MED-MTE) degree program. The program will continue to be monitored to ensure that all learning outcomes/objectives are being addressed, and that students are meeting or exceeding desired targets. There were no changes and/or modifications made or planned with assessment procedures. Moreover, the program is being deactivated in the fall semester of 2011.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:** What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

**Detailed Assessment Report**

**2010-2011 Mathematics Education Online MEd**

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the M.Ed in Mathematics Education program is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: • informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; • empowered to serve as change agents; • committed to and respectful of all learners; and • engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

The mission of the **Master of Education (MED) in Mathematics** is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools.

The M.Ed. major in Mathematics Education provides for master’s level study in Mathematics Education and Mathematics content and leads to T-5 certification in secondary Mathematics (grades 6-12). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle and high school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content.

The program’s underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The
The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban Mathematics education.

**Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**

**G 1: Content Knowledge**
The goal of the M.Ed Online Mathematics Education program is to help candidates to be informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach Mathematics in Grades 6-12.

**SLO 1: Demonstrates strong content knowledge**
Students in MEd. Online Program in Mathematics Education are expected have strong knowledge and understanding of Algebra, geometry, statistics, problem solving and, history and evolution of mathematics.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Portfolio section "Mathematical Preparation"**
Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Mathematics Standards. These sections of portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the majority of standards in the areas of content knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
Each student is required to pass the portfolio requirement in order to meet the requirements of the program. That is, each student must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for each standard.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective by getting at least 2 out of 3.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Action Plan: Mathematical Preparation**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
All students met this requirement after one or more revisions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a p...

**G 2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Dispositions**
Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching Mathematics in Grades 6-12.

**SLO 2: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge**
Students in MEd. Online Program in Mathematics Education are expected implement successful techniques to promote higher order thinking and effective problem solving skills with using student centered, technology-intensive and differentiated instruction in diverse classroom settings.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Portfolio section "Impact on Student Learning"**
Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Mathematics Standards. This section of portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the majority of standards in the areas of impact on student learning and assessment.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Document:**
Achievement Target:
Each student is required to pass the portfolio requirement in order to meet the requirements of the program. That is, each student must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for each standard.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective. 17% of the students exceed the expectations by getting 3 out of 3

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Action Plan: Impact on Student Learning
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Data show that 83% of the students met the expectation and 17% of the students exceed the expectations after one or more resubmi...

M 3: Microteaching Video
Students are expected to videotape themselves while teaching and write a reflection about their teaching.
Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

Document:

Achievement Target:
Students are expected to get 7 out of 10 to achieve this goal.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Action Plan: Microteaching Video
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
All students met this requirement. Clear instructions were helpful for students to meet this expectation. However, sample teachin...

M 4: Portfolio Section "Teacher Preparation and Connections"
Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Mathematics Standards. These sections of portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the majority of standards in the areas of pedagogical knowledge which will include planning, instructional skills, and content knowledge.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
Each student is required to pass the portfolio requirement in order to meet the requirements of the program. That is, each student must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for each standard.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective. 50% of the students exceed the expectations by getting 3 out of 3.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Action Plan: Teaching Preparation and Connections
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Data show that all of the students met the expectation after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards...

SLO 4: Demonstrates effective dispositions
Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program are expected to demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision.

Related Measures
M 3: Microteaching Video
Students are expected to videotape themselves while teaching and write a reflection about their teaching.
Source of Evidence: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)
Document:

- Rubric Curriculum Exploration Project

M 5: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric
Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Achievement Target:
Students are expected to get at least 7 out of 10.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100 percent of the students meet the expectations of this objective.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Action Plan: Dispositions
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
All students met this requirements. We will continue working closely with students to make sure they understand the standard well...

G 3: Effects on P-12 Student Learning
Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the Mathematics learning of their students

SLO 3: Understands and uses effective assessment techniques
Students in the MEd. Online Mathematics Education Program are expected to use a variety of assessment techniques to evaluate students' academic, social and personal development in all aspects of mathematics.

Related Measures
M 2: Portfolio section "Impact on Student Learning"
Students are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the National Mathematics Standards. This section of portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the majority of standards in the areas of impact on student learning and assessment.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
Document:

- Rubric Unit Plan (Path Not Found)

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Action Plan: Clinical Practice
Data show that all students met the expectation after one or more resubmissions of the assignment. Students will be provided a sample video to make sure that they have a clear understanding of the expectations.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Plan should be fully implemented by the end of the fall semester 2011.
Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Mathematics Education.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Action Plan: Dispositions
All students met this requirements. We will continue working closely with students to make sure they understand the standard well and work accordingly.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates effective dispositions

Implementation Description: During regular advisement sessions, students will be informed about the requirement and encouraged to work accordingly.
Completion Date: 12/2012

Action Plan: Effects on P-12 Learning
Data show that 83% of the students met the expectation and 17% of the students exceed the expectations after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. Although the portfolio standards were assigned as a part of the course EDMT 7560-Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. In order to make sure that students have a clear understanding of the standards, more emphasis will be given to the portfolio standards during the advisement sessions that we hold once every semester.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Plan should be fully implemented by the end of the fall semester 2011.
Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty teaching for MEd. in Mathematics Education (Online)
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Action Plan: Impact on Student Learning
Data show that 83% of the students met the expectation and 17% of the students exceed the expectations after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing the coursework. Students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course
content of EDMT 7560-Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction and EDMT 7360-Integration of Technology in Mathematics Instruction.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Portfolio section "Impact on Student Learning" | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge

**Completion Date:** 12/2012  
**Action Plan:** Mathematical Preparation  
All students met this requirement after one or more revisions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing the coursework. Students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content of MATH 6301-College Geometry, MATH 6435-Linear Algebra and MATH 6547-Mathematical Statistics I.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Portfolio section "Mathematical Preparation" | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates strong content knowledge

**Completion Date:** 12/2012  
**Action Plan:** Microteaching Video  
All students met this requirement. Clear instructions were helpful for students to meet this expectation. However, sample teaching video will be provided to help students to have a better understanding of the expectation.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Microteaching Video | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge

**Completion Date:** 12/2012  
**Action Plan:** Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)  
Data show that 50% of the students met the expectation and 50% of the students exceed the expectations after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing the coursework. Students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. More emphasis will be given to the portfolio standards during the advisement sessions that we hold each semester to make sure that students have a clear understanding of them.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** Plan should be fully implemented by the end of the fall semester 2011.

**Completion Date:** 12/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty teaching for M.Ed in Mathematics Education (Online)

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Action Plan:** Teaching Preparation and Connections

Data show that all of the students met the expectation after one or more resubmissions of the portfolio. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing the coursework. Students had to resubmit their work for the portfolio more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content of EDMT 7560-Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Portfolio Section "Teacher Preparation and Connections"  
- Outcome/Objective: Demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge

**Completion Date:** 12/2012

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements** - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment** - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs** - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection** - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The goals, outcomes and measures for the program were modified to align with key assessments for the program.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g.,
revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Based on the data, we will do a curriculum change to provide more opportunities to extent their knowledge on curriculum and assessment techniques in mathematics education. The curriculum change will require to develop a new mathematics education methods course to address those issues.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Master of Arts in Teaching program for Mathematics is aligned with the mission of the GSU PEF, which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the TEEMS program in Mathematics is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: • informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; • empowered to serve as change agents; • committed to and respectful of all learners; and • engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

**Goals and Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**G 1: Become Content & Pedagogical Knowledge Experts**
The teacher candidate will be knowledgeable in mathematics content areas, have the pedagogical knowledge to create effective teaching environments, and to include the use of innovative technology as a part of their instruction, curriculum, and reflective practices.

**O/O 1: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge**
The teacher candidate demonstrates pedagogical content knowledge in Mathematics with technology integration to create and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: INTASC Standard 1 Rating from program portfolio**
Supervisors’ final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 1.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the
effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

90% of the student population is at or above target. Plan to maintain procedures.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Modify Syllabi**

_Established in Cycle: 2010-2011_

Program faculty will maintain the modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor ...

**M 7: INTASC Standard 7 Rating from program portfolio**

Supervisors’ final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 7.

_Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work_

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% met target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**

_Established in Cycle: 2010-2011_

Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**M 8: INTASC Standard 8 Rating from program portfolio**

Supervisors’ final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 8.

_Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work_

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

100% met target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**

_Established in Cycle: 2010-2011_

Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**M 11: KA#1: Georgia Content Test**

The GACE content tests is a requirement for certification and completing the master’s degree.
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will pass the GACE content Tests [#022 & #023]

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target:** *Met*
100% met target

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**M 12: KA#2 Content Knowledge**
The content knowledge of the candidates is enhanced when they complete 5 or more content courses for the master's degree.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will meet the target of successfully completing 5 content courses.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target:** *Met*
100% met target

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain the modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor ...

**M 14: KA#4: Clinical Practice**
Evidence of Clinical Practice will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will meet this standard in livetext portfolio.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target:** *Met*
100% met target

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**G 2: Commit to Achievement of Urban Students**
The teacher candidate in MAT Mathematics Education program will be committed to the achievement of the unique social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/secondary level students in urban environments.

**O/O 2: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs**
The teacher candidate possesses a strong knowledge base about and demonstrate sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/secondary level students

**Related Measures**
**M 2:** INTASC Standard 2 Rating from program portfolio
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 2.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
95% met target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain the modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor ...

---

**M 6: INTASC Standard 6 Rating from program portfolio**
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 6.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
95% met target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

---

**M 7: INTASC Standard 7 Rating from program portfolio**
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 7.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
95% met target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

---

**M 8: INTASC Standard 8 Rating from program portfolio**
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 8.
Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
95% met target.

M 13: KA#3 Planning
Evidence of planning will be demonstrated in the livetext portfolio.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
95% met target

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

M 14: KA#4: Clinical Practice
Evidence of Clinical Practice will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
95% met target

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

M 15: KA#5: Effects on Student Learning
Evidence of student learning will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
95% met target

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...
O/O 4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn
The teacher candidate understands and demonstrates the belief that all students can learn.

Related Measures

M 4: INTASC Standard 4 Rating from program portfolio
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 4.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
95% met target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

M 7: INTASC Standard 7 Rating from program portfolio
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 7.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
95% met target.

M 8: INTASC Standard 8 Rating from program portfolio
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 8.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
95% met target.

M 10: INTASC Standard 10 Rating from program portfolio
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 10.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
95% met target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Modified Sequence of Activities**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**M 14: KA#4: Clinical Practice**
Evidence of Clinical Practice will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
95% met target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**M 15: KA#5: Effects on Student Learning**
Evidence of student learning will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
95% met target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**O/O 5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator**
The teacher candidate demonstrates an efficacious attitude as a community-oriented educator who continues reflection and individual professional development throughout their career.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: INTASC Standard 5 Rating from program portfolio**
Supervisors’ final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 5.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: **Met**
95% met target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**M 9: INTASC Standard 9 Rating from program portfolio**
A portfolio rating for standard 9 will be derived from each teacher candidate's written and oral rationales, explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competencies.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: **Met**
95% met target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**M 10: INTASC Standard 10 Rating from program portfolio**
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 10.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: **Met**
95% met target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

Modified Sequence of Activities
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...
M 16: KA#6: Dispositions
Evidence of Dispositions will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
95% met target
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

G 3: Facilitate Learning in Urban Environments
The teacher candidate will be knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners and be able to facilitate learning in such settings.

O/O 3: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners
The teacher candidate creates a productive and responsive learning environment for diverse learners while providing for students with exceptionalities.

Related Measures
M 3: INTASC Standard 3 Rating from program portfolio
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 3.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
90% met target.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

M 6: INTASC Standard 6 Rating from program portfolio
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 6.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
90% met target.

**M 7: INTASC Standard 7 Rating from program portfolio**

Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 7.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

90% met target.

**M 8: INTASC Standard 8 Rating from program portfolio**

Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 8.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

90% met target.

**M 10: INTASC Standard 10 Rating from program portfolio**

Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 10.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

90% met target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Modified Sequence of Activities**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**M 13: KA#3 Planning**

Evidence of planning will be demonstrated in the livetext portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

90% met target

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.
Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities  
*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011  
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**M 14: KA#4: Clinical Practice**  
Evidence of Clinical Practice will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work  
**Achievement Target:**  
90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target:** *Met*  
90% met target  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities  
*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011  
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**M 15: KA#5: Effects on Student Learning**  
Evidence of student learning will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work  
**Achievement Target:**  
90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target:** *Met*  
90% met target  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities  
*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011  
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**O/O 4: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn**  
The teacher candidate understands and demonstrates the belief that all students can learn.  
**Related Measures**  
**M 4: INTASC Standard 4 Rating from program portfolio**  
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 4.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work  
**Achievement Target:**  
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target:** *Met*  
95% met target  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

M 7: INTASC Standard 7 Rating from program portfolio
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 7.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
95% met target.

M 8: INTASC Standard 8 Rating from program portfolio
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 8.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
95% met target.

M 10: INTASC Standard 10 Rating from program portfolio
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 10.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
95% met target.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Modified Sequence of Activities
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

M 14: KA#4: Clinical Practice
Evidence of Clinical Practice will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
95% met target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2010-2011
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**M 15: KA#5: Effects on Student Learning**
Evidence of student learning will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work  
**Achievement Target:**  
90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
95% met target  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2010-2011
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**G 4: Commit to the Learning Community**
The teacher candidate will believe that all students can learn and being community-oriented educators, they will continue to pursue professional development.

**O/O 5: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator**
The teacher candidate demonstrates an efficacious attitude as a community-oriented educator who continues reflection and individual professional development throughout their career.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: INTASC Standard 5 Rating from program portfolio**
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 5.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work  
**Achievement Target:**  
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
95% met target.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2010-2011
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

**M 9: INTASC Standard 9 Rating from program portfolio**
A portfolio rating for standard 9 will be derived from each teacher candidate's written and oral rationales, explaining how portfolio artifacts demonstrate student competencies.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
95% met target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

---

**M 10: INTASC Standard 10 Rating from program portfolio**
Supervisors' final evaluation, mentor evaluations, and portfolio evaluations are combined into faculty ratings of teacher candidates in livetext for Standard 10.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level of knowledge and understanding of the standard with little/no assistance and supervision from a professor, clinical teacher or assigned mentor. The candidate demonstrates the standard consistently in a field setting and can assess the effectiveness of his/her professional decisions and actions. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
95% met target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

---

**Modified Sequence of Activities**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...

---

**M 16: KA#6: Dispositions**
Evidence of Dispositions will be demonstrated in livetext portfolio.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
90% of the candidates are expected to meet the target.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
95% met target

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

---

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue...
**Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Increasing mathematics proficiency for teaching**
Faculty members will focus on developing and enhancing teachers proficiency for teaching mathematics. Two courses are being developed to address this national and local concern in light of student learning. In the meanwhile the program is being maintained and monitored.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Two courses are being developed and must be sent for approval before implementation.  
**Completion Date:** 05/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Mathematics Education Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** N/A  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Maintain and Modify Syllabi**
Program faculty will maintain the modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2010-2011 academic year and beyond.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** INTASC Standard 1 Rating from program portfolio  
**Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Continuous until changes are required.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** INTASC Standard 3 Rating from program portfolio  
**Outcome/Objective:** Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners

**Implementation Description:** Continuous until changes are required.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
Program faculty will maintain the modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: INTASC Standard 2 Rating from program portfolio | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs
- **Measure**: KA#1: Georgia Content Test | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge
- **Measure**: KA#2 Content Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge

**Implementation Description**: Continuous until changes are required.

**Responsible Person/Group**: MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

**Established in Cycle**: 2010-2011

**Implementation Status**: In-Progress

**Priority**: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: INTASC Standard 5 Rating from program portfolio | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator

**Implementation Description**: Continuous until changes are required.

**Responsible Person/Group**: MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

**Established in Cycle**: 2010-2011

**Implementation Status**: In-Progress

**Priority**: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: INTASC Standard 4 Rating from program portfolio | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrates that All Learners can Learn

**Implementation Description**: Continuous until changes are required.

**Responsible Person/Group**: MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

**Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities**
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

**Established in Cycle**: 2010-2011

**Implementation Status**: In-Progress

**Priority**: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: INTASC Standard 6 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners’ Needs

Implementation Description: Continuous until changes are required.
Responsible Person/Group: MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: INTASC Standard 7 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge

Implementation Description: Continuous until changes are required.
Responsible Person/Group: MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: INTASC Standard 8 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge

Implementation Description: Continuous until changes are required.
Responsible Person/Group: MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

Maintain and Monitor Sequence of Activities
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: INTASC Standard 9 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator
- Measure: KA#3 Planning | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners
### Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: KA#4: Clinical Practice</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge</td>
<td>Demonstrate Sensitivity to Diverse Learners' Needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Measure: KA#5: Effects on Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners |
| Measure: KA#6: Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate the Attitude of a Reflective Educator |

### Implementation Description
Continuous until changes are required.

**Responsible Person/Group:** MSIT Mathematics Education Faculty

**Modified Sequence of Activities**
Program faculty will maintain and monitor the sequence of modified activities and discourses in the methods courses and continue to build and monitor relationships in the schools to reinforce the implementation of multiple strategies for the stated learning outcomes during 2009-2010 academic year and beyond.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** INTASC Standard 10 Rating from program portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Can Effectively Create Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements** - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

Major accomplishment is that we maintained the students’ achievement of passing the GACE II exams (100%) and completing all content requirements for certification as previous years.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment** - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

Students came into the program with several misconceptions of how to teach, classroom management skills, and within content knowledge. Towards the end of student teaching students have cleared up most, if not all, of their misconceived ideas.
CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

While there is still room for improvement in all areas, two areas are of immediate concerns: (1) Creating Productive Learning Environments for Diverse Learners and (2) demonstrating pedagogical content knowledge. Assistance needed would be efforts to reconstruct the program to include a course that facilitates pre-service and in-service teachers’ creativity for producing better learning environments for diverse learners and demonstration of effective pedagogical content knowledge.

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

Within the pedagogical methods courses, faculty has initiated and integrated efforts of facilitating pedagogical content knowledge. However, those efforts need to be more elaborate to be more effective.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Several assessments are in livetext to gather data from our courses. These assessments are working effectively. The targets were revised to demand reaching higher levels in the courses and program.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The impact of the data obtained from assessment findings has been positive. The pedagogy courses in the program will be revised for greater impact.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

---

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Master of Arts in Teaching program for Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies is aligned with the mission of the GSU PEF, which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the TEEMS program in Middle Level Language Arts and Social
Studies is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: • informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; • empowered to serve as change agents; • committed to and respectful of all learners; and • engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

Goals without Outcome/Objective Relationships Specified

G 1: Goals for teacher candidates enrolled in MCE LA/SS
The goals for teacher candidates enrolled in the Middle Level Education Language Arts/Social Studies program include the development of students who are aware of the unique social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students; knowledgeable in Language Arts and Social Studies content areas, including the use of innovative technology; are knowledgeable about learning environments for diverse learners; believe that all students can learn and are community-oriented educators who will continue to pursue professional development.

Student Learning Outcome/Objective, without Goals, along with Any Associations and Related Goals, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings

SLO 1: The Diverse Adolescent Learner
Possess a strong knowledge base about and demonstrate sensitivity to the social and academic needs of diverse adolescent/middle level students.

Related Measures

M 3: Teacher Work Sample: Planning
The key assessment for planning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). Students are evaluated on their ability to plan a four-week unit based on contextual factors of the school setting, appropriate learning goals that they establish based on their knowledge of the context, an assessment plan that addresses the learning goals, and a design for instruction that includes at least four weeks of lesson plans. The instructions relevant to the assessment for planning are provided for the candidates in the students’ course template in the sections for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction. (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate’s TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Planning with the rubrics for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
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Achievement Target:
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong planning skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
The achievement target was partially met with students attaining the following percentages the assessment of the Teacher Work Sample. A few students earned only an acceptable or unacceptable rating in the following areas. An action plan will be developed to address these weaknesses. Assessment: Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction 2 (8%) 3 (13%) 18 (78%) Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance 3 (13%) 6 (26%) 14 (60%) Multiple Modes and Approaches 1 (4%) 7 (30%) 15 (65%) Technical Soundness 3 (13%) 7 (27%) 18 (78%) Adaptations Based of Individuals Needs of Student 2 (9%) 6 (27%) 14 (63%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Contextual Factors: Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors
1 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%) Knowledge of Characteristics of Students 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 18 (81%)
Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%)
Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%)
Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%)
Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient
Exemplary Design for Instruction: Alignment With Learning Goals 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 19 (82%)
Accurate Representation of Content 10 (43%) 13 (56%)
Lesson and Unit Structure 5 (22%) 17 (77%)
Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%)
Use of Technology 1 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%)
Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Support Teacher Work Sample Efforts - Planning
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Faculty will provide additional opportunities for support of students' work with the Teacher Work Sample. A practice TWS is bein...

M 4: Clinical Practice
Candidates are assessed for Clinical Practice with the use of rubrics contained in the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken prior to students' clinical practice) and the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken near the end of students' clinical practice). Rubrics in these two instruments are based on the Georgia GSTEP standards and are used to assess students on Standard 2: Knowledge of Students and Learning, Standard 3: Learning Environments, Standard 4: Assessment, Standard 5: Planning and Instruction, and Standard 6: Professionalism. The first key assessment for Clinical Practice is given at or near the end of Practicum I. The emphasis in Practicum I is to familiarize candidates with the school through immersion in both an elementary and middle school setting. Candidates are encouraged to observe a wide variety of settings within the school and to learn as much as possible about the school context, including classroom culture, policies, procedures, and protocols. Candidates plan and teach a limited number of lessons (5-10). At least three of these lessons are observed by the university supervisor, who uses an observation tool based on the Georgia Framework for Teaching. The university supervisor provides immediate feedback to the candidate after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor completes the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the candidate's teaching performance gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate. The second assessment for Clinical Practice is done at or near the end of the candidates' semester of student teaching. During this semester, which is typically spent on the same middle school campus, the teacher candidates gradually take on an increasing amount of responsibility until they eventually assume the full role of the classroom teacher. During this semester, the candidates are required to teach a minimum of four weeks of lessons during which they plan, teach, reflect upon, and evaluate their praxis. The university supervisor conducts a minimum of three formal observations, providing feedback and support to the teacher candidate. Near the end of the student teaching semester, the university supervisor completes the Final Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the student gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
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Achievement Target:
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate excellent clinical practice skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument associated with the students' field work.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
Final Assessment of Clinical Practice, the following data demonstrate that the achievement target has been met. Knowledge of Students and Learning: Students' Development GA-GSTEP-2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Learning Environments: Classroom Environment GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Classroom Management GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Communication GA-GSTEP-3 21 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment Score for Learning Environments GA-GSTEP-3, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.3 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate Assessment: Assessment GA-GSTEP-4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.1 17 (77%) 5 (22%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Planning and Instruction: Lesson Plan & Instruction GA-GSTEP-5 16 (76%) 5 (23%) Instructional Strategies GA-GSTEP-5 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Monitoring and Adjustments GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment of Planning and Instruction GA-GSTEP-5, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Professionalism: Reflection and Growth GA-GSTEP-6 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Analysis of educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan contexts. 17 (80%) 4 (19%) Overall Assessment of Professionalism GA-GSTEP-6, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR)

M 5: Effects on Student Learning
The key assessment for Effects on Student Learning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample. Students are evaluated on their ability to analyze the results of a four-week unit that they teach during the semester of student teaching. A key component of the Teacher Work Sample project is the design and implementation of an assessment plan, which includes a pre-test and a post-test as a part of the teaching unit. The instructions relevant to the assessment for Effects on Student Learning are provided for the candidates in the students' course template in the sections for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample attached below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate’s TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Effects on Student Learning with the rubrics for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Document:
- MAT MLE LA/SS Key Assessments Chart

Achievement Target:
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate significant and impactful effects on student learning by obtaining a rating of "Exemplary" or "Proficient" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
As demonstrated by the below data, our target has not been achieved - an appropriate action plan will be developed. Analysis of Student Learning: Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 5 (23%) 14 (66%) Alignment with Learning Goals 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Interpretation of Data 2
Evidence of Impact on Students' Learning

Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Support Teacher Work Sample Efforts - Effect on Student Learning
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Faculty will provide additional opportunities for support of students' work with the Teacher Work Sample. A practice TWS is bein...

SLO 2: Pedagogical Content Knowledge
Demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge in Language Arts and Social Studies with technology integration to create and assess rigorous, relevant, and engaging student-centered lessons.

Related Measures
M 1: GACE II Content Area Exam Language Arts and Social Studies
Students must have a minimum of 12 credit hours in English coursework and 12 credit hours in Social Studies coursework and must pass the GACE II content test in Middle Level Language Arts and Middle Level Social Studies before being recommended for certification.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Achievement Target:
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts/Social Studies program will pass the GACE II content exams.

M 2: Content Knowledge Demonstrated in Teaching
Content Knowledge rubrics in the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument and the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument: Data for the key assessment of Content Knowledge are taken from the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument and the Final Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument. The midpoint evaluation takes place prior to clinical practice, at or near the end of the Practicum I (field experience). The final evaluation takes place at or near the end of Practicum II/III (student teaching). For each assessment, students are evaluated on their command of Content Knowledge by their university supervisor, who observes and confers with students and considers feedback from the student's mentor teacher. Candidates are not given specific instructions for this assessment; rather, they demonstrate their content knowledge through their teaching performance and ongoing conversations with mentor teachers and university supervisors. The Teaching Evaluation rubrics are used twice during each student's program - at the midpoint of the program (before clinical practice) and at the end of the program (at the end of clinical practice). The rubric is aligned with the PEF Conceptual Framework, and the portion of the rubric that is used to assess Content Knowledge addresses the following Conceptual Framework standard: CF 1.2. Data generated from reports of student performance in the area of Content Knowledge are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in preparing students who have a strong background in the areas of Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies.
Source of Evidence: Performance in subsequent schooling feedback
Document:

- MAT MLE LA/SS Key Assessments Chart

Achievement Target:
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong content knowledge by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument used to assess their pedagogical content knowledge via teaching.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
The achievement target was met with students attaining 81% at the "Effectively Demonstrated" level and 18% at the "Adequately Demonstrated" level in the overall assessment of content knowledge. The second assessment of the year showed a slight decrease in success thus prompting analysis of
students' opportunities to demonstrate/practice their content knowledge in the first semester of student teaching. Content Knowledge Assessment Midpoint: Subject Specific Content/Concepts GA-GSTEP-1 22 (100%) Pedagogical (Instructional Methods) GA-GSTEP-1 22 (100%) Content Connections GA-GSTEP-1 22 (100%) Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge GA-GSTEP-1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.2 21 (100%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not demonstrated Not Observed or Not Able to Rate (NATR) Content Knowledge Final Assessment: Subject Specific Content/Concepts GA-GSTEP-1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Pedagogical (Instructional Methods) GA-GSTEP-1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Content Connections GA-GSTEP-1 19 (86%) 3 (13%) Overall Assessment of Content Knowledge GA-GSTEP-1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.2 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not demonstrated Not Observed or Not Able to Rate (NATR)

**M 3: Teacher Work Sample: Planning**

The key assessment for planning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). Students are evaluated on their ability to plan a four-week unit based on contextual factors of the school setting, appropriate learning goals that they establish based on their knowledge of the context, an assessment plan that addresses the learning goals, and a design for instruction that includes at least four weeks of lesson plans. The instructions relevant to the assessment for planning are provided for the candidates in the students' course template in the sections for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction. (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate’s TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Planning with the rubrics for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

**Source of Evidence:** Project, either individual or group

**Document:**
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**Achievement Target:**
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong planning skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
The achievement target was partially met with students attaining the following percentages the assessment of the Teacher Work Sample. A few students earned only an acceptable or unacceptable rating in the following areas. An action plan will be developed to address these weaknesses. Assessment: Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction 2 (8%) 3 (13%) 18 (78%) Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Perfrormance 3 (13%) 6 (26%) 14 (60%) Multiple Modes and Approaches 1 (4%) 7 (30%) 15 (65%) Technical Soundness 5 (21%) 18 (78%) Adaptations Based of Individuals Needs of Student 2 (9%) 6 (27%) 14 (63%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Contextual Factors: Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors 1 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%) Knowledge of Characteristics of Students 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 18 (81%) Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning 1 (4%) 2 (9%) 15 (67%) Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Design for Instruction: Alignment With Learning Goals 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 19 (82%) Accurate Representation of Content 10 (43%) 13 (56%) Lesson and Unit Structure 5 (22%) 17 (77%) Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources 1 (4%) 5 (22%) 16 (72%) Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources 6 (27%) 16 (72%) Use of Technology Element 6 1 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%) Unacceptable
Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Learning Goals: Significance, Challenge and Variety

Clarity: 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%)
Appropriateness for Students: 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%)
Alignment with Local, State and National Standards: 2 (8%) 5 (21%) 16 (69%)

Unacceptable: Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

**M 4: Clinical Practice**

Candidates are assessed for Clinical Practice with the use of rubrics contained in the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken prior to students' clinical practice) and the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken near the end of students' clinical practice). Rubrics in these two instruments are based on the Georgia GSTEP standards and are used to assess students on Standard 2: Knowledge of Students and Learning, Standard 3: Learning Environments, Standard 4: Assessment, Standard 5: Planning and Instruction, and Standard 6: Professionalism. The first key assessment for Clinical Practice is given at or near the end of Practicum I. The emphasis in Practicum I is to familiarize candidates with the school through immersion in both an elementary and middle school setting. Candidates are encouraged to observe a wide variety of settings within the school and to learn as much as possible about the school context, including classroom culture, policies, procedures, and protocols. Candidates plan and teach a limited number of lessons (5-10). At least three of these lessons are observed by the university supervisor, who uses an observation tool based on the Georgia Framework for Teaching. The university supervisor provides immediate feedback to the candidate after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor completes the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the candidate's teaching performance gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate. The second assessment for Clinical Practice is done at or near the end of the candidates' semester of student teaching. During this semester, which is typically spent on the same middle school campus, the teacher candidates gradually take on an increasing amount of responsibility until they eventually assume the full role of the classroom teacher. During this semester, the candidates are required to teach a minimum of four weeks of lessons during which they plan, teach, reflect upon, and evaluate their praxis. The university supervisor conducts a minimum of three formal observations, providing feedback and support to the teacher candidate. Near the end of the student teaching semester, the university supervisor completes the Final Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the student gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate.

**Source of Evidence:** Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
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**Achievement Target:**

All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate excellent clinical practice skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument associated with the students' field work.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

Final Assessment of Clinical Practice, the following data demonstrate that the achievement target has been met. Knowledge of Students and Learning: Students' Development GA-GSTEP-2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Learning Environments: Classroom Environment GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Classroom Management GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Communication GA-GSTEP-3 21 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment Score for Learning Environments GA-GSTEP-3, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.3 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate Assessment: Assessment GA-GSTEP-4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.1 17 (77%) 5 (22%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Planning and Instruction: Lesson Plan &
M 5: Effects on Student Learning
The key assessment for Effects on Student Learning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample. Students are evaluated on their ability to analyze the results of a four-week unit that they teach during the semester of student teaching. A key component of the Teacher Work Sample project is the design and implementation of an assessment plan, which includes a pre-test and a post-test as a part of the teaching unit. The instructions relevant to the assessment for Effects on Student Learning are provided for the candidates in the students’ course template in the sections for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample attached below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate’s TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Effects on Student Learning with the rubrics for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
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Achievement Target:
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate significant and impactful effects on student learning by obtaining a rating of “Exemplary” or "Proficient" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
As demonstrated by the below data, our target has not been achieved - an appropriate action plan will be developed. Analysis of Student Learning: Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 5 (23%) 14 (66%) Alignment with Learning Goals 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Interpretation of Data 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Evidence of Impact on Students’ Learning 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 2 (9%) 17 (80%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Support Teacher Work Sample Efforts - Effect on Student Learning
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Faculty will provide additional opportunities for support of students' work with the Teacher Work Sample. A practice TWS is being...
The key assessment for planning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). Students are evaluated on their ability to plan a four-week unit based on contextual factors of the school setting, appropriate learning goals that they establish based on their knowledge of the context, an assessment plan that addresses the learning goals, and a design for instruction that includes at least four weeks of lesson plans. The instructions relevant to the assessment for planning are provided for the candidates in the students’ course template in the sections for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction. (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate's TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Planning with the rubrics for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
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Achievement Target:
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong planning skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
The achievement target was partially met with students attaining the following percentages the assessment of the Teacher Work Sample. A few students earned only an acceptable or unacceptable rating in the following areas. An action plan will be developed to address these weaknesses. Assessment: Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction 2 (8%) 3 (13%) 18 (78%) Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance 3 (13%) 6 (26%) 14 (60%) Multiple Modes and Approaches 1 (4%) 7 (30%) 15 (65%) Technical Soundness 5 (21%) 18 (78%) Adaptations Based of Individuals Needs of Student 2 (9%) 6 (27%) 14 (63%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Contextual Factors: Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors 1 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%) Knowledge of Characteristics of Students 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 18 (81%) Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Design for Instruction: Alignment With Learning Goals 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 19 (82%) Accurate Representation of Content 10 (43%) 13 (56%) Lesson and Unit Structure 5 (22%) 17 (77%) Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources 1 (4%) 5 (22%) 17 (72%) Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources 6 (27%) 16 (72%) Use of Technology Element 61 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Learning Goals: Significance, Challenge and Variety 1 (4%) 4 (17%) 18 (78%) Clarity 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%) Appropriateness for Students 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%) Alignment with Local, State and National Standards 2 (8%) 5 (21%) 16 (69%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

M 4: Clinical Practice
Candidates are assessed for Clinical Practice with the use of rubrics contained in the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken prior to students’ clinical practice) and the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken near the end of students’ clinical practice). Rubrics in these two instruments are based on the Georgia GSTEP standards and are used to assess students on Standard 2: Knowledge of Students and Learning, Standard 3: Learning Environments, Standard 4: Assessment, Standard 5: Planning and Instruction, and Standard 6: Professionalism. The first key assessment for Clinical Practice is given at or near the end of Practicum I. The emphasis in
Practicum I is to familiarize candidates with the school through immersion in both an elementary and middle school setting. Candidates are encouraged to observe a wide variety of settings within the school and to learn as much as possible about the school context, including classroom culture, policies, procedures, and protocols. Candidates plan and teach a limited number of lessons (5-10). At least three of these lessons are observed by the university supervisor, who uses an observation tool based on the Georgia Framework for Teaching. The university supervisor provides immediate feedback to the candidate after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor completes the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the candidate's teaching performance gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate. The second assessment for Clinical Practice is done at or near the end of the candidates' semester of student teaching. During this semester, which is typically spent on the same middle school campus, the teacher candidates gradually take on an increasing amount of responsibility until they eventually assume the full role of the classroom teacher. During this semester, the candidates are required to teach a minimum of four weeks of lessons during which they plan, teach, reflect upon, and evaluate their praxis. The university supervisor conducts a minimum of three formal observations, providing feedback and support to the teacher candidate. Near the end of the student teaching semester, the university supervisor completes the Final Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the student gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
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Achievement Target:
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate excellent clinical practice skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument associated with the students' field work.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
Final Assessment of Clinical Practice, the following data demonstrate that the achievement target has been met. Knowledge of Students and Learning: Students' Development GA-GSTEP-1.1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Learning Environments: Classroom Environment GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Classroom Management GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Communication GA-GSTEP-3 21 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment Score for Learning Environments GA-GSTEP-3, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.3 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate Assessment: Assessment GA-GSTEP-4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.1 17 (77%) 5 (22%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Planning and Instruction: Lesson Plan & Instruction GA-GSTEP-5 16 (76%) 5 (23%) Instructional Strategies GA-GSTEP-5 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Monitoring and Adjustments GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Resources & Technology GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment of Planning and Instruction GA-GSTEP-5, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Professionalism: Reflection and Growth GA-GSTEP-6 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Analysis of educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan contexts. 17 (80%) 4 (19%) Overall Assessment of Professionalism GA-GSTEP-6, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR)

M 5: Effects on Student Learning
The key assessment for Effects on Student Learning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample. Students are evaluated on their ability to analyze the results of a four-week unit that they
teach during the semester of student teaching. A key component of the Teacher Work Sample project is the design and implementation of an assessment plan, which includes a pre-test and a post-test as a part of the teaching unit. The instructions relevant to the assessment for Effects on Student Learning are provided for the candidates in the students' course template in the sections for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample attached below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate's TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Effects on Student Learning with the rubrics for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Document:**

- MAT MLE LA/SS Key Assessments Chart

**Achievement Target:**
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate significant and impactful effects on student learning by obtaining a rating of "Exemplary" or "Proficient" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
As demonstrated by the below data, our target has not been achieved - an appropriate action plan will be developed. Analysis of Student Learning: Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 5 (23%) 14 (66%) Alignment with Learning Goals 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Interpretation of Data 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Evidence of Impact on Students' Learning 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 2 (9%) 17 (80%)

Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Support Teacher Work Sample Efforts - Effect on Student Learning**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

Faculty will provide additional opportunities for support of students' work with the Teacher Work Sample. A practice TWS is bein...

**SLO 4: Professional Community Oriented Educator**
Demonstrate the belief that a) all students can learn and b) an efficacious attitude as a global and community-oriented educator who continues reflection and individual professional development throughout their career.

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Teacher Work Sample: Planning**
The key assessment for planning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). Students are evaluated on their ability to plan a four-week unit based on contextual factors of the school setting, appropriate learning goals that they establish based on their knowledge of the context, an assessment plan that addresses the learning goals, and a design for instruction that includes at least four weeks of lesson plans. The instructions relevant to the assessment for planning are provided for the candidates in the students' course template in the sections for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction. (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate's TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students
are assessed for Planning with the rubrics for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Document:

- MAT MLE LA/SS Key Assessments Chart

**Achievement Target:**
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate strong planning skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
The achievement target was partially met with students attaining the following percentages the assessment of the Teacher Work Sample. A few students earned only an acceptable or unacceptable rating in the following areas. An action plan will be developed to address these weaknesses. Assessment: Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction 2 (8%) 3 (13%) 18 (78%) Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance 3 (13%) 6 (26%) 14 (60%) Multiple Modes and Approaches 1 (4%) 7 (30%) 15 (65%) Technical Soundness 5 (21%) 18 (78%) Adaptations Based of Individuals Needs of Student 2 (9%) 6 (27%) 14 (63%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Contextual Factors: Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors 1 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%) Knowledge of Characteristics of Students 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 18 (81%) Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment 1 (4%) 6 (27%) 15 (68%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Design for Instruction: Alignment With Learning Goals 1 (4%) 3 (13%) 19 (82%) Accurate Representation of Content 10 (43%) 13 (56%) Lesson and Unit Structure 5 (22%) 17 (77%) Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources 1 (4%) 5 (22%) 16 (72%) Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources 6 (27%) 16 (72%) Use of TechnologyElement 6 1 (4%) 4 (18%) 17 (77%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary Learning Goals: Significance, Challenge and Variety 1 (4%) 4 (17%) 18 (78%) Clarity 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%) Appropriateness for Students 1 (4%) 5 (21%) 17 (73%) Alignment with Local, State and National Standards 2 (8%) 5 (21%) 16 (69%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

**M 4: Clinical Practice**
Candidates are assessed for Clinical Practice with the use of rubrics contained in the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken prior to students' clinical practice) and the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken near the end of students' clinical practice). Rubrics in these two instruments are based on the Georgia GSTEP standards and are used to assess students on Standard 2: Knowledge of Students and Learning, Standard 3: Learning Environments, Standard 4: Assessment, Standard 5: Planning and Instruction, and Standard 6: Professionalism. The first key assessment for Clinical Practice is given at or near the end of Practicum I. The emphasis in Practicum I is to familiarize candidates with the school through immersion in both an elementary and middle school setting. Candidates are encouraged to observe a wide variety of settings within the school and to learn as much as possible about the school context, including classroom culture, policies, procedures, and protocols. Candidates plan and teach a limited number of lessons (5-10). At least three of these lessons are observed by the university supervisor, who uses an observation tool based on the Georgia Framework for Teaching. The university supervisor provides immediate feedback to the candidate after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor completes the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the candidate's teaching performance gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate. The second assessment for Clinical Practice is done at or near the end of the candidates' semester of student teaching. During this semester, which is typically spent on the same middle school campus, the
teacher candidates gradually take on an increasing amount of responsibility until they eventually assume the full role of the classroom teacher. During this semester, the candidates are required to teach a minimum of four weeks of lessons during which they plan, teach, reflect upon, and evaluate their praxis. The university supervisor conducts a minimum of three formal observations, providing feedback and support to the teacher candidate. Near the end of the student teaching semester, the university supervisor completes the Final Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the student gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Document:**

- MAT MLE LA/SS Key Assessments Chart

**Achievement Target:**
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate excellent clinical practice skills by obtaining a rating of "Effectively" or "Adequately" on the observation instrument associated with the students' field work.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
Final Assessment of Clinical Practice, the following data demonstrate that the achievement target has been met. Knowledge of Students and Learning: Students' Development GA-GSTEP-2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.1, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Learning Environments: Classroom Environment GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Classroom Management GA-GSTEP-3 16 (72%) 6 (27%) Communication GA-GSTEP-3 21 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment Score for Learning Environments GA-GSTEP-3, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.2, GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.3 18 (81%) 4 (18%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate Assessment: Assessment GA-GSTEP-4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.1 17 (77%) 5 (22%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate Instruction: Lesson Plan & Instruction GA-GSTEP-5 16 (76%) 5 (23%) Instructional Strategies GA-GSTEP-5 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Monitoring and Adjustments GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Resources & Technology GA-GSTEP-5 20 (95%) 1 (4%) Overall Assessment of Planning and Instruction GA-GSTEP-5, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR) Professionalism: Reflection and Growth GA-GSTEP-6 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Analysis of educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan contexts. 17 (80%) 4 (19%) Overall Assessment of Professionalism GA-GSTEP-6, GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.4, GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.3 19 (90%) 2 (9%) Effectively Demonstrated Adequately Demonstrated Partially Demonstrated Not Demonstrated Not Able to Rate (NATR)

**M 5: Effects on Student Learning**
The key assessment for Effects on Student Learning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample. Students are evaluated on their ability to analyze the results of a four-week unit that they teach during the semester of student teaching. A key component of the Teacher Work Sample project is the design and implementation of an assessment plan, which includes a pre-test and a post-test as a part of the teaching unit. The instructions relevant to the assessment for Effects on Student Learning are provided for the candidates in the students' course template in the sections for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample attached below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate's TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Effects on Student Learning with the rubrics for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.
Achievement Target:
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate significant and impactful effects on student learning by obtaining a rating of "Exemplary" or "Proficient" on the rubric associated with the Teacher Work Sample.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
As demonstrated by the below data, our target has not been achieved - an appropriate action plan will be developed. Analysis of Student Learning: Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation 1 (4%) 1 (4%)  5 (23%) 14 (66%) Alignment with Learning Goals 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Interpretation of Data 2 (9%) 3 (14%) 16 (76%) Evidence of Impact on Students' Learning 1 (4%) 1 (4%) 2 (9%) 17 (80%) Unacceptable Developing Acceptable Proficient Exemplary

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Support Teacher Work Sample Efforts - Effect on Student Learning
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Faculty will provide additional opportunities for support of students' work with the Teacher Work Sample. A practice TWS is being...

M 6: Professional Dispositions
The assessment for Dispositions is entitled "Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals" and is used in all programs in the Professional Education Unit. Students are not required to submit specific assignments for this assessment. Prior to Fall 2010, a different rubric was used. The older rubric, which was linked directly to the 10 INTASC standards, was replaced by an instrument that could be more clearly linked to the PEF unit's rearticulated conceptual framework outcomes. Each program in the unit administers the assessment at approximately midpoint and end of program. For Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies TEEMS programs, the Dispositions assessment is completed by the university supervisor at the end of Practicum I and at the end of student teaching. Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Achievement Target:
All students enrolled in the Middle Level Language Arts and Social Studies program will demonstrate high levels of professionalism by obtaining a rating of "Exceptional" or "Acceptable" on the rubric used to assess students' professional dispositions.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
Professional Dispositions data demonstrates achievement goal has been met. EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others' points of view; bases communication on learner's point of view; believes in establishing rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.2 19 (86%) 3 (13%) POSITIVE VIEW OF OTHERS: Believes in the worth, ability and potential of others; trusts learner's capacity for change; believes others can and will rather than can't or won't GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.1 18 (81%) 4 (18%) POSITIVE VIEW OF SELF: Believes in the worth, ability and potential of self; possesses a fundamentally positive sense of self-adequacy, capability and dependability; has positive expectations of self GA-GSU-COE-CF-2.3 18 (81%) 4 (18%) AUTHENTICITY: Able to be open and genuine; self-discloses and melds personal uniqueness with culturally responsive interactions; does not feel one must play a role to be effective GA-GSU-COE-CF-3.1 17 (77%) 5 (22%) MEANINGFUL PURPOSE AND VISION: Focused on the long range; is visionary and reflective as a professional; commits to growth for all learners; cares about what is really important GA-GSU-COE-CF-1.4 19 (86%) 3 (13%) Exceptional Acceptable Marginal Unacceptable

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Support Teacher Work Sample Efforts
Faculty will provide additional opportunities for support of students' work with the Teacher Work Sample. A practice TWS is being introduced in the Fall semester of student teaching - Practica I and will be supported both in a methods course and in Practica I. The methods course that houses the content "Planning" has been moved to the long semester when the students are conducting their field work and should provide for better support/practice in developing their skill as effective and impactful lesson designers.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Completion Date: 05/2012  
Responsible Person/Group: MLE TEEMS LA/SS Faculty  
Additional Resources: None.  
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Support Teacher Work Sample Efforts - Effect on Student Learning
Faculty will provide additional opportunities for support of students' work with the Teacher Work Sample. A practice TWS is being introduced in the Fall semester of student teaching - Practica I and will be supported both in a methods course and in Practica I. The methods course that houses the content "Analysis of Student Learning" has been moved to the long semester when the students are conducting their field work and should provide for better support/practice in developing their skill as effective and impactful educators.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Effects on Student Learning  
  **Outcome/Objective**: Learning Environment
  | Pedagogical Content Knowledge | Professional Community Oriented Educator | The Diverse Adolescent Learner

Completion Date: 05/2012  
Responsible Person/Group: MLE LA/SS Faculty  
Additional Resources: None.  
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Support Teacher Work Sample Efforts - Planning
Faculty will provide additional opportunities for support of students' work with the Teacher Work Sample. A practice TWS is being introduced in the Fall semester of student teaching - Practica I and will be supported both in a methods course and in Practica I. The methods course that houses the content "Planning" has been moved to the long semester when the students are conducting their field work and should provide for better support/practice in developing their skill as effective and impactful lesson designers.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Teacher Work Sample: Planning  
  **Outcome/Objective**: The Diverse Adolescent Learner

Completion Date: 05/2012  
Responsible Person/Group: MLE TEEMS LA/SS Faculty
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1: What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Program faculty have refined the use of the Teacher Work Sample, lesson planning, and assessment to better support our students in these efforts. These changes were made based on prior year's data and while some progress has been made, data this year demonstrate there is still some progress to be made. A few low assessments from a couple of students indicate that we still have work to do in clarifying the lesson design / implementation / assessment process. Our goal is for all students to master this process. Program faculty have realigned coursework to better match with field work and continue to improve work with lesson design (using Wiggins & McTighe as well as the Teacher Work Sample) as well as improvement with assessment processes and systems for the classroom.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Program faculty use the assessment of student strengths and weaknesses to pinpoint areas of improvement in coursework. We have realigned courses for this year to better match methods and fieldwork. We continue to revise and improve curriculum with regards to the lesson design / implementation / assessment cycle.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: 
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

**Detailed Assessment Report**

**2010-2011 Middle Grades Education (Math and Science) TEEMS MAT**

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Master of Art in Teaching (MAT) in Middle-level Math-Science is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the MAT Middle-level Math-Science program is to prepare educators who are: informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; empowered to serve as change agents; committed to and respectful of all learners; and engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

**Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**

**G 1: Content Knowledge**

1. Candidates will be seen as more knowledgeable others in their classrooms, in their schools, and in their communities with regard to their understandings of the content and ways of knowing within the disciplines of math and science.

**SLO 1: Content Knowledge**

Candidates will possess and use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge and pedagogy to facilitate learning for all.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Objective 1 - Content Knowledge**

There will be three sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. The candidates performance on the GACE Middle-level Mathematics and Middle-level Science tests. 2. Supervisor ratings on the Standard 1: Content Knowledge components of the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments. 3. Reviewer ratings on the content and curriculum standard in the final e-portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

1. For the GACE tests, the target is for 100% of the candidates to pass both the Middle-level Math and Middle-level Science exams. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 2.5 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Unsatisfactory.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

1. The GACE scores had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report. 2. With regards to the mid-term and evaluation rubrics, the target was met for the overall rating of students in the area of content knowledge. However, the overall score on the Content Connections element was a 3.35, with 3 of the students receiving a score of partially demonstrated. This is clearly below the target set for the individual participants. 3. The Electronic Portfolio data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the **Action Plan Detail** section of this report.

**Content Knowledge Action Plan**
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011

In the mathematics and science methods courses, there needs to be a stronger connection to other disciplines. While the mathem...

**G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions**

2. Candidates will be skilled craftspeople with the appropriate dispositions for translating their content knowledge into meaningful learning experiences for a diverse set of learners in grades 4 - 8 math and science classrooms.

**SLO 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge**

Candidates will be able use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design meaningful educational opportunities for all learners.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Objective 2 - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge**

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Learning Goals and Design for Instruction assignments in the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by supervisors on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation related to this area 3. Evaluation by reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

1. For the Learning Goals assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 17 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements; for the Design for Instruction assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 27 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 2.5 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Unsatisfactory..

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

1. For the Learning Goals assignment, the target was met, with all but one student achieving a 17 or better and less than 25 % of the students receiving a rating of 2 or below. For the Design for Instructions assignment, the target was met (26.7 average overall), although there were 5 students with scores below 26. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Rubrics, the target was met as the average was 3.55 for all students and no student received a rating of 2 or 1. 3. The Electronic Portfolio data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

**SLO 3: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences**

Candidates will be able to coordinate time, space, activities, technology and other resources to provide active and equitable engagement of diverse learners in real world experiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Objective 3 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences**

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Design for Instruction and Instructional Decision Making assignments in the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on this element in the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessment 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of this section of the e-portfolio

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

1. For the Design for Instruction assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 27 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements; for the Instructional Decision Making assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 13 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or
1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 2.5 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Unsatisfactory.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

1. For the Design for Instructions assignment, the target was met (26.7 average overall), although there were 5 students with scores below 26. For the Instructional Decision Making assignment, the target was met with only two students scoring below the desired average of 13. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Rubrics, the target was met as the average was 3.55 for all students and no student received a rating of 2 or 1. 3. The Electronic Portfolio data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

**SLO 4: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments**

Candidates will be able to create engaging learning environments where the diverse perspectives, opinions, and beliefs of others are acknowledged and respected.

**Related Measures**

**M 4: Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments**

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluations of the Contextual Factors assignment within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on this element in the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluations by the reviewer of this section of the electronic portfolio

**Achievement Target:**

1. For the Contextual Factors assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 21 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 2.5 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Unsatisfactory.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

1. For the Contextual Factors assignment, the target was met as the overall average was well over 21; however, there were 6 (out of 29 students) who scored at or below that average. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the overall assessment on the Learning Environments section was a 3.57, meeting the specified target; however, it needs to be noted that the average score on the Classroom Environment element was 3.42 and on the Classroom Management element was 3.39. 3. The Electronic Portfolio data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Methods Courses**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

In the mathematics and science methods courses, there is a need to have assignments that speak to the issue of classroom learn...

**SLO 5: Professional Dispositions**

Normal 0 false false false EN-US X-NONE X-NONE MicrosoftInternetExplorer4 Candidates will be able to exhibit ethically-appropriate behavior towards students, colleagues, administrators, and community members and will be able to commit to continuing personal and professional development.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Objective 5 - Professional Dispositions**

There will be two sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Ratings by the supervisor on the Dispositions Key Assessment 2. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
1. For the Disposition Key Assessment rubric, the target is for the candidates to average a of 18 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 2.5 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Unsatisfactory.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

1. For the Dispositions Key Assessment, the candidates achieved an average well over the target of 18 overall, with only 2 students receiving a score below the average. Further, the average per element was 3.57 indicating that most ratings were either Exceptional or Acceptable (only 6 ratings of Marginal were assigned and no ratings of Unacceptable were assigned). 2. The Electronic Portfolio data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

**G 3: Impact on student learning**

3. Candidates will be reflective professionals with the capacity to analyze the effect that their teaching practices have on the learning of the students in their grades 4 - 8 math and science classes.

**SLO 7: Impact on Student Learning and Reflection**

Candidates will be able to reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Objective 7 - Impact on Student Learning and Reflection**

There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Reflection and Self-Evaluation assignment within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

1. For the Reflection & Self-Evaluation assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 22 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 2.5 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Unsatisfactory.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

1. For the Reflection & Self-Evaluation assignment, only 2 candidates scored below the target average, so the overall average was well above the established target. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluations, the overall candidate average for the Professionalism standard was 3.62 indicating that the candidates performed above the target rating of 3.5 and this was true for each of the individual elements within this standard. 3. The Electronic Portfolio data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Revised TWS/Rubrics**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

Our degree program had some changes institutionalized made based off of last year's action plan. We implemented a revised vers...
O/O 6: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment
Candidates will be able to design and utilize a range of formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous development of all learners and support learners in engaging in the process of self-assessment.

Related Measures
M 6: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment
There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Assessment Plan and Impact on Student Learning assignments within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
1. For the Assessment Plan assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 22 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 2.5 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Unsatisfactory.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
1. For the Assessment Plan assignment, the target was met with the overall average for the set of candidates being a 22.66 on this assignment. Nonetheless, 9 of the 29 candidates did score below this average, some considerably so. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the set of candidates scored just below the target mark of 3.5 (with the average for all students being 3.48). However, it should be noted that all students received a rating of Adequately or Effectively Demonstrated this proficiency, with no students receiving a rating of Partially Demonstrated or below (indicating that the target may have been too high). 3. The Electronic Portfolio data had not been compiled at the time of the initial findings report.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Refined TWS/Rubrics
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The implementation of the TWS is a means to create a cohesive, interrelated set of assessments that also impact student learni...

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Additional support in professionalism
Faculty will provide additional support to students through focused assignments. Student handbook will clearly describe expectations for professionalism.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The target date of October 2010 will give faculty adequate time to implement the additional support structures.
Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Program faculty; field experiences director
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Strengthening knowledge of professionalism
While faculty ratings on professionalism of teacher candidates (via the STARS system) have met our achievement target, our assessment results based on portfolio evaluation have indicated we
have partially met our achievement target. To strengthen our teacher candidates' knowledge of professionalism, we will provide a revised coursework (added learning modules on legal and ethical issues) which will guide our teacher candidates to develop basic knowledge of professionalism. Also, teacher candidates will be required to submit weekly reflections as part of their coursework which will offer continued communication and guidance between university supervisors and teacher candidates, thus will foster our teacher candidates' understanding and reflective practices of professionalism.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Provide more support for students related to classroom management
The MAT MCE Math and Science students take two methods courses: One with a math focus and one with a science focus. It is difficult as it is for the instructors to prepare students in the methodologies specific to those two disciplines in single courses. And without a third course which could introduce general features of pedagogy such as notions of lesson planning, classroom management, etc., it falls on the instructors of the two methods courses to try to add that content in as well. As a result, it is likely that insufficient attention is being paid to those areas, because students have provided feedback to that effect. The preferred solution would be to find a way to add a third methods course such as exists in the MAT SCE Science program. However, until a way to do that with a schedule which is already over-crowded is determined, some kind of patchwork solutions will be required. One is to require students to read a book related to classroom management to go along with the discipline-specific methods books they are now required to read. Another is something that will be tried this semester: Bringing in a guest speaker (in this case a teacher trained in behavior management techniques). We will continue to look for other options.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Objective 3 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences  
  Outcome/Objective: Professional Dispositions

Implementation Description: The program coordinator will sit down with individuals responsible for the two methods courses and find ways to weave in sufficient material related to classroom management without pushing out other critical content in these courses.

Completion Date: 07/2011  
Responsible Person/Group: Program coordinator in conjunction with methods course instructors  
Additional Resources: None  
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Content Knowledge Action Plan
In the mathematics and science methods courses, there needs to be a stronger connection to other disciplines. While the mathematics and science connections are made fairly easy, there needs to be more integration of other academic disciplines. All candidates take EDRD 7630, so it might be prudent for students to further utilize some of the strategies introduced in that course. Additionally, there needs to be more integration of other subjects that are also aligned to the standards. Further, pre-service teachers need to explore multiple ways to bridge “school” content knowledge with the world outside of school.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Methods Courses
In the mathematics and science methods courses, there is a need to have assignments that speak to the issue of classroom learning environments. These issues should be inclusive of classroom management issues. Scholarly readings from practitioner and research journals will be shared with cohort members for discussion and practice in their practicum placements. In addition, guest speakers (preferably those teaching in urban spaces) will be invited to a classroom management/learning environments session to help pre-service teachers develop action plans for their developing their own plans as it pertains to learning environments.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Objective 1 - Content Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective**: Content Knowledge

Refined TWS/Rubrics
The implementation of the TWS is a means to create a cohesive, interrelated set of assessments that also impact student learning. As it stands, there are refined rubrics for assessments to provide better structure to the TWS for pre-service teachers and university supervisors alike. These refined rubrics also make the expectations clear for students as it pertains to impacting student learning and assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments | **Outcome/Objective**: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments

Revised TWS/Rubrics
Our degree program had some changes institutionalized made based off of last year’s action plan. We implemented a revised version of TWS as a means to create a cohesive, interrelated set of assessments. During the practicum I, students chart their goals with specificity. During practicum II and III, students delve deeper into these goals and use their stated goals to meet the needs of learners. We also refined the rubrics for assessments to provide better reliability among the supervisors performing the ratings of students’ learning outcomes.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment | **Outcome/Objective**: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment

- **Measure**: Objective 7 - Impact on Student Learning and Reflection | **Outcome/Objective**: Impact on Student Learning and Reflection

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Our degree program had some changes institutionalized made based off of last year’s action plan. We implemented a revised version of TWS as a means to create a cohesive, interrelated set of assessments. During the practicum I, students chart their goals with specificity. During practicum II and III, students delve deeper into these goals and use their stated goals to meet the needs of learners. We also refined the rubrics for assessments to provide better reliability among the supervisors performing the ratings of students’ learning outcomes.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

During this academic year, we will make several improvements to the degree program. First, we will ensure that there is a better integration between assignments in the methods courses and the TWS assignments. This will allow students understand more fully the objectives of the assignment and will allow students to develop deeper insights about the assignments. Next, we will ensure that students understand mathematics and science curricula. We will do a better job of connection state and national standards. This will result in better instructional strategies that address learning goals and objectives in curriculum planning. This will also result in better lessons that build on students’ experiences and that are simultaneously linked to the standards. Finally, there will be more of a focus on different forms of assessment as a means of creating a more holistic picture of individual and group learning. Moreover, there were no course changes made in the program during this academic year.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
**Detailed Assessment Report**

**2010-2011 Middle Level Education BSE**

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the B.S.E. Middle Level Education program is aligned with the mission of the GSU PEF, which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the B.S.E. Middle Level Education program is to prepare educators who are: • informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; • empowered to serve as change agents; • committed to and respectful of all learners; and • engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities. The B.S.E. teacher education program in Middle Level Education is one of eight teacher certification programs offered through the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT). The program is based on current research in teacher education and support planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in education. The program also includes major, in-depth practicum / teaching experience at the middle grades level. Graduates have a well developed content knowledge in two fields (language arts, mathematics, reading, science, or social studies). Successful completion of this program and the appropriate GACE Content Assessment tests leads to a recommendation for licensure for grades four through eight in the two areas of concentration. This program leads a Bachelor of Science in Education (B.S.E.) degree and a level T-4 Georgia teaching certification.

**Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**

**G 1: Candidates are Informed Educators with Expert Content Knowledge**
Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge in two content fields in middle level education.

**SLO 1: Candidates Demonstrates Knowledge in their Content Field**
Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, standards, and structures of content in their chosen teaching fields.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Student Teaching Evaluation**
Students are knowledge and understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, standards, and structures of content in their chosen teaching fields is evaluated by their university supervisors via the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Achievement Target:**
100% of students will receive a score of "3" (adequately demonstrated) or higher on all rubric components related to content knowledge.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
All but one student scored a level "3" or higher in all content area rubric measurements. See report here:
https://c1.livetext.com/misk5/xcreports/view_report/sid/73762?key=9f4d5f10388c5cc64bbedfd8bc8e2a6cb

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the **Action Plan Detail** section of this report.
Increased content in methods courses
*Established in Cycle*: 2010-2011
Although almost all of our preservice teachers were rated at a score of "3" or "adequately demonstrated" or higher in their cont...

G 2: Candidates are Inform Educators with Necessary Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions for teaching Middle Level Students
Candidates are informed educators with knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching middle level students.

SLO 2: Candidates Plan, Implement, and Reflect on Instruction Methods
Candidates plan, implement, and reflect upon a wide range of instructional methods through teacher inquiry.

**Related Measures**

M 2: Action Research Paper 1 Rubric
Candidates demonstrate their ability to plan, implement, and reflect upon a wide range of instructional methods through teacher action research. They are evaluated via the Action Research Project rubric - 4600.
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**
100% of students will receive a score of "2" (proficient) or higher on all rubric components related to action research.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
9% of our students did not score at the "proficient" level or higher for portions of the action research component. More specifically, students struggled with the literature review, research methods, and results sections.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

Improved instruction related to action research
*Established in Cycle*: 2010-2011
Although most of our students did well on the action research project, not everyone was at the proficient or partially proficient...

SLO 3: Candidates Create Meaningful Learning Experiences
Candidates create meaningful learning experiences that develop all young adolescents’ competence in subject matter and skills.

**Related Measures**

M 3: Teaching Evaluation Rubrics
Candidates create meaningful learning experiences that develop all young adolescents’ competence in subject matter and skills. During student teaching, they are evaluated via the following rubrics: Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument and Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Achievement Target:**
100% of students will score a level "3" or "adequately demonstrated" in the following areas 2-5 of the teaching evaluation rubric: (2) knowledge of students and learning, (3) learning environments, (4) assessments, and (5) planning and instruction.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students scored at a level "3" or "adequately demonstrated" in the all areas 2-5 of the teaching evaluation rubric: (2) knowledge of students and learning, (3) learning environments, (4) assessments, and (5) planning and instruction.

SLO 4: Candidates Demonstrate Positive Dispositions
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision for working with middle level students.

**Related Measures**

**M 4: Dispositions Assessment Rubric**
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. Candidates dispositions will be evaluated via the Dispositions Assessment Rubric.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Achievement Target:**
100% of students will score a level "3: acceptable" or higher, while 50% of students will score at a level of "4: exceptional."

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of students received a score of "3: acceptable" or higher in all sections of the disposition rubric. Between 74% and 94% of students received a score of "4: exceptional" on all components of the dispositions rubric.

**G 3: Candidates are Effective Educators who Impact Student Learning**
Candidates are effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the learning of their students.

**SLO 5: Candidates Use Effective Assessment and Reflection to Plan and Evaluate Instruction**
Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and reflection practices to plan effective instruction, evaluate processes and products, to monitor student learning.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Action Research Paper 2 Rubric**
Through an action research project, candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, evaluate processes and products, and monitor student learning. Candidates are evaluated via the Action Research Project rubric - 4700
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Achievement Target:**
100% of students will score at the "2: proficient" level or higher.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
All but one student scored "proficient" or higher in all aspects of the action research report. However, one student (out of 12) scored only "partially proficient" in three areas: literature review, research methods, and results. 100% of the students scored at the highest level of "exemplary" in the focus and rationale section of the paper. This is exciting, given that they were able to carefully articulate the reason behind their action research project. 11 out of 12 students also scored exemplary on the conclusions and recommendations portion of the paper, which is also very exciting. This part of the paper exemplifies students’ ability to critically analyze data through written reflection.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Focus on action research as a continual process of thinking/being in the classroom**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Although most of our students did well on the action research project, not everyone was at the proficient or partially proficient level. We plan to add more instruction related to action research in EDCI 4640, and talk specifically about how this action research process is a way of thinking/being in the classroom, not just a formal research plan to use once in teacher education courses.
**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Action Research Paper 2 Rubric  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Candidates Use Effective Assessment and Reflection to Plan and Evaluate Instruction

**Implementation Description:** Work more carefully with preservice teachers to help them understand action research as a way of thinking/being in the classroom. This instruction/discussion will take place in EDCI 4640.  
**Completion Date:** 04/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Instructor of EDCI 4640.

**Improved instruction related to action research**

Although most of our students did well on the action research project, not everyone was at the proficient or partially proficient level. We plan to add more instruction related to action research to EDRD 4600 and EDCI 4640 in order to help students better understand the importance of each required component of action research.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Action Research Paper 1 Rubric  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Candidates Plan, Implement, and Reflect on Instruction Methods

**Implementation Description:** The instructor of EDRD 4600 will devote one full class session and two partial class sessions to action research methods.  
**Completion Date:** 08/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** EDRD 4600 instructor.  

**Increased content in methods courses**

Although almost all of our preservice teachers were rated at a score of "3" or "adequately demonstrated" or higher in their content knowledge, not 100% of the students were rated at this level. In fact, approximately 26% of our preservice teachers received a "3" instead of a "4" or "effectively demonstrated" on pedagogical content knowledge as it relates to instructional methods and planning. Given this, our plan in the coming year is to increase content learning experiences in our methods courses within the BSE MLE program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Student Teaching Evaluation  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Candidates Demonstrates Knowledge in their Content Field

**Implementation Description:** The BSE MLE program coordinator will work with methods course instructors to add more content into the course syllabi.  
**Completion Date:** 04/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** BSE MLE program coordinator and BSE MLE methods course instructors.  

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A (see CTW report for BSE MLE)

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A (see CTW report for BSE MLE)

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A (see CTW report for BSE MLE)

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A (see CTW report for BSE MLE)

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We have decided to add to our assessment related to "Impact on Student Learning." Students will not only complete an action research project to measure their impact on student learning, but they will also submit a teacher work sample. This new teacher work sample measure, which includes analyzing pre and post assessments, writing unit plans, and reflecting on teaching, will more specifically focus on their impact on student learning.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Based on this year's assessment data, we will focus on two course changes. First, we will spend more time providing instruction related to teacher action research. We believe this is an important aspect of undergraduate education, but our students were struggling with literature reviews and data analysis. We will include more readings and instruction related to inquiry in several of our courses. Second, we will increase our focus on content in our preservice teacher methods courses. We anticipate that this will increase student first-time pass rates on GACE II exams.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
N/A

Detailed Assessment Report
2010-2011 Middle Level Education MEd

Mission / Purpose
The M.Ed. major in Middle Childhood Education provides for master’s level study in Middle Childhood Education and advanced content knowledge in English, Mathematics, Science, or Social Studies, and leads to T-5 certification in Middle Childhood Education (Grades 4-8). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge as well as pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing middle school students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content. The program’s underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in urban Middle Childhood education. The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; empowered to serve as change agents; committed to and respectful of all learners; and engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings

G 1: Candidates are experts in their knowledge of the content they teach.
1. Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach their subject to students in grades 4-8.

SLO 1: Candidates demonstrate superior content knowledge of the subjects they teach.
1. Candidates have depth and breadth of their content knowledge. They are able to provide an in-depth explanation of the importance for teaching each content area (the two areas in which the teacher is certified), including current thinking and research in the content areas. They give detailed explanations with examples cited to support contentions. (2) Candidates can clearly articulate and provides examples demonstrating how to plan and implement an interdisciplinary lesson and/or unit of study. In their portfolio, they provide a clear explanation with examples cited to support contentions.

Related Measures

M 1: Content Knowledge Rubric
MCE Advanced Masters Content Knowledge Rubric in MED MLE portfolio assessment: https://c1.livetext.com/doc/4879240#4879240
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100 % of candidates will score at a level of 4 (out of a possible score of 5) on this measure. At least 50% will score at a level 5.

Document:

- MED MLE COMPLETERS 2010_2011
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

Of the 3 completers, two (2) scored at a level 5 and one (1) scored at a level four. Thus, the target was fully met on this measure.

**G 2: Candidates have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to be successful middle school teachers.**

Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching students in grades 4-8.

**SLO 2: Candidates demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary for teaching middle school students.**

(1) Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the principles guiding assessment and instruction at the middle grades level and can clearly articulate the theoretical connections between using well planned assessments to guide instruction. Students provide artifacts that demonstrate how they have applied these principles in the classroom. (2) Candidates demonstrate knowledge of a wide variety of teaching, learning, and assessment strategies that are developmentally responsive, culturally sensitive, and technologically sound. Students provide artifacts that demonstrate how they have applied this understanding in the classroom. (3) Candidates clearly articulate the need for teaching higher order thinking skills and can demonstrate through their artifacts that they have implemented lessons at the classroom level which address this standard.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Teaching Performance Rubric**

MCE Advanced Masters Teaching Performance Rubric in student portfolio for MED Middle Level Education. Link to Rubric:

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of candidates will score at a level of 4 (out of a possible score of 5) on this measure. At least 50% will score at a level 5.

**Document:**

- MED MLE COMPLETERS 2010_2011

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**

This measure is divided into three domains: Principles of Instruction and Assessment: On this domain, two students scored at a level 5 and 1 student scored at a level 1. Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Strategies: On this domain, one student scored at a level 5 and two students scored at a level 4. Integrated Higher Order Thinking Skills: On this domain, three students scored at a level 5. Overall, the target was met. However, on the domain of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Strategies, the target was partially met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Focus on teaching strategies**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

Given that the target for "Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Strategies" was only partially met, we will focus our efforts on i...

**SLO 3: Candidates demonstrate the dispositions necessary to be successful middle school teachers.**

Candidates demonstrate the five dispositions necessary to work successfully with middle level students, colleagues, and other education professionals. (1) EMPATHY: Sees and accepts others’ points of view; bases communication on learner’s point of view; believes in establishing rapport with learner; respects perspective of the learner. (2) POSITIVE VIEW OF OTHERS: Believes in the
worth, ability and potential of others; trusts learner’s capacity for change; believes others can and will rather than can’t or won’t. (3) **POSITIVE VIEW OF SELF:** Believes in the worth, ability and potential of self; possesses a fundamentally positive sense of self-adequacy, capability and dependability; has positive expectations of self. (4) **AUTHENTICITY:** Able to be open and genuine; self-discloses and melds personal uniqueness with culturally responsive interactions; does not feel one must play a role to be effective. (5) **MEANINGFUL PURPOSE AND VISION:** Focused on the long range; is visionary and reflective as a professional; commits to growth for all learners; cares about what is really important

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Dispositions Rubric**

Five Dispositions of Highly Effective Educators - Endpoint of program: Link to Rubric This rubric is used to assess all students in the College of Education/College of Arts and Sciences Professional Education Unit.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Document:**

- **DISPOSITIONS ASSESSMENT**

**Achievement Target:**

100% of candidates will score at a level of 3 (Acceptable) out of a possible score of 4 on all five elements for this measure. At least 50% will score at a level 4 (Exceptional) on at least 3 out of 5 elements.

**Document:**

- **MED MLE Dispositions Data 2010-2011**

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

The target was met. 100% of completers scored at a level 3 or higher on all elements (see attached data table), meeting the first part of the target. For the domains of Positive View of Others, Positive View of Self, and Meaningful Purpose and Vision, at least 50% scored exceptional (67%, 100%, and 100%, respectively).

**G 3: Candidates are effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on student learning.**

Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the learning of their students in middle level classrooms.

**SLO 4: Candidates demonstrate the ability to make a positive impact on student learning.**

Candidates can illustrate how assessment results are compared, contrasted, and analyzed to plan and revise effective instruction for the student within an assessment/instruction cycle. Meaningful interpretations and appropriate conclusions are determined based on a range of data collected. Analysis of student learning includes clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the literacy achievement of the target student.

**Related Measures**

**M 4: Impact on Student Learning Rubric**

Rubric to evaluate student's impact on student learning - in MED Middle Level Education Portfolio Assessment: Link to rubric

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of candidates will score at a level of 4 (out of a possible score of 5) on this measure. At least 50% will score at a level 5.

**Document:**
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
For the measure of Impact on Student Learning, two students scored at a level 5 and one student scored at a level 4.

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Recommend Deactivation of Program
The MED for Middle Childhood Education has been an underenrolled program for several years. Enrollment dropped even more when the Bachelor of Science in Middle Childhood Education, from which some of the MED students came, was phased out in December 2006. Currently, there are only five students who are actively enrolled. In order to use faculty resources in programs that serve a larger population of students, the program faculty are recommending that the MED program in Middle Childhood Education be deactivated. Faculty will fully support the remaining five students until completion of their degree requirements or until the program is deactivated in December 2011.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The faculty will recommend that the program be deactivated by December 2011. This should give current students ample time to complete their degree requirements.
Completion Date: 11/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Program Coordinator: Dr. Stephanie Behm Cross Department Associate Chair: Dr. Mary Ariail
Additional Resources: N/A
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Program Deactivation
The MED for Middle Childhood Education has been an underenrolled program for several years. Enrollment dropped even more when the Bachelor of Science in Middle Childhood Education, from which some of the MED students came, was phased out in December 2006. Currently, there are only five students who are actively enrolled. In order to use faculty resources in programs that serve a larger population of students, the program faculty are recommending that the MED program in Middle Childhood Education be deactivated. Faculty will fully support the remaining five students until completion of their degree requirements or until the program is deactivated in December 2011.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Focus on teaching strategies
Given that the target for “Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Strategies” was only partially met, we will focus our efforts on increasing students’ abilities in this area. We will make sure to include more readings and discussions focused on teaching and assessment strategies in the required course EDCI 7400: Curriculum Issues in Middle Level Education. In class discussions and readings will be purposefully connected with reflections on current teaching practices.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Teaching Performance Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Candidates demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary for teaching middle school students.
Implementation Description: Course will be redesigned to include more focus on teaching, learning, and assessment strategies.

Completion Date: 04/2012

Responsible Person/Group: Stephanie Behm Cross

Additional Resources: None

Budget Amount Requested: 0

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

No changes were made in the assessment process. This is because this program will be deactivated in Fall 2011.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

This program will be deactivated in Fall 2011. Despite this, we are still devoted to offering courses in this program until all students graduate. Based on the assessment results, we have decided to focus on adding more readings and discussions related to assessment and teaching/learning strategies into our required course, EDCI 7400.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Detailed Assessment Report
2010-2011 Reading Specialist (p-12) MEd

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Master of Education RLL Reading Specialist is to prepare educators to become reading specialists who are informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice.

Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings

G 1: G1: Content Knowledge
Candidates are informed educators who have a strong knowledge of the content needed to teach literacy.

SLO 1: History of Literacy
Candidates are knowledgeable of literacy research and histories of literacy development.

Related Measures
M 1: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History
Candidates demonstrate their understanding of the history of literacy research in the Content Knowledge portion of their video portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target: Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
100% of the students received a 4.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

video refinement
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
MEd Reading Specialists candidates do well on the video portfolio. However, as the video portfolio becomes more established we a...

SLO 2: Foundations of Reading and Writing
Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

Related Measures
M 2: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations
Candidates demonstrate their understanding of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological foundations of literacy processes and instruction in the Content Knowledge portion of their video portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target: Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric. Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
66% of the students received a 4, 33% of the students received a 5

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Redesigned Portfolio**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2008-2009  
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

**video refinement**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2010-2011  
MEd Reading Specialists candidates do well on the video portfolio. However, as the video portfolio becomes more established we a...

**G 2: Planning and Teaching Performance**
G 2: Candidates are professional educators with pedagogical knowledge and dispositions needed to design culturally responsive learning spaces.

**SLO 3: SBRR**
Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the SBRR principles (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) as related to literacy development.

**Related Measures**
**M 3: Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBRR**
Candidates demonstrate their understanding of the SBRR principles and provide supporting evidence from their program in the Planning and Teaching Performance portion of their video portfolio.  
*Source of Evidence*: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work  
*Achievement Target*:  
Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.  
*Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met*  
50% of the students received a 4, 50% of the students received a 5

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Redesigned Portfolio**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2008-2009  
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

**video refinement**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2010-2011  
MEd Reading Specialists candidates do well on the video portfolio. However, as the video portfolio becomes more established we a...

**SLO 4: Planning and Teaching Performance**
Candidates create a literate environment that fosters literacy by integrating foundational knowledge, use of instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.

**Related Measures**
**M 4: Portfolio Rating Standard 4: Literate Environments**
Candidates demonstrate their understanding how to integrate knowledge and dispositions of instructional practices, curricular materials, assessment and evaluation to create a
literate environment that fosters literacy in the Planning and Teaching Performance portion of their video portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
66% of the students received a 4, 33% of the students received a 5

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Redesigned Portfolio**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

**video refinement**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
MEd Reading Specialists candidates do well on the video portfolio. However, as the video portfolio becomes more established we a...

**SLO 5: Range of Curricular Materials**
Candidates use a wide range of curricular materials in effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of literacy development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials**
Candidates demonstrate their understanding of the range of curricular materials for providing effective literacy instruction for learners at different stages of literacy development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds in the Planning and Teaching Performance portion of their video portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
66% of the students received a 4, 33% of the students received a 5

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Redesigned Portfolio**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

**video refinement**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
MEd Reading Specialists candidates do well on the video portfolio. However, as the video portfolio becomes more established we a...

**SLO 6: Professional Development**
Candidates view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility.

**Related Measures**

**M 6: Portfolio Rating Standard 6: Prof Dev**
Candidates demonstrate their understanding of how to view professional development as a career-long effort and responsibility in the Planning and Teaching Performance portion of their video portfolio.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
66% of the students received a 4, 33% of the students received a 5

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Redesigned Portfolio**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

**video refinement**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
MEd Reading Specialists candidates do well on the video portfolio. However, as the video portfolio becomes more established we a...

**SLO 8: Evaluate Practice**
Candidates work with colleagues to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other’s practice.

**Related Measures**
**M 8: Portfolio Rating Standard 8: Evaluate Practice**
Candidates demonstrate their understanding how to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other’s practice in the Planning and Teaching Performance portion of their video portfolio.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
66% of the students received a 4, 33% of the students received a 5

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Redesigned Portfolio**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

**video refinement**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
MEd Reading Specialists candidates do well on the video portfolio. However, as the video portfolio becomes more established we a...

**G 3: G3: Impact on Students**
G 3: Candidates are effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the reading development of their students.

**SLO 7: Impact on Students**
Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction.
Related Measures

M 7: Portfolio Rating Standard 7: Assessment
Candidates demonstrate their understanding how to use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction in the Impact on Students portion of their video portfolio.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
Students will average 4 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
66% of the students received a 4, 33% of the students received a 5

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Redesigned Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the ...

video refinement
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
MEd Reading Specialists candidates do well on the video portfolio. However, as the video portfolio becomes more established we a...

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Redesigned Portfolio
Portfolio will be re-designed with professional standards aligned with courses.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lori Elliott
Additional Resources: nono
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Redesigned Portfolio
The MEd faculty are in the process of redesigning the exit portfolio for the MEd students. The framework will be drawn from the 2010 International Reading Standards for reading specialists. Students will create a video document that provides opportunities for synthesis and analysis of the reading process, diagnosis, and instructional decision making.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History | Outcome/Objective: History of Literacy
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations | Outcome/Objective: Foundations of Reading and Writing
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBRR | Outcome/Objective: SBRR
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 4: Literate Environments | Outcome/Objective: Planning and Teaching Performance
- Measure: Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials | Outcome/Objective: Range of Curricular Materials
**Video Portfolio**

The MEd students currently submit video portfolios that are based on the IRA standards (2004). There are new standards (2010) that will be utilized in the future based on acceptance from the PSC. Candidates continue to refine their process and create video portfolios that demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the reading process, instructional practices, and assessments.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Completion Date:** 08/2012

**video refinement**

MEd Reading Specialists candidates do well on the video portfolio. However, as the video portfolio becomes more established we are going to require candidates to demonstrate more synthesis across the standards so that it is clear to the viewer that the candidate has a deep knowledge of the reading/writing process, how to design and implement strategies based on this knowledge, and how to effectively assess children's literacy progress. Additionally, with future changes to the program to better reflect the trends in the field, the candidate will also add information related to home/community literacy practices and response to intervention information to their video presentation.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Portfolio Rating Standard 1: History | **Outcome/Objective:** History of Literacy
- **Measure:** Portfolio Rating Standard 2: Foundations | **Outcome/Objective:** Foundations of Reading and Writing
- **Measure:** Portfolio Rating Standard 3: SBRR | **Outcome/Objective:** SBRR
- **Measure:** Portfolio Rating Standard 4: Literate Environments | **Outcome/Objective:** Planning and Teaching Performance
- **Measure:** Portfolio Rating Standard 5: Curricular Materials | **Outcome/Objective:** Range of Curricular Materials
- **Measure:** Portfolio Rating Standard 6: Prof Dev | **Outcome/Objective:** Professional Development
- **Measure:** Portfolio Rating Standard 7: Assessment | **Outcome/Objective:** Impact on Students
- **Measure:** Portfolio Rating Standard 8: Evaluate Practice | **Outcome/Objective:** Evaluate Practice

**Implementation Description:** Candidates will be instructed to synthesize across their coursework to complete the video portfolio  
**Completion Date:** 08/2012
### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

#### CTW Reflection 1: Achievements
What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

#### CTW Reflection 2: Assessment
What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

#### CTW Reflection 3: Needs
What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

#### CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection
What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

### ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The MEd Reading faculty meet on a regular basis to discuss the direction of the MEd reading specialist program. There have been no changes in how we assess the students. The students, however, continue to refine their process of creating the portfolio. We have a large number of sample videos that students may view as they begin to create their own. In the upcoming year, the MEd Reading faculty will begin to consider how to update the program to better reflect trends in the field. This will necessitate a change in learning outcomes and objectives, which will also change the rubric for the video portfolio.

### ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The MEd Reading faculty meet on a regular basis to discuss the direction of the MEd reading specialist program. Through the assessment of the students' video portfolios we are considering redesigning the coursework to better reflect the current trends in the field. There will be greater attention to issues related to community and home literacies, as well as digital literacies, thereby impacting the standards and rubric that will be used to assess students’ understandings.

### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

### ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
Mission / Purpose

The Ed.S. in Reading is designed to provide students the in-depth theoretical and applied knowledge needed to excel in school, district, and state level positions in literacy curriculum.

Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings

G 1: Content knowledge
EdS candidates are informed educators who have a strong knowledge of the content needed to teach literacy.

SLO 1: Knowledge of the field
Knowledge of the Field of Literacy: Reading-Language Arts. Accomplished Early and Middle Childhood/Literacy: Reading–Language Arts teachers know and understand current literature and theories about reading–language arts. They evaluate this knowledge and use it in their instructional practice.

Related Measures

M 1: Knowledge of field
EdS candidates will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the field of literacy development and instruction in the content area of their portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100 % of the students scored a 4; with 50% of them scoring a 5.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Portfolio

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The EdS students complete a portfolio that demonstrates their knowledge and competence in literacy development. The program is b...

G 2: Teaching Performance
EdS candidates have pedagogical knowledge and dispositions to effectively teach literacy practices as well as provide coaching/leadership in the area of literacy development.

SLO 2: Continued development
Candidates constantly seek to improve their knowledge and practice through a continuing process of professional reading, writing, dialogue, inquiry, and reflection.

Related Measures

M 2: Continued development
EdS candidates demonstrate their ability to improve their practice through a continuing process of professional reading, writing, dialogue, inquiry, and reflection in the teaching performance section of the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher, with 25% of them scoring a 5.

SLO 3: Reciprocal nature of literacy development
Candidates understand the reciprocal nature of the literacy processes of reading, writing, listening, speaking, and viewing, and they provide developmentally appropriate learning activities that integrate among the language arts and across the curriculum.

Related Measures
M 3: Reciprocal nature of literacy development
EdS candidates demonstrate their understanding of the reciprocal nature of the literacy processes of reading, writing, listening, speaking, and viewing, and they provide developmentally appropriate learning activities that integrate among the language arts and across the curriculum as evidenced in the teaching performance section of the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher; with 25% of them scoring a 5

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The EdS students complete a portfolio that demonstrates their knowledge and competence in literacy development. The program is b...

G 3: Impact on Students
EdS candidates are effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the reading development of their students.

SLO 4: Lifelong learning and effective instruction
Candidates use their knowledge of reading processes, language development, texts, and ongoing assessment to advance literacy, develop strategic readers, promote an appreciation of reading as vital to lifelong learning, and create effective instruction so that readers can negotiate, inquire about, and construct meaning across the curriculum.

Related Measures
M 4: Lifelong learning and effective instruction
EdS candidates use their knowledge of reading processes, language development, texts, and ongoing assessment to advance literacy, develop strategic readers, promote an appreciation of reading as vital to lifelong learning, and create effective instruction so that readers can negotiate, inquire about, and construct meaning across the curriculum as evidenced in the impact on student learning section of the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher, with 25% of them scoring a 5

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The EdS students complete a portfolio that demonstrates their knowledge and competence in literacy development. The program is b...

**SLO 5: Knowledge of writing**
Candidates use their knowledge of writing processes, language development, writing development, and ongoing assessment to provide instruction in the components of writing, assist students in constructing meaning in their written work, and provide genuine opportunities for students to write for a variety of purposes and audiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Knowledge of writing**
EdS candidates use their knowledge of writing processes, language development, writing development, and ongoing assessment to provide instruction in the components of writing, assist students in constructing meaning in their written work, and provide genuine opportunities for students to write for a variety of purposes and audiences as evidenced in the impact on student section of the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher, with 25% scoring a 5

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Portfolio**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
The EdS students complete a portfolio that demonstrates their knowledge and competence in literacy development. The program is b...

**SLO 6: Knowledge of oral language**
Candidates know, value, and teach oral language development and listening and speaking skills as essential components of literacy, and they provide opportunities for students to listen and speak for a variety of purposes and audiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 6: Knowledge of oral language**
EdS candidates know, value, and teach oral language development and listening and speaking skills as essential components of literacy, and they provide opportunities for students to listen and speak for a variety of purposes and audiences as evidenced in the impact on student learning section of the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher, with 25% scoring a 5

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Portfolio**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
The EdS students complete a portfolio that demonstrates their knowledge and competence in literacy development. The program is b...
SLO 7: Knowledge of viewing
Candidates know, value, and teach viewing as an essential component of literacy. They use a wide variety of print and nonprint resources to develop students' viewing and visual-representation skills.

Related Measures
M 7: Knowledge of viewing
EdS candidates know, value, and teach viewing as an essential component of literacy. They use a wide variety of print and nonprint resources to develop students' viewing and visual-representation skills as evidenced by the impact on student learning section of the portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
Students will average 4.0 or higher, with 25% of students scoring a 5 and no more than 10% of students scoring a 3 or lower when measured on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
100% of the students scored a 4.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Portfolio
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The EdS students complete a portfolio that demonstrates their knowledge and competence in literacy development. The program is b...

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Portfolio
The EdS students complete a portfolio that demonstrates their knowledge and competence in literacy development. The program is being phased out so there are no substantive changes in the way the portfolio is designed or how students go about completing the requirements for the portfolio.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Knowledge of field | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of the field
- Measure: Knowledge of oral language | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of oral language
- Measure: Knowledge of viewing | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of viewing
- Measure: Knowledge of writing | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of writing
- Measure: Lifelong learning and effective instruction | Outcome/Objective: Lifelong learning and effective instruction
- Measure: Reciprocal nature of literacy development | Outcome/Objective: Reciprocal nature of literacy development

Implementation Description: To continue supporting students in the program, there are planned advising sessions that review the requirements.
Completion Date: 08/2012

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A
CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

The EdS Reading Specialist program has not undergone any substantive changes in the assessment process. The current students are aware of and knowledgeable about the standards and rubric for the portfolio. The program is being phased out.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The number of students pursuing the EdS degree has declined in recent years, thereby prompting a decision to phase the degree and program out. No changes are planned in courses or sequence of courses at this time.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1: Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2: What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3: What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

Detailed Assessment Report
2010-2011 Reading, Language, Literacy (ESOL) Online TEEMS MAT

Mission / Purpose

Note: This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy ESOL - Online MAT Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). The M.A.T. major in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education provides initial teacher preparation in ESOL for individuals holding bachelor’s degree and who have an interest in English to speakers of other languages in K-12 settings. The Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) enables ESOL paraprofessional or provisional teachers to earn initial certification. The course of study meets the requirements for professional certification at the initial level in ESOL and
the requirements for a Reading Endorsement. The M.A.T. teacher education program for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) is one of the five distance learning programs and two non-degree endorsements offered by the College of Education at Georgia State University through Georgia OnmyLine (GOML). Georgia ONmyLINE provides access to a full array of online and distance education offerings from the 35 colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. This M.A.T. in Reading, Language and Literacy Education (ESOL) at Georgia State University ("GSU") is a collaborative program between GSU, Valdosta State University ("VSU"), and North Georgia College and State University ("NGCSU"), institutions of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. In this online program, we strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings

**G 1: Content Knowledge**
Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach English to Speakers of Other Languages in grades PreK-12.

**SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge**
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to language acquisition and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition (Goal 1). (Key Assessment - Content Knowledge: GACE II scores and Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric Overall Assessment Score for Content Curriculum).

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Content Knowledge via Coursework**
Final Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Section on Overall Assessment Score for Content Curriculum (EDCI 7680)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of candidates in 2010-11 scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. M.A.T. Content Knowledge (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates can discuss the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to the nature and acquisition of language; discuss how this knowledge has aided you in the creation of learning environments that support the language and literacy development and content area achievement of ELLs, and demonstrate the impact of pedagogy informed by our current and
historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition on the linguistic, literacy, and content area achievement of ELLs (both individuals and groups) through the inclusion of student work. 2 1 Candidates are knowledgeable about the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture and cultural groups and the ways in which you use those theories to construct learning environments that support ESOL students’ cultural identities, language and literacy development and content area achievement. 2 1

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Improving content knowledge**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a high...  

**M 7: Content Knowledge: GACE II Scores**
Candidate performance on GACE tests for English to Speakers of Other Languages (forms 119 and 120). * Data for students who pursued a certification only is included.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Achievement Target:**
100% of candidates will pass the GACE 1 and 2 tests by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100 percent of the candidates passed the GACE tests. See table below: M.A.T. Content Knowledge.GACE (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Pass Fail English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Test I 3 English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Test II 3

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**improving content knowledge.GACE**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a high...  

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**
Candidates create learning environments which support ESOL students’ cultural identities, language and literacy development, and content area achievement through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials; view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities; and advocate for ESOL students and their families (Goal 2). (Key Assessment-Planning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction); Key Assessment- Clinical Practice: Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument and Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric)

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Planning Performance**
Teacher Work Sample rubric: Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction (EDCI 7680).
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction). These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) M.A.T. Planning performance (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have demonstrated the ability to plan for lessons for learners of English as a second language. 2 1

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

improving planning
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a hig...

M 3: Clinical Practice at Midpoint
Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (EDCI 7660)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the midpoint of the practicum internship.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher). M.A.T. clinical practice at midpoint (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have successfully taught ESOL students while utilizing ESOL pedagogy and approaches acquired in the courses at the midpoint of their coursework. 2 1

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

improving clinical practice
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a h...

SLO 3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision (Goal 2). (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

Related Measures
M 5: Dispositions
Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric. These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of the candidates scored at the proficient level or higher (score 4). M.A.T. Dispositions (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates believe in the worth, ability and potential of others; trust learner’s capacity for change; believe others can and will rather than can’t or won’t.
Candidates believe in the worth, ability and potential of self; possess a fundamentally positive sense of self-adequacy, capability and dependability; have positive expectations of self. 

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**improving dispositions**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a high... 

**G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions**
Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages in Grades PreK-12.

**SLO 3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions**
Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision (Goal 2). (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Dispositions**
Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric. These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of the candidates scored at the proficient level or higher (score 4). M.A.T. Dispositions (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates believe in the worth, ability and potential of others; trust learner's capacity for change; believe others can and will rather than can't or won't. Candidates believe in the worth, ability and potential of self; possess a fundamentally positive sense of self-adequacy, capability and dependability; have positive expectations of self. 

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**improving dispositions**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a high... 

**G 3: Impact on student learning**
Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English to Speakers of Other Languages learning of their students.

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**
Candidates create learning environments which support ESOL students’ cultural identities, language and literacy development, and content area achievement through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials; view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities; and advocate for ESOL students and their families (Goal 2). (Key Assessment-Planning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals,
**Related Measures**

**M 2: Planning Performance**
Teacher Work Sample rubric: Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction (EDCI 7680).
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction). These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher). M.A.T. Planning performance (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have demonstrated the ability to plan for lessons for learners of English as a second language. 2 1

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**improving planning**

*Established in Cycle*: 2010-2011
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a hig...

**M 3: Clinical Practice at Midpoint**
Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (EDCI 7660)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the midpoint of the practicum internship.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher). M.A.T. clinical practice at midpoint (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have successfully taught ESOL students while utilizing ESOL pedagogy and approaches acquired in the courses at the midpoint of their coursework. 2 1

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**improving clinical practice**

*Established in Cycle*: 2010-2011
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a h...

**SLO 4: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students**
Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning. (Goal 3) (Key Assessment - Impact on Student Learning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning)
Related Measures

**M 4: Clinical Practice at Endpoint**
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (EDCI 7680)
Source of Evidence: Professional standards

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of the candidates scored at the proficient level. (4 or higher) M.A.T. clinical practice at endpoint (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have successfully taught ESOL students while utilizing ESOL pedagogy and approaches acquired in the courses at the end of the program. 2 1

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**improving clinical practice at endpoint**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a h...

**M 6: Effects on P-12 Student Learning**
Teacher Work Sample rubric: Section on Analysis of Student Learning (EDCI 7680).
Source of Evidence: External report

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning as shown on their scores of the Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning). This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of the candidates scored at the proficient level (4 or higher). M.A.T. Effects on P-12 Student Learning (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have made impact on the P-12 ESOL students’ learning. 2 1

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**improving effects on P-12 student learning**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a h...

**Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Portfolio support**
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: 0
Portfolio support
We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
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Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 09/2010
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We will work with those students who will be completing their portfolios throughout the upcoming year of data collection.
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**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
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**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Time for complete implementation  
**Completion Date:** 09/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources:** 0  
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**Strengthening Professional Standard**
Compared to other standards in the portfolio, the reading endorsement standard 10, "students view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility" has been ranked the lowest. This result indicates that students need to be better prepared to address this standard in the course work as well as in the program. Therefore, the coordinator of the program will communicate with each of the students and course instructors to encourage the students to participate in various professional development opportunities and to document their activities throughout the program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi

**improving clinical practice**
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their teaching performance. This means that candidates' teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Clinical Practice at Midpoint  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills

**Implementation Description:** Candidates' teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

**Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

**improving clinical practice at endpoint**
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their teaching performance. This means that candidates' teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure: Clinical Practice at Endpoint | Outcome/Objective: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students

Implementation Description: Candidates' teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

Improving content knowledge

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in this content knowledge. This means that we set our expectations from the outset clearly and we maintain closer monitoring of candidates' obtaining content knowledge.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Content Knowledge via Coursework | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge

Implementation Description: As we were successful in attaining this target, we will continue with our implementation plan of effective monitoring of our students and effective teaching.

Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & MSIT Faculty

Improving content knowledge.GACE

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their GACE scores. This means that candidates' content knowledge learning is monitored through course work and additional support to prepare for the tests is provided in their last semester of the program by the program coordinator.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Content Knowledge: GACE II Scores | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge

Implementation Description: Candidates' content knowledge learning is monitored through course work and additional support to prepare for the tests is provided in their last semester of the program by the program coordinator.

Completion Date: 06/2012
Additional Resources: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

Improving dispositions

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving dispositions. This means that expectations are clearly stated and delivered to the candidates at the outset and their work is consistently monitored throughout the program.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
### Measure: Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions

**Implementation Description:** Expectations are clearly stated and delivered to the candidates at the outset and candidates’ work is consistently monitored throughout the program by the program coordinator.

**Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

*improving effects on P-12 student learning*

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their impact on learners’ learning. This means that candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

### Measure: Effects on P-12 Student Learning | Outcome/Objective: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students

**Implementation Description:** Candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teacher.

**Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

*improving planning*

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving planning. This means that candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

### Measure: Planning Performance | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills

**Implementation Description:** Candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work and through internship, which will be supervised by the university supervisor and the mentor teachers.

**Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1:** Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

Content knowledge has been strengthened as a result of close monitoring of students’ work in the courses and in the program.
CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class? 
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas? 
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report? 
N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year? 
N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain. 
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result? 
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)? 
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate? 
N/A

**Detailed Assessment Report 2010-2011 Reading, Language, Literacy (ESOL) MEd**

**Mission / Purpose**

This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy M.Ed. Degree with ESOL Concentration. The mission for the major in reading, language, and literacy program is to provide educators with a master’s level study of literacy processes and literacy instruction for culturally diverse learners with specialization in one of three options: reading instruction, early literacy, or teaching. English as a second language. Our purpose is to develop teachers as critical inquirers in multicultural, urban settings. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.
In our department, Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice.

We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity and social justice where individuals have access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge for the greater good.

**Goals without Outcome/Objective Relationships Specified**

**G 2: Promote Student Language and Literacy Development**
Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will apply the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to planning, managing, and evaluating instruction to promote student language and literacy development.

**Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**

**G 1: Become a Subject and Pedagogical Knowledge Expert**
Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will become experts in Reading, Language, Literacy and the Early Literacy and/or ESOL subject disciplines.

**SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading**
Candidates are knowledgeable about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension (SBRR principles).

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading**
100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced" rating on this standard. While the majority of our students met this standard, three failed to do so.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
One hundred percent (100%) will score at the Proficient or Advanced level on this standard.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of our candidates achieved this target. Three of the four graduates attained "advanced" with one student gaining "proficiency." The average of the scores attained is 4.75.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate standard

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures....

Goal partially met more monitoring will be done of weak students
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to bet...

More support for weak students
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to bet...

**Weak students will be monitored closely.**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
While the majority of our students met all the goals there was still a small number who lagged behind in meeting the highest sta...

**Continue monitoring student progress and effective implementation strategies.**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
As we have been successful with our past implementation plan of effective teaching and monitoring of students' progress, we wil...

**Continue with the implementaiton of effective teaching and monitoring of all students.**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Our implementation of higher standards, good monitoring, focussed and effective teaching with pertinent assignments have helped ...

**Greater clarity in our expectations from the outset and closer monitoring of this standard.**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a hig...

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL**
Candidates will understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and acquisition of language learning and teaching.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL**
100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced " rating on this standard. The majority of our students met this standard while 2 achieved passing.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
100% of our candidates will achieve advance or proficient levels in this standard.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of our candidates attained this target. 50% of the teachers achieved "advanced" and 50% "proficient." With an average score of 4.6 more students are leaning toward "advanced."

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measure...

**More support for weak students**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to bet...

**SLO 3: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture**
Candidates will understand the major concepts, theories, and research related to culture, language teaching and learning.

**Related Measures**
M 3: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture
100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced" rating on this standard.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of our students will achieve an advance or proficient on this standard.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of our students attained this target. 50% of our students attained "advanced" and 50%
attained "proficiency." With the average score of 4.6 most of our students are leaning toward
"advanced."

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level
in our assessment measures.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories
of our assessment measure...

More support for weak students
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the
duration of the program to bet...

Continue our plan of effective monitoring and teaching.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
As we were successful in attaining this target, we will continue with our implementation plan of
effective monitoring of our stu...

G 3: Become Reflective Practitioners
Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will think critically and reflectively about his/her practice
and develop appropriate dispositions with learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

SLO 5: Demonstrate Advocacy on Behalf of Learners
Candidates will demonstrate a disposition indicating that teachers should reflect on, support and
advocate for ESOL students and their families and work collaboratively to improve their learning
environment.

Related Measures
M 5: Achievement of Reflective Action
100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced" rating on this standard.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of our students will achieve an advanced or proficient on this standard.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of our students attained this target. This portfolio continues to be the strongest standard for
our students. This year shows that of all the standards, this one attained the highest overal average
of 4.75. Three of our students attained "advanced" and one attained, "proficiency."

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level
in our assessment measures.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories
of our assessment measure...
**Goals and Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**G 4: Become Members of Professional Communities**
Students in the RLL MEd (ESOL) program will become members of one or more professional learning communities.

**O/O 6: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities**
Candidates are members of various learning and professional communities and organizations. Candidates will collaborate with and are prepared to serve as a resource to all staff, including paraprofessionals, to improve learning for all ESOL students.

**Related Measures**

**M 6: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership**
100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced " rating on this standard. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
100% of our students will achieve an advanced or proficient on this standard.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of our students attained this target. 50% of our students attained "advanced" and 50% attained "proficient."

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.

*Established in Cycle:* 2008-2009

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measure...

**More support for weak students through close monitoring.**

*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010

We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to bet...

**Continue to provide additional opportunities for students to develop in this area.**

*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011

As all our students met this target, we will continue to monitor and provide additional opportunities for our students to demons...

**Other Outcome/Objective, without Goals, along with Any Associations and Related Goals, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**

**O/O 4: Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development**
Candidates will know, manage, and implement a variety of standards-based teaching strategies and techniques for developing and integrating English listening, speaking, reading and writing, and for accessing the core curriculum. Candidates will support ESOL students in accessing the core curriculum as they learn language and academic content together.

**Related Measures**

**M 4: Achievement of Instructional Practices**
100% of our candidates will achieve a "proficient" or "advanced " rating on this standard. Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
100% of our students will achieve an advanced or proficient on this standard.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% of our students met this target. However, for this year’s reporting, this target attained the weakest average score of 4.25 with three students achieving "proficient" and only one student attaining "advanced."

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measure...

**More support for weak students**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to bet...

**Continue effective monitoring and implementation of this target.**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
We will continue with the current design of our program, continue updating and strengthening so that our students continue to sh...

**Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**
For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture
- **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture

**Implementation Description:** These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.
**Completion Date:** 07/2010
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL
**Additional Resources:** All ESOL faculty
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.

**Completion Date:** 07/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL

**Additional Resources:** All ESOL faculty

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.**

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Achievement of Reflective Action | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Advocacy on Behalf of Learners

**Implementation Description:** These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.

**Completion Date:** 07/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL

**Additional Resources:** All ESOL faculty

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.**

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Achievement of Instructional Practices | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development

**Implementation Description:** These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.

**Completion Date:** 07/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL

**Additional Resources:** All ESOL faculty

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures.**
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Achievement of Professional Communities Membership  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities

**Implementation Description:** These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.  
**Completion Date:** 07/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL  
**Additional Resources:** All ESOL faculty  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

For all candidates to attain above intermediate and for the majority to attain the highest level in our assessment measures8

In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL

**Implementation Description:** These standards are set for the new cohort who will begin with us in August, 2010.  
**Completion Date:** 07/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator, MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator MAT-ESOL  
**Additional Resources:** All ESOL faculty  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

For all candidates to attain above intermediate standard

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

**Completion Date:** 07/2010

The majority of our candidates will attain the highest level in our assessment measures
In today's world teachers of English Language Learners need to be highly qualified in all categories of our assessment measures. Therefore we will strive for the majority of our candidates to reach the highest level in our work. While the median is acceptable we will raise the bar to indicate how strongly we feel about highly qualified teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

**Implementation Description:** One year from this date we hope for the majority our new cohort to attain this level of "highly qualified."

**Completion Date:** 07/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator of our MAT-ESOL.  
**Additional Resources:** All ESOL faculty.  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0  

*Goal partially met more monitoring will be done of weak students*

We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

**Implementation Description:** More support from the onset of the program

**Completion Date:** 05/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** ESOL Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** nil  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0  

*More support for weak students*

We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in ESOL  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL

**Implementation Description:** We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

**Completion Date:** 05/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** ESOL faculty  
**Additional Resources:** nil
Budget Amount Requested: 0

**More support for weak students**
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* Medium  
*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*

- **Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

**Implementation Description:** We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

*Completion Date:* 05/2011  
*Responsible Person/Group:* ESOL Faculty  
*Additional Resources:* nil  
*Budget Amount Requested:* 0

**More support for weak students**
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* Medium  
*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*

- **Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture

**Implementation Description:** We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

*Completion Date:* 05/2011  
*Responsible Person/Group:* ESOL Faculty  
*Additional Resources:* nil  
*Budget Amount Requested:* 0

**More support for weak students**
We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* Medium  
*Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):*

- **Measure:** Achievement of Instructional Practices  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development

**Implementation Description:** We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

*Completion Date:* 05/2011  
*Responsible Person/Group:* ESOL Faculty  
*Additional Resources:* nil
More support for weak students through close monitoring.

We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership  
  **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities

Implementation Description: We will provide more support for weaker students from the onset of their course work and over the duration of the program to better enable them to meet this standard.

Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL Faculty
Additional Resources: nil

Weak students will be monitored closely.

While the majority of our students met all the goals there was still a small number who lagged behind in meeting the highest standard possible. The action plan calls for closer monitoring and more support offered so that these students too might excel.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading  
  **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: There will be close tracking of students who appear to be lagging behind in submitting and completing coursework. Students who also do not achieve high standards in their course work will be given more support to complete submissions at a higher standard.

Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: ESOL faculty
Additional Resources: NA

Continue effective monitoring and implementation of this target.

We will continue with the current design of our program, continue updating and strengthening so that our students continue to shine in advocating for their learners and parents.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Achievement of Instructional Practices  
  **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate Student Language Literacy Development

Implementation Description: Continue monitoring and effective implementation plan.
Responsible Person/Group: Gertrude Tinker Sachs and MSIT faculty.
Additional Resources: Nil
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Amount Requested:</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continue monitoring student progress and effective implementation strategies.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As we have been successful with our past implementation plan of effective teaching and monitoring of students' progress, we will continue with this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established in Cycle:</strong></td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status:</strong></td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Relationships (Measure</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective):**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Description:</strong></td>
<td>Continue monitoring student progress and effective implementation strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Person/Group:</strong></td>
<td>Gertrude Tinker Sachs and MSIT faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Resources:</strong></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Amount Requested:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Continue our plan of effective monitoring and teaching.** |  |
| As we were successful in attaining this target, we will continue with our implementation plan of effective monitoring of our students and effective teaching. |  |
| **Established in Cycle:** | 2010-2011 |
| **Implementation Status:** | In-Progress |
| **Priority:** | Medium |
| **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):** |  |
| - Measure: Achievement of Content Knowledge in Culture |  |
| Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Culture |  |
| **Implementation Description:** | Continue our plan of effective monitoring and teaching. |
| **Responsible Person/Group:** | Gertrude Tinker Sachs and MSIT faculty. |
| **Additional Resources:** | Nil |
| **Budget Amount Requested:** | 0 |

| **Continue to provide additional opportunities for students to develop in this area.** |  |
| As all our students met this target, we will continue to monitor and provide additional opportunities for our students to demonstrate leadership in their professionalism through presenting at conferences and at in-school events and seeking publications for their writing. |  |
| **Established in Cycle:** | 2010-2011 |
| **Implementation Status:** | In-Progress |
| **Priority:** | Medium |
| **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):** |  |
| - Measure: Achievement of Professional Communities Membership |  |
| Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate Membership in Professional Communities |  |
| **Implementation Description:** | Continue to provide additional opportunities for students to develop in this area |
| **Responsible Person/Group:** | Gertrude Tinker Sachs and MSIT faculty. |
| **Additional Resources:** | Nil |
| **Budget Amount Requested:** | 0 |

| **Continue with the implementation of effective teaching and monitoring of all students.** |  |
|  |  |
Our implementation of higher standards, good monitoring, focused and effective teaching with pertinent assignments have helped us to realize this objective. We will continue to apply these strategies.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

**Implementation Description:** Our implementation of higher standards, good monitoring, focused and effective teaching with pertinent assignments have helped us to realize this objective. We will continue to apply these strategies.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Gertrude Tinker Sachs and MSIT faculty.

**Additional Resources:** Nil

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

Greater clarity in our expectations from the outset and closer monitoring of this standard. While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in teaching. This means, clearly working on this standard with great clarity in our expectations from the outset and closer monitoring of this standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Achievement of Content Knowledge in Reading  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

**Implementation Description:** Greater clarity in our expectations from the outset and closer monitoring of this standard throughout students' term of studies.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Gertrude Tinker Sachs and MSIT faculty.

**Additional Resources:** Nil

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?

N/A
ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Since our last assessment report, we have continued to monitor our students more closely by collecting data on our students from the outset in our classes. This closer monitoring of students was deemed necessary so that academically weak students could be identified early and given the necessary support and encouragement to successfully attain our standards. In the coming academic year we will continue to implement our close monitoring of all students especially the academically weak ones so that appropriate support may be offered.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The data obtained from the assessment findings inform us of the strengths and weaknesses of our program. We are generally strong and increased vigilance and close monitoring of our students with the necessary support will help us to maintain our strength. Based on this year’s data, we know that we need to continue to be vigilant. This means, keeping an eye on our curriculum so that it is always upgraded to meet the needs of all stakeholders, monitoring our teaching so that we continue to be responsive to our students’ challenges and maintaining awareness of the societal context (at the local, national and international levels) so that we continue to prepare quality teachers to meet the needs of 21st century urban teaching contexts.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

Detailed Assessment Report
2010-2011 Reading, Language, Literacy (ESOL) Online MEd

Mission / Purpose

This program should be listed as Reading, Language and Literacy M.Ed. with ESOL Concentration - Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line). The program’s underlying framework is constructivism, which suggests that human beings create knowledge through acting on their environment and interacting with other humans. The program encourages and supports planning, teaching, and reflection with colleagues who are committed to excellence in ESOL education. The M.Ed. major in English Speakers of Other Languages provides for master’s level study in ESOL Education and Reading Education and leads to T-5 certification in ESOL (grades K-12). The program ensures that candidates gain increased subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, demonstrate success in bringing K-12 students from diverse backgrounds to high levels of learning, and use technology skillfully as a tool for teaching and learning content. Our mission is to prepare
teachers who are leaders in the field in their knowledge, teaching and dispositions so as to enable their students to attain the highest standards in their literacy, language and emotional development. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. In this online program, we strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.

**Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**

**G 1: Content Knowledge**
Students will have knowledge of reading and ESOL.

**SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL**
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to language acquisition and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Content Knowledge in ESOL**
Content Knowledge in ESOL through coursework is assessed.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their TSLE course work.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 69% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of ESOL content knowledge as shown in their course work and the pertinent portfolio standard narrative. Med.Content Knowledge in ESOL(Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Develop-ing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates can discuss the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to the nature and acquisition of language; discuss how this knowledge has aided you in the creation of learning environments that support the language and literacy development and content area achievement of ELLs, and demonstrate the impact of pedagogy informed by our current and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition on the linguistic, literacy, and content area achievement of ELLs (both individuals and groups) through the inclusion of student work. 11 3 9 Candidates are knowledgeable about the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture and cultural groups and the ways in which you use those theories to construct learning environments that support ESOL students’ cultural identities, language and literacy development and content area achievement. 12 6 5

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Improving content knowledge**
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a h...

SLO 2: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading
Students are knowledgeable about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

Related Measures
M 2: Content knowledge in Reading
Content knowledge in Reading in coursework is assessed.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the area of reading theories and pedagogy as shown in their EDRD course work.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 95% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of reading pedagogy and theories in the EDRD course work. See table below: MED. content knowledge in reading (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient (4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Candidates are knowledgeable about and can apply research-based practices for the teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension (SBRR principles).

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

improving content knowledge. Reading
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a h...

G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions
Students are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching reading and English to Speakers of Other Languages in their base certifications (Grades PreK-12).

SLO 3: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills
Students create learning environments which support ESOL students’ cultural identities, language and literacy development, and content area achievement through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials; view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities; and advocate for ESOL students and their families. Students also demonstrate the effectiveness of the P-12 students’ learning of reading.

Related Measures
M 3: Planning Performance
Students’ ability to plan effectively is assessed in the coursework and clinical practice.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 48% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning as shown on their
scores of the Teacher Work Sample rubric Med. Planning performance (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Develop-ing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have demonstrated the ability to effectively plan for reading lessons. 11 12

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**improving planning**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a h...

**M 4: Clinical Practice**
Students’ effectiveness of lessons drawing on the learning theories and approaches is assessed in course work and clinical practice.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
**Achievement Target:**
90% of students will demonstrate an acceptable level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 48% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of clinical practice. See table below: Med.clinical practice (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Develop-ing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have successfully taught ESOL students while utilizing ESOL and reading pedagogy and approaches acquired in the courses. 11 12

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**improving clinical practice**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a h...

**SLO 4: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions**
Students demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision.

**Related Measures**
**M 5: Dispositions**
Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions using the unit-wide dispositions rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 87% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of dispositions. Med.Dispositions (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Develop-ing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates believe in the worth, ability and potential of others; trust learner’s capacity for change; believe others can and will rather than can’t or won’t. Candidates believe in the worth, ability and potential of self; possess a fundamentally positive sense of self-adequacy, capability and dependability; have positive expectations of self 18 2 3

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
improving dispositions  
*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011  
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a h...

**G 3: Impact on student learning**  
Students are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on reading and the English to Speakers of Other Languages learning of their students.

**SLO 5: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students**  
Students use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning.

**Related Measures**  
**M 6: Effects on P-12 Student Learning**  
Effects on P-12 Student Learning are assessed through course work and clinical practice.  
*Source of Evidence:* Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric  
*Achievement Target:*  
90% of students will demonstrate an acceptable level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**  
100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 30% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning MEd Effects on PK-12 student learning (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, & Spring 2011) Advanced (5 pts) Proficient(4 pts) Basic (3 pts) Developing (2 pts) Beginner-(1 pts) No Evidence-(0 pts) Candidates have made impact on the P-12 students’ learning of reading. 1 6 16  
*Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):*  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

improving effects on P-12 student learning  
*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011  
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a h...

**Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**  
**Embed**  
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

*Established in Cycle:* 2008-2009  
*Implementation Status:* Planned  
*Priority:* High  
*Implementation Description:* Time for complementation  
*Completion Date:* 09/2010  
*Responsible Person/Group:* Frances Howard  
*Additional Resources:* 0  
*Budget Amount Requested:* 0  
*Embed standard*
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Embed standard
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Embed standard
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Embed standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Embed standards

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required
course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of
the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's
responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the
portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.  
**Completion Date:** 09/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources:** Additional faculty  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Embed standards**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required
course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of
the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's
responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the
portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.  
**Completion Date:** 09/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources:** Additional faculty  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Embed standards**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required
course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of
the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's
responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the
portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** The action plan will be reassessed after one year.  
**Completion Date:** 09/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Frances Howard  
**Additional Resources:** Additional faculty  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Embed standards**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required
course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of
the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor's
responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the
portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.
Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: Additional faculty
Budget Amount Requested: 0

**Embed Standards**

Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.
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Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Time for complete implementation
Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: 0
Budget Amount Requested: 0

**Embed standards for portfolio**
Although the portfolio standards are presently embedded in the various courses through required course work and projects, the plan is to draw more attention to the standard(s) by requiring a draft of the narrative for that standard as one of the course requirements. It will be the instructor’s responsibility to read and respond to the narrative(s) until their quality warrants at least a 3 on the portfolio grading scale of 1-5, a 3 being necessary to pass the standard.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The action plan will be reassessed after one year.
Completion Date: 09/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Frances Howard
Additional Resources: none
Budget Amount Requested: 0

**Strengthening Professional Standard**
Compared to other standards in the portfolio, the reading endorsement standard 10, "students view professional development as a career long effort and responsibility" has been ranked the lowest. This result indicates that students need to be better prepared to address this standard in the course work as well as in the program. Therefore, the coordinator of the program will communicate with each of the students and course instructors to encourage the students to participate in various professional development opportunities and to document their activities throughout the program.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi

**improving clinical practice**
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their teaching performance. This means that candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Clinical Practice  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills

Implementation Description: Candidates’ teaching performance will be closely monitored through course work.
Completion Date: 06/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

**Improving content knowledge**
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their content knowledge in ESOL. This means that expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Content Knowledge in ESOL  | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in ESOL

Implementation Description: Expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.

Completion Date: 06/2012  
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their content knowledge in Reading. This means that expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Content knowledge in Reading  | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate Content Knowledge in Reading

Implementation Description: Expectations for them to learn content knowledge are high in the courses and their learning will be closely monitored throughout course work.

Completion Date: 06/2012  
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in dispositions. This means that expectations are clearly set at the outset of the program and their overall progress is closely monitored throughout the program.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Dispositions  | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions

Implementation Description: Expectations are clearly set at the outset of the program and their overall progress is closely monitored throughout the program.

Completion Date: 06/2012  
Responsible Person/Group: Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

**improving effects on P-12 student learning**
While 100% of our students attained this target, we will work harder to ensure that most if not all of our students attain a higher overall score in improving their impact on learners' learning in P-12. This means that candidates will successfully learn content knowledge, on which they plan and implement rigorous lessons, which are followed by critical reflection on their teaching.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Effects on P-12 Student Learning | **Outcome/Objective:** Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students

**Implementation Description:** Continue our plan of effective monitoring and teaching  
**Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Planning Performance | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills

**Implementation Description:** Candidates will be requested to plan rigorous lessons taking into account multiple factors through course work. This will be closely monitored by program coordinator.  
**Completion Date:** 06/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Jayoung Choi & other MSIT faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements** - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

Content knowledge has been strengthened as a result of close monitoring of students' work in the courses and in the program.

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment** - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs** - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection** - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

N/A
**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:**
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

---

**Detailed Assessment Report**

**2010-2011 Reading, Language, & Literacy (ESOL) TEEMS MAT**

**Mission / Purpose**

The exact title of this degree program should be: Reading, Language and Literacy TEEMS ESOL MAT. Our TEEMS-ESOL program is a nontraditional approach to teacher education at the graduate level and leads to certification in Pre-K-12. It is built upon cutting edge research and best practices in preparing teachers to work in urban environments with students who are linguistically and culturally diverse. Our mission is to prepare teachers who are leaders in the field in their knowledge, teaching and dispositions so as to enable their students to attain the highest standards in their literacy, language and emotional development. Our faculty are committed to preparing educators who are expected to be advocates for their students through the example of our teaching, research, mentoring and service.

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching, and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities, and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice.

We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good.
Goals without Outcome/Objective Relationships Specified

G 1: Content knowledge
Candidates are informed educators who have expert knowledge of the content needed to teach English to Speakers of Other Languages in grades PreK-12.

G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions
Candidates are professional educators with advanced knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages in Grades PreK-12.

G 3: Impact on student learning
Candidates are highly effective educators whose teaching practices have a measurable impact on the English to Speakers of Other Languages learning of their students.

Student Learning Outcome/Objective, without Goals, along with Any Associations and Related Goals, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings

SLO 1: Demonstrate Content Knowledge
Candidates have knowledge and understanding of the major concepts, theories, methods, and research related to language acquisition and historical knowledge of theories, methods, and research on language acquisition (Goal 1). (Key Assessment - Content Knowledge: GACE II scores and Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric Overall Assessment Score for Content & Curriculum).

Related Measures
M 1: Content Knowledge: GACE II Scores
Candidate performance on GACE tests for English to Speakers of Other Languages (forms 119 and 120). * * Data for students who pursued a certification only is included.
Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Achievement Target:
GACE Scores are still pending as of 5/10/2011.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
GACE Scores for 2010-2011 are still pending as of 9/29/2011. However, our passing rate for GACE tests has been 100% over the past three years (2007-2010), which indicates that our students are able to take and pass the content tests.

M 2: Content Knowledge via Coursework
Final Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Section on Overall Assessment Score for Content Curriculum (EDCI 7680)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Achievement Target:
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequately proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effectively proficient level (Score 4) of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
95 % of candidates in 2010-11 met the target of demonstrating adequately proficiency (Score 3) or higher levels of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages content area as shown in their Content Knowledge section of Final Teaching Evaluation rubric. On the four categories for
content knowledge, a minimum of 24% and a maximum of 33% of candidates scored at the effectively proficient level (Score 4).

**SLO 2: Demonstrate Professional and Pedagogical Skills**
Candidates create learning environments which support ESOL students’ cultural identities, language and literacy development, and content area achievement through planning and implementation of a wide range of instructional methods, and curriculum materials; view teacher-researcher models of inquiry, professional development, collaboration with colleagues as career-long efforts and responsibilities; and advocate for ESOL students and their families (Goal 2). (Key Assessment-Planning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction); Key Assessment- Clinical Practice: Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument and Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric)

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Planning Performance**
Teacher Work Sample rubric: Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction (EDCI 7680).
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptably proficient (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of planning as shown in their Teacher Work Sample rubric (Sections on Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction). These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
The following results are for each area: Contextual Factors: 100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 100% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher)
Learning Goals: 100% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher)
Assessment Plan: 94% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 69% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher)
Design for Instruction: 100% scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 89% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher).

**M 4: Clinical Practice at Midpoint**
Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (EDCI 7660)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as shown on their scores of the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the midpoint of the practicum internship.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
The following results are for each area on the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument: Knowledge of Students and Learning: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 24% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher)
Learning Environments: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 38 % scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher)
Assessment: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 19% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher)
Planning and Instruction: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 19% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher)

**M 5: Clinical Practice at Endpoint**
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (EDCI 7680)
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**
90% of candidates will demonstrate an adequate level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an effective level (Score 4) in the area of clinical practice at midpoint as
shown on their scores of the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument. This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

The following results are for each area on the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument: Knowledge of Students and Learning: 94% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 83% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Learning Environments: 89% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 78% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Assessment: 94% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 72% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher) Planning and Instruction: 94% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 83% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher). Professionalism: 100% scored at the adequate level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 78% scored at the effective level (Score 4 or higher).

**SLO 3: Demonstrate Professional Dispositions**

Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision (Goal 2). (Key Assessment - Dispositions: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

**Related Measures**

**M 6: Dispositions**

Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate an exceptional level (Score 4) in the area of dispositions as shown in their Unit-Wide Dispositions rubric. These levels are expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

Among the five categories assessed for dispositions (Empathy, Positive View of Others, Positive View of Self, Authenticity, and Meaningful and Purposeful Vision), candidates scored 100% of candidates demonstrated an acceptable level of performance (Score 3) or higher levels and a minimum of 47% of candidates demonstrated an exceptional level (Score 4).

**SLO 4: Uses a variety of assessments for impact on PreK-12 students**

Candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment tools and practices to plan effective instruction, to evaluate processes and products, and to monitor student learning. (Goal 3) (Key Assessment - Impact on Student Learning: Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning)

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Effects on P-12 Student Learning**

Teacher Work Sample rubric: Section on Analysis of Student Learning (EDCI 7680).

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Achievement Target:**

90% of candidates will demonstrate an acceptable level (Score 3) or higher levels and 40% of candidates will demonstrate a proficient level (Score 4) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning as shown on their scores of the Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning). This level is expected by the end of student teaching/final internship, indicating readiness for certification.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

94 % scored at the acceptable level (Score 3 or higher) and a minimum of 72% scored at the proficient level (Score 4 or higher) in the area of effects on P-12 Student Learning as shown on their scores of the Teacher Work Sample rubric (Section on Analysis of Student Learning).

**Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

Increasing content knowledge as well as professional and pedagogical skills
(1) Though 95% of candidates in 2010-11 met the target of demonstrating adequately proficiency (Score 3) or higher levels of knowledge in the English to Speakers of Other languages (ESOL) content area, a minimum of 24% and a maximum of 33% of candidates scored at the effectively proficient level (Score 4) on the four categories for content knowledge. In order for our candidates to meet higher levels of knowledge (Score 4 or 5) in the ESOL content area, we plan to integrate more various kinds of learning tasks, assignments, and activities into ESOL content area courses. For instance, from fall 2010, both TSLE 7240 and 7250 have already incorporated research and practice readings and in-depth discussions about the role and use of multimodality and technology to classes. In TSLE 7250, a group of students (a cooperative learning team) are asked to make a presentation about weekly readings in a multimodal and creative manner (e.g., critiquing readings and presenting discussion questions for the class, showing video clips that are related to weekly readings, and preparing activities to learn abstract and difficult theoretical concepts). In addition, TSLE classes plan to hold a mini-conference about students’ final projects or papers at the last class. By doing so, our candidates will have an opportunity to share their academic interests and experiences with the entire classmates, increase theoretical and practical knowledge about the learning and teaching of ESOL, and will be more likely to become an active member in an academic community. (2) 100% of candidates in 2010-11 met the target of demonstrating adequately proficiency (Score 3) in professional and pedagogical skills through the “Clinical Practice at Midpoint”; however, a minimum of 19% and a maximum of 38% of candidates scored at the effectively proficient level (Score 4 or higher). Thus, in order to help our candidate increase their professional and pedagogical skills, ESOL faculty members plan to provide our candidates with more opportunities to engage in discussions and reflections about four areas, (a) knowledge of students and learning, (b) learning environments, (c) assessment, and (d) planning and instruction. More specifically, in TSLE classes, our candidates are asked to observe and interview English language learners about their language acquisition, to analyze interviews for a brief report, and to investigate the context where learning may take place. In addition, in EDRD reading classes, our candidates are asked to assess pre-k-12 students’ English language and literacy (especially reading) skills and conduct lessons based on their assessment of students' language and literacy skills. By doing so, our candidate are likely to increase their knowledge of professional and pedagogical skills in ESOL.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: ESOL faculty members plan to provide our candidates with more opportunities to engage in various kinds of learning tasks, assignments, and activities into TSLE content area courses and EDRD reading courses. Detailed descriptions are seen in the section "Description" above.
Completion Date: 05/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Tinker Sachs, Co-ordinator MEd and Dr. Yi, Co-ordinator of our MAT-ESOL

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A
CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Though we have not made any major change in the assessment process, we have phased portfolio assessment into the course throughout the program so that we have been able to see the progress of our candidates learning in the program.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
The findings indicate that we are doing well in general, but we would like to do better. Our scores in assessment reflected some weaknesses with some of our candidates so this is an area which we have targeted for more specific instructional emphasis. All ESOL faculty members are reinforcing this area in their respective courses.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

The findings indicate that we are doing well in general, but we would like to do better. Our scores in assessment reflected some weaknesses with some of our candidates so this is an area which we have targeted for more specific instructional emphasis. All ESOL faculty members are reinforcing this area in their respective courses.

**Detailed Assessment Report**
2010-2011 Science Education MEd

**Mission / Purpose**

**Goals and Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**G 1:** Exploring issues of equity in the science classroom
Exploring issues of equity in the science classroom

**O/O 2:** Promotes science in the community
Teachers of science relate their discipline to their local and regional communities, involving stakeholders and using the individual, institutional, and natural resources of the community in their teaching. They actively engage students in science-related studies or activities related to locally important issues.

Related Measures

M 9: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit
Teacher candidates develop an SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment. The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.

Source of Evidence:
- Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher on element rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher on element rubric.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Pk-12 involvement
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, but explore and implement ways to involve th...

O/O 5: Promotes learners` safety and welfare
Teachers of science organize safe and effective learning environments that promote the success of students and the welfare of all living things. They require and promote knowledge and respect for safety, and oversee the welfare of all living things used in the classroom or found in the field.

Related Measures

M 1: Portfolio Element: Safety Certification
The teacher candidates will be required to attend the safety certification course at Georgia State University. Students will attach a copy of the certificate in their portfolio using the format provided below. The safety certification will be used as satisfactory way to meet the safety standard Student Name SSN Date of Safety Certification Class Either attach a copy of your completion certificate or scan your certificate and insert it at the bottom of this document.

Source of Evidence:
- Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of teacher candidates will attend and 90% will successfully complete the safety certification workshop.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of students successfully completed the safety certification workshop.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Pk-12 involvement
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, but explore and implement ways to involve th...
G 2: Becoming reflective practitioners
Becoming reflective practitioners through the use of inquiry/action research

O/O 1: Constructs and uses assessments effectively
Teachers of science construct and use effective assessment strategies to determine the backgrounds and achievements of learners and facilitate their intellectual, social, and personal development. They assess students fairly and equitably, and require that students engage in ongoing self-assessment.

Related Measures
M 2: Portfolio component: SSI lesson plan (assessment)
Teacher candidates develop a SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment. The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage their students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. This lesson plan will focus on student assessment. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher on element rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher on element rubric.

O/O 3: Strives for continuous professional growth
Teachers of science strive continuously to grow and change, personally and professionally, to meet the diverse needs of their students, school, community, and profession. They have a desire and disposition for growth and betterment.

Related Measures
M 10: Professional Growth Plan
Teacher candidates will submit at least three documents/artifacts demonstrating professional growth activities/plan within the last two years. Teacher candidates will be given choices in terms selecting the artifacts such as becoming active members of NSTA/GSTA (National Science Teachers Association/ Georgia Science Teachers Association), in-service professional development workshops, presentations at conferences, and publications in scholarly journals etc. Teacher candidates will describe what they learnt from their experiences with the help of a reflection paper. They will describe the artifacts that document their professional growth. They will evaluate their own professional growth, list their ongoing goals and design a plan to meet these goals. The professional growth plan and the reflection paper will be graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the student exceeds expectation), 2 indicates that the student meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the students has not met the criteria.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
90% of students attain a score of `2` or higher on element rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher on element rubric.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Pk-12 involvement**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, but explore and implement ways to involve th...

**O/O 4: Engages learners in the nature of Science**  
Teachers of science engage students effectively in studies of the history, philosophy, and practice of science. They enable students to distinguish science from non-science, understand the evolution and practice of science as a human endeavor, and critically analyze assertions made in the name of science.

**Related Measures**  
**M 3: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Plan**  
Teacher candidates develop a SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment. The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage their students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work  
**Achievement Target:**  
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.  
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Pk-12 involvement**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, but explore and implement ways to involve th...

**M 6: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit (Nature of Science)**  
Teacher candidates develop a SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment). The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage their students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work  
**Achievement Target:**  
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.  
**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**  
100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of `2` or higher` on element rubric.
Other Outcome/Objective, without Goals, along with Any Associations and Related Goals, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings

O/O 6: Knows and can apply modern science content

Teachers of science understand and can articulate the knowledge and practices of contemporary science. They can interrelate and interpret important concepts, ideas, and applications in their fields of licensure; and can conduct scientific investigations.

Related Measures

M 7: Portfolio element: Curriculum Exploration/Analysis

The curriculum exploration and analysis paper will require teacher candidates to generate a list of criteria after consulting professional documents to evaluate curriculum materials. Using these criteria, the teacher candidates will examine two science curricula: one traditional curriculum developed by textbook publishing companies and one NSF reform based curriculum. The teacher candidates will write a report based on the criteria highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of each curriculum. The curriculum explorations paper is graded using a rubric on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates exceeds expectations, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the teacher candidates has not met the criteria.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met

100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

M 8: Student portfolio element: Lesson Plan

Demonstration of content skills through a lesson plan. The Content knowledge section of the portfolio focuses on candidates’ understanding of the foundations of science (NSTA standard 1) through the development of a Socio-Scientific Issues Science (SSI) Unit that covers a science topic of social relevance. These units include all lesson plans, assessments, and resources for teaching the unit. The lesson plan is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates exceeds expectations, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the teacher candidates has not met the criteria.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:

90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met

100 % of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

O/O 7: Understand issues in science and technology

Teachers of science recognize that informed citizens must be prepared to make decisions and take action on contemporary science- and technology-related issues of interest to the general society. They require students to conduct inquiries into the factual basis of such issues and to assess possible actions and outcomes based upon their goals and values.

Related Measures

M 9: Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit

Teacher candidates develop an SSI mini unit based on the processes described in class. Mini-unit will consist of five lessons (the lessons will focus on Nature of Science, Inquiry, SS issues, science in the community, and assessment. The SSI unit should include a title page, the unit as defined in class, references, and any ancillary materials (handouts, lab sheets, assignment sheets, etc.). The unit plan will engage students in science related learning for a total of 5 hours. The SSI unit is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the five components in the lesson plans with a strong emphasis, 2 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 1 indicates that the teacher candidates have inferred the integration of various components, and 0 indicates that the various components are missing from the SSI unit criteria.
Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

O/O 8: Can engage learners in inquiry
Teachers of science engage students both in studies of various methods of scientific inquiry and in active learning through scientific inquiry. They encourage students, individually and collaboratively, to observe, ask questions, design inquiries, and collect and interpret data in order to develop concepts and relationships from empirical experiences.

Related Measures
M 4: Portfolio element: Research Paper
The teacher candidates will identify a minimum of 5 peer-reviewed articles that encompass student and teacher interactions (for e.g. classroom management, modification for ESOL learners, science teaching in urban settings, and technology integration etc.). The students will summarize the articles, reflect on the findings of the articles, and discuss the implications for a classroom. The lesson plan is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 3 point scale. A rating point of 3 indicates that the student exceeds expectation), 2 indicates that the student meets expectations, and 1 indicates that the students has not met the criteria.

Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘2’ or higher on element rubric.

O/O 9: Can plan and implement science curriculum
Teachers of science plan and implement an active, coherent, and effective curriculum that is consistent with the goals and recommendations of the National Science Education Standards. They begin with the end in mind and effectively incorporate contemporary practices and resources into their planning and teaching.

Related Measures
M 5: Portfolio Element: Peer teaching/Reflection paper
Teacher candidates use one of the lesson plans in the SSI unit to do peer teaching. For the purpose of Peer teaching, they the lesson plan must include: objectives to be taught; activity materials; development of a problem-solving experience for the students; contextualizing the lesson plan in a specific context. The peer teaching will take place in class between 15 to 20 minutes. Post peer-teaching, the teacher candidates will document reflective thoughts about the lesson (two pages). They will answer the following questions: To what extent did you achieve the objectives, rationale, or purpose of the lesson? What did you feel were the strengths of the lesson? The weaknesses of the lesson? What was your perception of the classroom climate? How would you describe the students’ behavior during the presentation? What would you suggest for improvement in teaching the lesson? The peer teaching is graded using a rubric using various criteria on a 4 point scale. A rating point of 5 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the components of effective teaching in their peer teaching with a strong emphasis, 4 indicates that the teacher candidates have incorporated all the elements, 3 indicates that the teacher candidates taught the lesson ineffectively using various components, and rating of 0-2 indicates that the teacher candidates did not demonstrate various components of effective teaching in their peer teaching.

Achievement Target:
90% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘4’ or higher on element rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
100% of teacher candidates attain a score of ‘4’ or higher on element rubric.

O/O 10: Has effective teaching skills for science
Teachers of science create a community of diverse learners who construct meaning from their science experiences and possess a disposition for further exploration and learning. They use, and can justify, a variety of classroom arrangements, groupings, actions, strategies, and methodologies.

**Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Pk-12 involvement**

Program faculty will maintain the current design and implementation of the program, but explore and implement ways to involve the engagement of pk-12 faculty to provide their input in the program design during the 2008-2009 academic year.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Portfolio Element: Safety Certification | **Outcome/Objective:** Promotes learners’ safety and welfare
- **Measure:** Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Unit | **Outcome/Objective:** Promotes science in the community
- **Measure:** Portfolio Element: Socio-Scientific Issues Plan | **Outcome/Objective:** Engages learners in the nature of Science
- **Measure:** Professional Growth Plan | **Outcome/Objective:** Strives for continuous professional growth

**Implementation Description:** As the program is ending after this semester, this item is now closed.

**Completion Date:** 09/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** COE Dean's office

**Providing diverse experiences in the program**

Our student population comprises of in-service teachers that may be working with a specific student population. We need to formalize ways of providing diverse learning experiences to our students and collect data on this process.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** As the program is being deactivated and students are all graduating this semester, this item is no longer active.

**Completion Date:** 09/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** All program faculty. We have implemented two changes discussed in our actions plan for 2006-2007. For providing diverse experiences to our students (in-service teachers), we now require the students to do a revised program assessment (peer teaching). We need to meet as a group to further discuss and develop ideas for integrating diverse learning experiences for our students.

**Additional Resources:** None

**Communication between faculty and candidates**

The program plan to improve communication between faculty and candidates to better support and guide candidates. The faculty will host a meeting with candidates at least once a semester in addition to various informal interactions and communication.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** The faculty will host a meeting with candidates at least once a semester in addition to various informal interactions and communication.

**Completion Date:** 10/2011
Responsible Person/Group: The adviser of the one remaining student has been meeting regularly with the student and keeping in close contact until she graduates in December, 2011.

Faculty and Student Communication
As this program draws to a close, the one remaining student and faculty member/adviser will work together in the portfolio completion and review process. At this time, all candidates have finished coursework and have graduated except for this one particular student who in her last semester.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Email and telephone contact.
Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen, Adviser

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?
No specific changes were made in the assessment process. There is no plan to change our assessment process in the coming year.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:
What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.
There will be no changes to the program. All the candidates met the expected outcomes and successfully completed the program. However, the program plan to continue on improving communication between faculty and candidates throughout the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
N/A
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission for the Science Education M.Ed. Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line) is parallel to the mission statement of the Georgia State University Professional Education Faculty. The GSU PEF is unique in that it represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the MEd. Online Program in Science Education is to prepare science teachers who are informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; empowered to serve as change agents; committed to and respectful of all learners; and engaged with learners, their families, schools, and communities. Specifically, the mission for the Science Education M.Ed. Online Degree Program (Georgia On My Line) is to provide an opportunity for certified teachers to build capacity by expanding their content knowledge and pedagogical practices. Candidates develop knowledge, teaching expertise, and dispositions related to the Standards set forth by the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA).

**Goals without Outcome/Objective Relationships Specified**

**G 1: Goal/Purpose Statement**

Candidates who are admitted to this program have basic science knowledge; therefore the goals of the program to develop candidates who are: 1. Highly competent science teachers who have the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to advance the learning of students in science grades 6-12. 2. Prominent science teachers who utilize assessment strategies to determine the impact of their teaching on student learning in grades 6-12. 3. Highly qualified science teachers with exemplary knowledge of science.

**Student Learning Outcome/Objective, without Goals, along with Any Associations and Related Goals, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**

**SLO 1: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)**

Aligned with Goal 1; Key Assessment - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills: Exit Portfolio Standard – Skills of Science Candidates will be able to: Utilize a variety of teaching actions, strategies, and methodologies including interactions with students that promote learning and achievement; use advanced technology to extend and enhance the learning of all students; and use prior conceptions and student interests to create communities of diverse learners who can construct meaning from their science experiences.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Measure for Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)**

Candidates are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the Key Assessment - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills: Exit Portfolio Standard Skills of Science. This section of the portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the major standards in the areas of pedagogical knowledge which will include planning, instructional skills, and content knowledge. Students must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for this measure.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
1. Key Assessment: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills; Exit Portfolio Standard 5:
One hundred percent of the students will complete this target. It is expected that all students will score 2/3 or higher on this section of the portfolio assessment on the first submission of document.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
Twenty-five percent of the candidates scored at the meets expectation level, 37.5% scored at the exceeds expectation level and 37.5% scored at the meets expectation level after more than one submission. None of the candidates made an acceptable score on the first submission. The minimum number of submissions was 2 and the maximum was 27. The target was for the students to score at the advanced or proficient levels on the first submission.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Planning - Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills**
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
Linked to Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) Data show that 50 % of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation...

**Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)**
*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011
Linked to Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) Data show that 37.5 % of the students scored at the far exceeds and exceed...

**SLO 2: Effects on P-12 Student Learning**
Aligned with Goal 2; Key Assessment – Effects on K-12 Learners: Exit Portfolio Assessment and Impact on Student Learning Candidates will be able to: Use a variety of contemporary and traditional assessment strategies to evaluate the intellectual, social, and personal development of the learner in all aspects of science, and engage in reflective practice by using outcome data to guide and change instruction.

**Related Measures**
**M 2: Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning**
Candidates are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the Key Assessment Standard: Effects on K-12 Learners; Exit Portfolio Standards Assessment and Impact on Student Learning. This section of the portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the major standards in the areas of impact on student learning and assessment. Students must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for this measure.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
Key Assessment – Effects on P-12 Learners; Exit Portfolio Standards 8 and 10. One hundred percent of the students will complete this target. It is expected that all students will score 2/3 or higher on this section of the portfolio assessment on the first submission of document.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
Fifty percent of the students scored at the meets expectation level, 12.5% scored at the exceeds expectation level, and 37.5% scored at the far exceeds expectations level. None of the students met the target on the first submission. The minimum number of submissions was 2 and the maximum was 27. The target was for the students to score at the advanced or proficient levels on the first submission. The target was only partially met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Effects on P-12 Learning**
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
Linked to the Effects on P-12 Learning Data show that 50% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and...

**Effects on P-12 Learning**  
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*  
Linked to the Effects on P-12 Learning Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level, 12.5% ...

**Other Outcome/Objective, without Goals, along with Any Associations and Related Goals, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**  
**O/O 3: Content Knowledge**  
Aligned with Goal 3; Key Assessment – Content Knowledge; Exit Portfolio Standard: Content   
Candidates will be able to: Unify concepts and processes in the teaching of science as an interdisciplinary unit; utilize their knowledge of life, physical, earth and space sciences such that they can teach science as inquiry, incorporate technology, and relate science teaching to the personal, historical, and social perspectives of life.

**Related Measures**  
**M 3: Measure for Content Knowledge**  
1. Candidates are expected to complete a portfolio which will include a narrative and artifacts to demonstrate their mastery of the Key Assessment – Content knowledge; Exit Portfolio Standards Content. This section of the portfolio will provide documentation that students have met the major standards in the area of content knowledge. Students must achieve a rating of at least "2" out of a possible "3" for this measure.  
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**  
Key Assessment – Content Knowledge; Exit Portfolio Standards 1 and 4. One hundred percent of the students will complete this target. It is expected that all students will score 2/3 or higher on this section of the portfolio assessment on the first submission of document.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**  
All of the students achieved this target with 37.5 percent of the students scoring at the exceeds expectation level and 62.5% scored at the exceeds level. None of the students met the target on the first submission. The minimum number of submissions was 2 and the maximum was 27. The target was for the students to score at the far exceeds, exceeds, or meets expectation levels on the first submission. The target was only partially met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Clinical Practice**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
Linked to Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge) Data show that 33% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation...

**Content Knowledge**  
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*  
Linked to Content Knowledge: Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 62.5% scored...

**Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**  
**Clinical Practice**  
Linked to Clinical Practice (Pedagogical Knowledge) Data show that 33% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level. 33% scored at the exceeds expectation level, and 33% scored at the exceeds level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several
students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, EDSC 8430, and EDSC 8400.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Measure for Content Knowledge  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Content Knowledge

**Implementation Description:** Plan should be fully implemented at the end of the fall semester 2010.  
**Completion Date:** 11/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Science.  
**Additional Resources:** No additional resources needed.  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Implementation Notes:**

- **9/17/2011** Linked to Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds and exceeds expectation levels and 25% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of the course requirement for EDSC 7550 and EDSC 8400 which meant that the students completed the portfolio requirement while enrolled in a methods course. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was two and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.

**Effects on P-12 Learning**

Linked to the Effects on P-12 Learning Data show that 50% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 50% scored at the meets level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, and EDSC 8400.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Effects on P-12 Student Learning

**Implementation Description:** Plan should be fully implemented at the end of the fall semester 2010.  
**Completion Date:** 11/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Science.  
**Additional Resources:** No additional resources needed.  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Planning - Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills**
Linked to Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) Data show that 50% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 50% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were not assigned as a part of any course requirement; therefore, the students received feedback for their portfolios after completing course work. Several students had to resubmit their work more than twice to receive an acceptable rating. Portfolio standards will be embedded in the course content for EDSC 7550 and EDSC 8400.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Measure for Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) | **Outcome/Objective**: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)

Implementation Description: Plan should be fully implemented at the end of the fall semester 2010.

Completion Date: 11/2010
Responsible Person/Group: All faculty teaching in the MEd. Online Program in Science.
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Content Knowledge
Linked to Content Knowledge: Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level and 62.5% scored at the exceeds expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of course requirements for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, EDSC 8430, and EDSC 8400. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was two and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Measure for Content Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective**: Content Knowledge

Implementation Description: In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio. Students will be notified of the sessions through email.

Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: All Science Education Faculty.
Additional Resources: No additional resources are needed.
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Effects on P-12 Learning
Linked to the Effects on P-12 Learning Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds expectation level, 12.5% at the exceeds level, and 50% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of the course requirements for EDSC 7550, EDSC 8600, and EDSC 8400. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was 2 and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Measure for Effects on P-12 Student Learning
  **Outcome/Objective**: Effects on P-12 Student Learning

**Implementation Description**: In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio. Students will be notified of the sessions through email.

**Completion Date**: 12/2011
**Responsible Person/Group**: All Science Education Faculty
**Additional Resources**: No additional resources are needed.

Budget Amount Requested: 0

**Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)**
Linked to Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills) Data show that 37.5% of the students scored at the far exceeds and exceeds expectation levels and 25% scored at the meets expectation level. The portfolio standards were assigned as a part of the course requirement for EDSC 7550 and EDSC 8400 which meant that the students completed the portfolio requirement while enrolled in a methods course. Several students had to resubmit their work more than once to receive an acceptable rating. The minimum number of submissions was two and the maximum was 27. In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Measure for Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)
  **Outcome/Objective**: Planning (Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills)

**Implementation Description**: In addition to support in the classes, special virtual tutoring sessions will be offered to students to help them with the development of the exit portfolio in order to minimize the number of revisions to obtain an acceptable document.

**Completion Date**: 12/2011
**Responsible Person/Group**: All Science Education Faculty
**Additional Resources**: None

Budget Amount Requested: 0

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1**: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
NA

**CTW Reflection 2**: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
NA

**CTW Reflection 3**: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
NA
CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
NA

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Students submitted the exit portfolio as a culminating project which included artifacts to document the effects that their teaching had on P-12 learners. Data showed that 50% of the students scored at the meets expectation level which is acceptable. This also indicates that there is a need to improve in this area; therefore, students were asked to develop an assessment plan in which they were expected to collect their students' performance data, analyze the data, and modify their instructional practices based on the findings. This assessment plan was designed to help them reflect on their teaching practices and ultimately improve the performance of the students that they teach. It also afforded the students an opportunity to improve the assessment instruments that they were using to evaluate the work of their students. More emphasis will be placed on alternative assessment models in EDSC 8400.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Students are challenged to examine their students’ performance data as revealed by the documents submitted in their portfolios. Data from portfolio assessment indicated the need to focus more on assessment and assessment types. With this in mind, a section on assessment was included in EDSC 8400 with an assignment to develop an assessment plan for their students who were not performing at an acceptable level. Students struggled with this assignment; therefore, in the future more time and resources will be devoted to teaching the assessment unit. Special attention will be given to alternative assessment and the development of alternative assessment instruments.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
NA

Detailed Assessment Report
2010-2011 Science Education--TEEMS MAT

Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Master of Art in Teaching (MAT) in Secondary Science is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education,
working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the MAT Secondary Science program is to prepare educators who are: informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; empowered to serve as change agents; committed to and respectful of all learners; and engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings

G 1: Content Knowledge
1. Candidates will be seen as more knowledgeable others in their classrooms, in their schools, and in their communities with regard to their understandings of the content and ways of knowing within the disciplines of science

SLO 1: Content Knowledge
Candidates will possess and use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge and pedagogy to facilitate learning for all.

Related Measures
M 1: Objective 1 - Content Knowledge
There will be three sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. The candidates' performance on the GACE Broadfield and / or discipline-specific content exams. 2. Supervisor ratings on the Standard 1: Content Knowledge components of the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments. 3. Reviewer ratings on the content and curriculum standard in the final e-portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
1. For the GACE tests, the target is for 100% of the candidates to pass both the Middle-level Math and Middle-level Science exams. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
1. The GACE scores for the current cohort of students have not been completed as many students will be taking the exams in the summer of 2011. 2. For the Mid-term evaluation, the candidates averaged above a 3.5 on all 4 elements of the Content Standard and only 1 student received a rating below Adequately Demonstrated (and only on a single element); for the Final Evaluation, the candidates averaged above a 3.5 on all 4 elements of the Content Standard (achieving averages which were higher than those attained on the Mid-term despite having moved from middle-school to high-school settings) and no student received a score below Adequately Demonstrated on any of the elements. 3. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Continue current actions.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Continue current actions.

Related Action Plan(s):
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Faculty members teaching in the MAT science program will revisit standard #6 and revise the activities targeting these areas

G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions
2. Candidates will be skilled craftspeople with the appropriate dispositions for translating their content knowledge into meaningful learning experiences for a diverse set of learners in grades 6 - 12 science classrooms.

**SLO 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge**
Candidates will be able use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design meaningful educational opportunities for all learners.

**Related Measures**
**M 2: Objective 2 - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge**
There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Learning Goals and Design for Instruction assignments in the Teacher Work Sample. 2. Ratings by supervisors on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation related to this area. 3. Evaluation by reviewers of the section of the e-portfolio dedicated to this domain.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**
1. For the Learning Goals assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 17 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements; for the Design for Instruction assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 27 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
1. For the Learning Goals assignment the overall candidate average was above 17, as none of the candidates received a score below this value. (It may be necessary to raise the target for this assignment.) For the Design for Instruction assignment, the overall candidate average was 27.92, with only four students receiving scores below the target average that was set. 2. For the Mid-term Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.57, with no candidate receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated on any of the elements; for the Final Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.57, with more students receiving a rating of Effectively Demonstrated than in the Mid-term Evaluation, and, again, with no candidate receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated. 3. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Continue current actions.**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Continue current actions.

**Extended practica**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

**SLO 3: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences**
Candidates will be able to coordinate time, space, activities, technology and other resources to provide active and equitable engagement of diverse learners in real world experiences.

**Related Measures**
**M 3: Objective 3 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences**
There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Design for Instruction and Instructional Decision Making
assignments in the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on this element in the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessment 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of this section of the e-portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
1. For the Design for Instruction assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 27 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements; for the Instructional Decision Making assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 13 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
1. For the Design for Instruction assignment, the overall candidate average was 27.88 with six candidates scoring below the target average score (a small concern). For the Instructional Decision Making assignment, the overall candidate average was 13.62 with seven candidates scoring below the target average score (a small concern). 2. For the Mid-term Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.49, which is slightly below the target average; specifically, on two of the elements -- Lesson Plan & Instruction and Overall Assessment of Planning & Instruction -- the student means were 3.38 and 3.35 respectively. Further, on Monitoring & Adjustments, 3 candidates (14%) received ratings below Adequately Demonstrated. For the Final Evaluation, improvements were seen as the overall candidate average was 3.66, with more students receiving a rating of Effectively Demonstrated than in the Mid-term Evaluation, and with no candidate receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated on any of the elements. 3. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Extended practica
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences: Assistance with Teacher Work Sample
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
A. Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences: The results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) indicate that students nee...

G 3: Impact on student learning
3. Candidates will be reflective professionals with the capacity to analyze the effect that their teaching practices have on the learning of the students in their grades 6 - 12 science classes.

SLO 6: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment
Candidates will be able to design and utilize a range of formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous development of all learners and support learners in engaging in the process of self-assessment.

Related Measures
M 6: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment
There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Assessment Plan and Impact on Student Learning assignments within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio
Achievement Target:
1. For the Assessment Plan assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 22 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
1. For the Contextual Factors assignment, the overall candidate average was above the target average with only two candidates receiving a rating below this value. 2. For the Mid-term Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.48, with only 1 student receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated (which indicates the target may have been set a little high). For the Final Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.57, with more students receiving a rating of Effectively Demonstrated than in the Mid-term Evaluation, and with no candidate receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated on any of the elements. 3. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Continue current actions.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Continue current actions.

Concern about technology implementation and assessment
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Concern over issues in the community and its assessment
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Even though the portfolio data indicates that this objective has been met, there was conflicting data coming from the observatio...

Using Assessment Data
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Impact on Student Learning and Assessment: Students showed acceptable performance on this standard; however, closer examination...

SLO 7: Impact on Student Learning and Reflection
Candidates will be able to reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development.

Related Measures
M 7: Objective 7 - Impact on Student Learning and Reflection
There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluation of the Reflection and Self-Evaluation assignment within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
1. For the Reflection & Self-Evaluation assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 22 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
1. For the Reflection & Self-Evaluation assignment, the overall candidate average was 22.9 with six candidates scoring below the target average score. 2. For the Mid-term Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.86, with only 1 student receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated on each element; for the Final Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.78, with fewer students receiving a rating of Effectively Demonstrated than in the Mid-term Evaluation (the only case of this number going down), but with no candidate receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated on any of the elements. 3. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Continue current actions.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Continue current actions.

Goals and Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Findings, and Action Plans
G 2: Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions
2. Candidates will be skilled craftspeople with the appropriate dispositions for translating their content knowledge into meaningful learning experiences for a diverse set of learners in grades 6 - 12 science classrooms.

O/O 4: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments
Candidates will be able to create engaging learning environments where the diverse perspectives, opinions, and beliefs of others are acknowledged and respected.

Related Measures
M 4: Objective 4 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Environments
There will be three separate sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Evaluations of the Contextual Factors assignment within the Teacher Work Sample 2. Ratings by the supervisor on this element in the Mid-term and Final Evaluation Key Assessments 3. Evaluations by the reviewer of this section of the electronic portfolio
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
1. For the For the Contextual Factors assignment, the target is for the candidates to average a score of 21 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the Mid-term and Final Evaluation rubrics, the target is for the candidates to average a 3.5 rating, with no more than 10% of the candidates receiving ratings of 2 or 1. 3. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
1. For the Contextual Factors assignment, the overall candidate average was 21.8 with eight candidates scoring below the target average score (a small concern). 2. For the Mid-term Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.61, with no more than 2 students receiving ratings below Adequately Demonstrated on any element; for the Final Evaluation, the overall candidate average was 3.69, with more students receiving a rating of Effectively Demonstrated than in the Mid-term Evaluation, and with no candidate receiving a rating below Adequately Demonstrated on any of the elements. 3. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Extended Practica
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

O/O 5: Professional Dispositions
Candidates will be able to exhibit ethically-appropriate behavior towards students, colleagues, administrators, and community members and will be able to commit to continuing personal and professional development.

Related Measures
M 5: Objective 5 - Professional Dispositions
There will be two sources of data for determining the extent to which a candidate has met this objective: 1. Ratings by the supervisor on the Dispositions Key Assessment 2. Evaluation by the reviewer of the corresponding section of the electronic portfolio
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
1. For the Disposition Key Assessment rubric, the target is for the candidates to an average of 18 overall, with no more than 25% of the candidates receiving a rating of 2 or 1 on any of the rubric elements. 2. For the corresponding section of the Electronic Portfolio, the target is for the candidates to average a 4.25 rating, with no more than 15% of the candidates receiving ratings of Basic or below.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
1. For the Disposition Key Assessment rubric, the candidates achieved an overall average above the target score, with only one candidate receiving a score below this value. 2. The electronic portfolio evaluations were not completed by the time the initial findings for this report were written.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Extended Practica
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that pra...

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Continue current actions.
Continue current actions.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Objective 2 - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge
- Measure: Objective 7 - Impact on Student Learning and Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning and Reflection

Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen
Continue current actions.
Continue current actions.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Objective 1 - Content Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective**: Content Knowledge
- **Measure**: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment | **Outcome/Objective**: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment

**Completion Date:** 04/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen

**Extended Practica**

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Objective 2 - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective**: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge

**Completion Date:** 04/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen

**Extended Practica**

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Objective 3 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences | **Outcome/Objective**: Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences

**Completion Date:** 04/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lisa Martin-Hansen

**Extended Practica**

Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: Medium  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

| Measure: Objective 5 - Professional Dispositions | Outcome/Objective: Professional Dispositions |
| Completion Date: 04/2010 |
| Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen |

Extended Practica
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: Medium  
Completion Date: 04/2009  
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen  
Extended Practicum  
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: Medium  
Completion Date: 04/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen  
Extended Practicum  
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: Medium  
Completion Date: 04/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen  
Extended Practicum  
Specific findings will be shared with faculty members who teach in the MAT Science Program. Faculty have recommended that practica experiences be lengthened to provide for additional practice time under the supervision and guidance of their mentor teachers.
Plan to reexamine technology competency
There is either a misunderstanding by faculty by the term “developing” or our students need more guided experiences with technology implementation, or our program is not gatekeeping preservice teachers properly to hold them in the program if they are not adequately progressing. It will be necessary to have discussions with faculty regarding course and practicum expectations, revisit the ties to the INTASC standards, and to determine what more could be done to prevent preservice teachers from completing a program if they are not yet ready to teach. Despite training faculty supervisors on the administration of PAARS, ratings are still reporting below average when in reality all students who remained in the program have met or exceeded all expectations.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: We hope to see students navigating technology in the field more appropriately in fall, 2009.  
Completion Date: 04/2008  
Responsible Person/Group: Lisa Martin-Hansen and Science MAT faculty  
Related Action Plan(s):  
Faculty members teaching in the MAT science program will revisit standard #6 and revise the activities targeting these areas.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Objective 1 - Content Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective**: Content Knowledge

Implementation Description: Faculty member teaching in the MAT science program will revisit standard #6 and revise the activities targeting these areas.

Completion Date: 07/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: MAT Science Ed Unit  
Concern about technology implementation and assessment
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure**: Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment | **Outcome/Objective**: Impact on Student Learning and Assessment

Concern over issues in the community and its assessment
Even though the portfolio data indicates that this objective has been met, there was conflicting data coming from the observations. The issue seemed to be that if a supervisor did not see direct evidence of this objective in the lesson observed, the candidate was given a low score on the observation. In the portfolios, the candidates were able to show evidence in the artifacts they provided of meeting this objective. The point needs to be communicated to the supervisors that this objective needs to be assessed in the larger context of the whole practicum experience and not within the thin slice of a few observations.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: In-Progress
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Objective 6 - Impact on Student Learning and Assessment | **Outcome/Objective:** Impact on Student Learning and Assessment

**Implementation Description:** Certainly, the supervisors and faculty need to continue to emphasize this area of teaching practice. However, it seems important that the supervisors need to be given some guidance in how to think about assessing this objective. This guidance will be communicated by science education faculty, particularly the program coordinator.

**Completion Date:** 07/2011

**Responsible Person/Group:** All science education faculty can help in terms of communicating the significance of this objective to the candidates -- which they have been doing effectively. It will be a priority for the program coordinator to discuss the guidelines for assessing this objective with the supervisors.

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences: Assistance with Teacher Work Sample**

A. Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences: The results of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) indicate that students need additional assistance in the following areas: Instructional design and planning and assessment. Data showed that students needed clearer explanations of the TWS and the integrated nature of the assignments. The following actions will be taken to help students improve their knowledge and skills in assessment, instructional planning and instructional design. Students will receive more assistance with the TWS assignment in the methods courses and the methods course assignments will be aligned with the TWS. During Professional Advisement Week, students will also receive help with the TWS.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Objective 3 - Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences | **Outcome/Objective:** Pedagogical Skills and Learning Experiences

**Implementation Description:** Students will receive more assistance with the TWS assignment in the methods courses and the methods course assignments will be aligned with the TWS. During Professional Advisement Week, students will also receive help with the TWS.

**Completion Date:** 04/2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** All science Education Faculty

**Additional Resources:** None

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Using Assessment Data**

Impact on Student Learning and Assessment: Students showed acceptable performance on this standard; however, closer examination of the data revealed that there are some minor deficiencies with the interpretation of student assessment data. In the methods courses more emphasis will be placed on assessment, specifically how to use assessment data to improve instruction. A section of the assessment unit will cover data interpretation, particularly as it relates to different sub-groups of students within a class.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Implementation Description: In the methods courses more emphasis will be placed on assessment, specifically how to use assessment data to improve instruction. A section of the assessment unit will cover data interpretation, particularly as it relates to different sub-groups of students within a class.
Completion Date: 04/2012
Responsible Person/Group: All science education faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

CTW Reflection 1: Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
NA

CTW Reflection 2: Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
NA

CTW Reflection 3: Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
NA

CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?
NA

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Reflection on student performance data for the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) indicated that some modifications were needed. The TWS was implemented as a means to create a cohesive and interrelated set of assessments which included some alternative types of assessment for performance based assignments. Several of the instruments used for alternative assessment were refined to provide better reliability among the supervisors performing the student ratings. In addition, the curriculum for the methods courses was revised in order to make assessment instruments and their interrelationships clearer to students.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

In an effort to meet both national and local standards, the faculty reviewed the curriculum for the MAT Secondary Science Program. The curriculum was revised so that the students would see the relationships between state / national standards, scope & sequence of curriculum documents, learning goals and objectives as part of curriculum planning, and a flow of actions related to developing larger curricular units and then translating that into individual lessons that build on each other. The methods courses will focus more on different forms of assessment as a means of creating
a more holistic picture of individual and group learning. The Instructional Technology course was eliminated as a requirement and replaced with a set of suggested options based on the developmental needs of the candidates.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?
NA

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?
NA

Detailed Assessment Report
2010-2011 Social Studies Education MEd

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Master of Education (MED) in Social Studies is aligned with the mission of the GSU Professional Education Faculty (PEF), which represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, the mission of the MED Social Studies program is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are: • informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; • empowered to serve as change agents; • committed to and respectful of all learners; and • engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings
G 1: Goal: Leadership
1) Leaders in their Social Studies communities;

SLO 1: Content Knowledge
1) Content Knowledge Standards: Candidates demonstrate deep subject knowledge in a minimum of two social studies content areas: 1) multiculturalism (required) and 2) one of the following: history, world geography, economics, civics, sociology, and/or psychology (Goal 1, 2 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

Related Measures
M 1: Professional Portfolio
Portfolio Instructions Provided for Each Key Assessment Below: Overview The portfolio for the Master of Education in Social Studies serves as an exit requirement for this program. Each fall and spring semester, portfolio development seminars will be held during MSIT’s Professional Advising Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio Formal evaluation of each students’ portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program; it is suggested you submit a draft well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an
examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a “3” for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance. Guidelines for Creating your Portfolio: 1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure to address each element explicitly. 2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated. 3. Write thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized, clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the University Writing Center for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox

Achievement Target:
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met
Rubric: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Social Studies Content Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Cultural Studies/Diversity - Required 0 1 0 1 0 2.00 1 1.00 Historical Inquiry - Option 1 1 1 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Civic Action - Option 2 1 0 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Geographic Perspectives - Option 3 1 0 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Society & Technology & Economics - Option 4 1 0 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Cultural Studies/Diversity - Required 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Historical Inquiry - Option 1 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Civic Action - Option 2 1 (100%) Geographic Perspectives - Option 3 1 (100%) Society & Technology & Economics - Option 4 1 (100%) Exemplary Accomplished Basic No Evidence

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Content Knowledge - Action Plan
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
All students did not achieve the exemplary or accomplished level of Content Knowledge. This is demonstrated in the program portf...

SLO 2: Curriculum Standards
2) Curriculum Standards: Candidates demonstrate knowledge of major concepts, issues, and processes of inquiry relevant to social studies as well as articulates major theories, debates, and issues in social studies education (Goal 1, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

Related Measures
M 1: Professional Portfolio
Portfolio Instructions Provided for Each Key Assessment Below: Overview The portfolio for the Master of Education in Social Studies serves as an exit requirement for this program. Each fall and spring semester, portfolio development seminars will be held during MSIT's Professional Advising Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for
Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio Formal evaluation of each students' portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program; it is suggested you submit a draft well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a “3” for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance. Guidelines for Creating your Portfolio: 1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure to address each element explicitly. 2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated. 3. Write thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized, clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the University Writing Center for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Achievement Target:**
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
Rubric: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Curriculum Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Culturally Appropriate & Relevant Curriculum 2 0 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Curriculum Resources 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Culturally Appropriate & Relevant Curriculum 2 (100%) Curriculum Resources 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic No Evidence

**SLO 5: Assessment**
5) Assessment: Candidates demonstrate use of efficacious and appropriate assessment tools (Goal 1, 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

**Related Measures**
**M 1: Professional Portfolio**
Portfolio Instructions Provided for Each Key Assessment Below: Overview The portfolio for the Master of Education in Social Studies serves as an exit requirement for this program. Each fall and spring semester, portfolio development seminars will be held during MSIT's Professional Advising Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio Formal evaluation of each students' portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program; it is suggested you submit a draft well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a “3” for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance. Guidelines for Creating your Portfolio: 1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure
to address each element explicitly. 2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated. 3. Write thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized, clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the UniversityWritingCenter for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Achievement Target:
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Data-driven Assessment 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Student Self-Assessment 0 2 0 0 0 3.00 3 0.00 Grading Procedure 0 2 0 0 0 3.00 3 0.00 Data-driven Assessment 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Student Self-Assessment 2 (100%) Grading Procedure 2 (100%) Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic No Evidence

SLO 6: Disposition
6) Disposition: Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. (Goal 1, 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

Related Measures
M 2: Unit-Wide Dispositions Rubric
Faculty evaluate candidates on demonstration of empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
All students will achieve a (4 = Strength, that means that the disposition is a pervasive trait of the student or 3 = Developing that means the student is aware of and values that trait.)

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
All students assessed received either a 4, or 3 on all portions of the dispositions rubric indicating a met target.

G 2: Goal: Pedagogical Content Knowledge
2) Creators of democratic, socioconstructivist learning environments for diverse students using appropriate pedagogical content knowledge and innovative technology; and,

SLO 1: Content Knowledge
1) Content Knowledge Standards: Candidates demonstrate deep subject knowledge in a minimum of two social studies content areas: 1) multiculturalism (required) and 2) one of the following: history, world geography, economics, civics, sociology, and/or psychology (Goal 1, 2 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

Related Measures
M 1: Professional Portfolio
Portfolio Instructions Provided for Each Key Assessment Below: Overview The portfolio for the Master of Education in Social Studies serves as an exit requirement for this program. Each fall and
spring semester, portfolio development seminars will be held during MSIT's Professional Advising Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio Formal evaluation of each students' portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program; it is suggested you submit a draft well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a “3” for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance. Guidelines for Creating your Portfolio: 1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure to address each element explicitly. 2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated. 3. Write thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized, clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the UniversityWritingCenter for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Achievement Target:**
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Partially Met**
Rubric: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Social Studies Content Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Cultural Studies/Diversity - Required 0 1 0 1 0 2.00 1 1.00 Historical Inquiry - Option 1 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Civic Action - Option 2 1 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Geographic Perspectives - Option 3 1 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Society & Technology & Economics - Option 4 1 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Cultural Studies/Diversity - Required 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Historical Inquiry - Option 1 1 (50%) Civic Action - Option 2 1 (100%) Geographic Perspectives - Option 3 1 (100%) Society & Technology & Economics - Option 4 1 (100%) Exemplary Accomplished Basic No Evidence

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Content Knowledge - Action Plan**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
All students did not achieve the exemplary or accomplished level of Content Knowledge. This is demonstrated in the program portf...

**SLO 3: Learning Environment**
3) Learning Environment: Candidates establish a positive and engaging learning environment for all students within the field of social studies education (Goal 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

**Related Measures**
M 1: Professional Portfolio

Portfolio Instructions Provided for Each Key Assessment Below: Overview

The portfolio for the Master of Education in Social Studies serves as an exit requirement for this program. Each fall and spring semester, portfolio development seminars will be held during MSIT's Professional Advising Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio

Formal evaluation of each student's portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program; it is suggested you submit a draft well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a "3" for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance.

Guidelines for Creating your Portfolio:
1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure to address each element explicitly. 2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated. 3. Write thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized, clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the University Writing Center for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox

Achievement Target:
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
Rubric: TEACHING PERFORMANCE: Learning Environment Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Culturally Responsive Practice 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Communication & Technology 2 0 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Community Resources 2 0 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Classroom Management 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Culturally Responsive Practice 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Communication & Technology 2 (100%) Community Resources 2 (100%) Classroom Management 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic No Evidence

SLO 4: Knowledge of Students
4) Knowledge of Students: Candidates possess deep knowledge of students and adaptations to their individual situations to provide for optimal learning (Goal 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

Related Measures

M 1: Professional Portfolio

Portfolio Instructions Provided for Each Key Assessment Below: Overview The portfolio for the Master of Education in Social Studies serves as an exit requirement for this program. Each fall and spring semester, portfolio development seminars will be held during MSIT's Professional Advising Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education
in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio Formal evaluation of each students' portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program; it is suggested you submit a draft well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a "3" for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance. Guidelines for Creating your Portfolio: 1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure to address each element explicitly. 2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated. 3. Write thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized, clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the UniversityWritingCenter for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Achievement Target:**

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Knowledge of Students Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev High Expectations and Differentiation 2 0 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Learning Theory 2 0 0 0 4.00 0 4 High Expectations and Differentiation Communication 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Learning Theory 2 0 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Family No Evidence Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment

**SLO 5: Assessment**

5) Assessment: Candidates demonstrate use of efficacious and appropriate assessment tools (Goal 1, 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

**Related Measures**

M 1: Professional Portfolio

Portfolio Instructions Provided for Each Key Assessment Below: Overview The portfolio for the Master of Education in Social Studies serves as an exit requirement for this program. Each fall and spring semester, portfolio development seminars will be held during MSIT's Professional Advising Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio Formal evaluation of each students' portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program; it is suggested you submit a draft well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a
“3” for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance. Guidelines for Creating your Portfolio: 1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure to address each element explicitly. 2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated. 3. Write thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized, clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the UniversityWritingCenter for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Achievement Target: All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Data-driven Assessment 1 1 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Student Self-Assessment 0 2 0 0 3.00 3 0.00 Grading Procedure 0 2 0 0 3.00 3 0.00 Data-driven Assessment 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Student Self-Assessment 2 (100%) Grading Procedure 2 (100%) Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic No Evidence

SLO 6: Disposition
6) Disposition: Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. (Goal 1, 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

Related Measures
M 2: Unit-Wide Dispositions Rubric
Faculty evaluate candidates on demonstration of empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
All students will achieve a (4= Strength, that means that the disposition is a pervasive trait of the student or 3 = Developing that means the student is aware of and values that trait.)

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
All students assessed received either a 4, or 3 on all portions of the dispositions rubric indicating a met target.

G 3: Goal: Scholarship
3) Scholars of educational theory and research as applied to social studies education.

SLO 2: Curriculum Standards
2) Curriculum Standards: Candidates demonstrate knowledge of major concepts, issues, and processes of inquiry relevant to social studies as well as articulates major theories, debates, and issues in social studies education (Goal 1, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

Related Measures
M 1: Professional Portfolio
Portfolio Instructions Provided for Each Key Assessment Below: Overview

The portfolio for the Master of Education in Social Studies serves as an exit requirement for this program. Each fall and spring semester, portfolio development seminars will be held during MSIT’s Professional Advising Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio Formal evaluation of each students’ portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program; it is suggested you submit a draft well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a “3” for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance.

Guidelines for Creating your Portfolio:
1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure to address each element explicitly.
2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated.
3. Write thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized, clear, and coherent.
4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program.
5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review.
6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio.
7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the University Writing Center for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox

Achievement Target:
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
Rubric: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Curriculum Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pt) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Culturally Appropriate & Relevant Curriculum 2 0 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Curriculum Resources 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Culturally Appropriate & Relevant Curriculum 2 (100%) Curriculum Resources 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Exemplary Accomplished Basic No Evidence

SLO 3: Learning Environment
3) Learning Environment: Candidates establish a positive and engaging learning environment for all students within the field of social studies education (Goal 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

Related Measures
M 1: Professional Portfolio
Portfolio Instructions Provided for Each Key Assessment Below: Overview
The portfolio for the Master of Education in Social Studies serves as an exit requirement for this program. Each fall and spring semester, portfolio development seminars will be held during MSIT’s Professional Advising Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts...
demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio Formal evaluation of each students' portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program; it is suggested you submit a draft well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a “3” for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance. Guidelines for Creating your Portfolio: 1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure to address each element explicitly. 2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated. 3. Write thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized, clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the University Writing Center for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Achievement Target:
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
Rubric: TEACHING PERFORMANCE: Learning Environment Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Culturally Responsive Practice 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Communication & Technology 2 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Community Resources 2 0 0 0 4.00 4 0.00 Classroom Management 1 1 0 0 0 3.50 3 0.50 Culturally Responsive Practice 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Communication & Technology 2 (100%) Community Resources 2 (100%) Classroom Management 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic No Evidence

SLO 4: Knowledge of Students
4) Knowledge of Students: Candidates possess deep knowledge of students and adaptations to their individual situations to provide for optimal learning (Goal 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

Related Measures
M 1: Professional Portfolio
Portfolio Instructions Provided for Each Key Assessment Below: Overview The portfolio for the Master of Education in Social Studies serves as an exit requirement for this program. Each fall and spring semester, portfolio development seminars will be held during MSIT's Professional Advising Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio Formal evaluation of each students' portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program; it is suggested you submit a draft well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a “3” for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance. Guidelines for Creating
your Portfolio:

1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure
to address each element explicitly. 2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each
standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated. 3. Write
thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not
excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized,
clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen
artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact
demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or
your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources:
Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share
your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a
colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final
portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism.
You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at
the graduate level. Consider visiting the UniversityWritingCenter for assistance, if needed:
http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Achievement Target:

All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated
on the rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met

Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Knowledge of Students Exemplary (4 pts)
Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pt) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev High
Expectations and Differentiation 2 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 Learning Theory 2 0 0 0 4.00 4.00 Family
Communication 1 0 0 0 3.50 3.50 Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic
No Evidence Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment

SLO 5: Assessment

5) Assessment: Candidates demonstrate use of efficacious and appropriate assessment tools (Goal
1, 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Portfolio)

Related Measures

M 1: Professional Portfolio

Portfolio Instructions Provided for Each Key Assessment Below: Overview The portfolio for the
Master of Education in Social Studies serves as an exit requirement for this program. Each fall and
spring semester, portfolio development seminars will be held during MSIT's Professional Advising
Week (PAW). During these seminars, faculty and students collaboratively discuss the standards for
the program, relevant artifacts, and how to compile the program portfolio. As a Master of Education
in Social Studies, expertise in the following standards (adapted from National Council on the Social
Studies and the Georgia Professional Growth Plan based on the Extended Georgia Framework for
Teaching) must be demonstrated through the portfolio which consists of at least three (3) artifacts
demonstrating proficiency in each standard. Evaluation of the Portfolio Formal evaluation of each
students' portfolio takes place at the final semester of the program; it is suggested you submit a draft
well prior to the due date for feedback from your advisor. The final evaluation will be based on an
examination of the submitted portfolio. All portfolio standards must be met by a minimum rating of a
“3” for candidates to be recommended to graduate. If you have questions, you can go to the HELP
BUTTON at the top of the screen, or contact your advisor for assistance. Guidelines for Creating
your Portfolio: 1. Read each standard carefully: Each standard contains multiple elements. Be sure
to address each element explicitly. 2. Read the assessment rubric carefully: The criteria for each
standard indicate the way each narrative and its corresponding artifacts will be evaluated. 3. Write
thorough but concise narrative essay: Be sure that your narratives are well-developed, but not
excessively wordy. Narratives should be focused on the standard and should be well-organized,
clear, and coherent. 4. Explain how each artifact relates to the standard: Each carefully chosen
artifact should be introduced in the narrative along with an explanation of how the artifact
demonstrates how you have met the standard. As a general rule, artifacts should be those you (or your students) have created during your degree program. 5. Use other professionals as resources: Seek feedback on your writing and artifacts from your peers and other professional colleagues. Share your work with others prior to submitting your portfolio for review. 6. Consider feedback from a colleague: The feedback you receive from your draft evaluation will guide your revisions for the final portfolio. 7. Proofread carefully: Consider the portfolio as a representation of your professionalism. You may be asked to revise narratives if your writing does not meet expected standards for writing at the graduate level. Consider visiting the University Writing Center for assistance, if needed: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwcwr/services.html. Compiled by Teresa Fisher, Mary Ariail, and Dana Fox

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Achievement Target:**
All students will achieve an exemplary or accomplished level of portfolio performance as indicated on the rubric.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

Rubric: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment Exemplary (4 pts) Accomplished (3 pts) Advanced (2 pts) Basic (1 pts) No Evidence (0 pts) Mean Mode Stdev Data-driven Assessment 1 0 0 0 3.50 0.50 Student Self-Assessment 0 2 0 0 0 3.00 3 0.00 Grading Procedure 0 2 0 0 0 3.00 3 0.00 Data-driven Assessment 1 (50%) 1 (50%) Student Self-Assessment 2 (100%) Grading Procedure 2 (100%) Exemplary Accomplished Advanced Basic No Evidence

**SLO 6: Disposition**

6) Disposition: Candidates demonstrate empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. (Goal 1, 2, 3 / Key Assessment: Unit-wide Dispositions Rubric)

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Unit-Wide Dispositions Rubric**

Faculty evaluate candidates on demonstration of empathy, a positive view of self and others, authenticity of interactions with others, and a long-range and meaningful purpose and vision. Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**
All students will achieve a (4= Strength, that means that the disposition is a pervasive trait of the student or 3 = Developing that means the student is aware of and values that trait.)

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

All students assessed received either a 4, or 3 on all portions of the dispositions rubric indicating a met target.

**Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**M.Ed. Collaboration**

MSIT is in the process of combining the master's degree programs in the department with the Educational Leadership department to create an innovative master's degree program highlighting the social studies as well as urban teaching and leadership with a coaching and / or leadership endorsement.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Completion Date:** 09/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Ad Hoc Committee

**Additional Resources:** n/a

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Recruitment**

We need to look at how students are recruited for this program and work on some materials and/or processes to increase enrollment.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Revise Portfolio Assessment**
We need to look at the portfolio assessment plan and revise it to better meet the GA frameworks and students’ coursework.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Content Knowledge - Action Plan**
All students did not achieve the exemplary or accomplished level of Content Knowledge. This is demonstrated in the program portfolio and program faculty should revisit this section of the portfolio to clarify the guidelines governing this section. Additionally, this M.Ed. is being collapsed into a more comprehensive M.Ed. program which will better address the issue of diversity. This new M.Ed. is expected to begin in Spring 2012.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Professional Portfolio  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Content Knowledge

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1:** Achievements - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
N/A

**CTW Reflection 2:** Assessment - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
N/A

**CTW Reflection 3:** Needs - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
N/A

**CTW Reflection 4:** Overall Reflection - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were
these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

Faculty have collaborated to create an innovative M.Ed. program which spans two departments (MSIT / EPS). The new M.Ed. allows students to gain content knowledge in their area of specialty - but also to obtain coaching and leadership endorsements. This M.Ed. encompasses a field component - all of which will address weaknesses in the current SS M.Ed. program and better utilize faculty resources.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Data analysis provides insight to strengths and weaknesses in the program. As highlighted by the content knowledge/diversity target not being met, program faculty need to develop ways in which students can better demonstrate their knowledge.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:** Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:** What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:** What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

---

**Detailed Assessment Report**

**2010-2011 Social Studies Education--TEEMS MAT**

**Mission / Purpose**

The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

**Goals and Student Learning Outcome/Objective, with Any Associations and Related Student Learning Outcome/Objective, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings**

**G 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**

Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will be experts in their knowledge of the multiple contexts, purposes, and ends of education as well as specific pedagogical aims and interests.

**Document:**

- [Social Studies Key Assessments Chart](#)

**SLO 1: Content and Curriculum**

The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge; adapts content and teaching to meet observed learner needs; builds teaching on a strong and current foundation in the content area(s) they teach; makes content relevant to students; uses available resources, including technology, to learn more about content area(s); and, follows state and local curriculum.
Related Measures

M 1: Content and Curriculum
Data for the objective of Content Knowledge are taken from the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument and the Final StudentTeaching Evaluation Instrument. The midpoint evaluation takes place prior to clinical practice, at or near the end of the Practicum I (field experience). The final evaluation takes place at or near the end of Practicum II/III (student teaching). For each assessment, students are evaluated on their command of Content Knowledge by their university supervisor, who observes and confers with students and considers feedback from the student’s mentor teacher. Candidates are not given specific instructions for this assessment; rather, they demonstrate their content knowledge through their teaching performance and ongoing conversations with mentor teachers and university supervisors.
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Achievement Target:
100% of students will score at the level of Adequately Demonstrated and 80% of students will score at the level of Effectively Demonstrated on this standard.
Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
A total of 100% of students scored at the level of Adequately Demonstrated on this standard. 81% of the students received the an Effectively Demonstrated rating on this standard. The mean was 3.81 with a standard deviation of 0.39.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

M 2: Planning
The teacher candidate locates, comprehends, and builds rationales from curriculum guides, other applicable documents, and experienced colleagues; plans and carries out instruction based on state and local performance standards; selects and varies instructional strategies, assessing their impact on student engagement and learning; observes students closely and acknowledges how adjustments in teaching can impact learning; explores teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for assigned students; assesses individual learners’ needs and seeks resources to improve instruction and increase student achievement; learns to work and plan productively as part of a team, grade level, and/or department group.

G 2: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions
Candidates in social studies initial teacher education programs will be experts in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to develop an understanding of the purposes and history of the field of social studies.

Document:

- Social Studies Key Assessments Chart
The key assessment for planning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample. Students are evaluated on their ability to plan a four-week unit based on contextual factors of the school setting, appropriate learning goals that they establish based on their knowledge of the context, an assessment plan that addresses the learning goals, and a design for instruction that includes at least four weeks of lesson plans. The instructions relevant to the assessment for planning are provided for the candidates in the students' course template in the sections for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction. Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate's TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Planning with the rubrics for Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, and Design for Instruction in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Achievement Target:
100% of students will score at the level of Proficient and 80% of students will score at the level of Exemplary on this standard.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
A total of 100% of students scored at the level of Adequately Demonstrated on this standard. 80% of the students received the an Effectively Demonstrated rating on this standard. The mean was 3.80 with a standard deviation of 0.38.

SLO 3: Clinical Practice
The teacher candidate creates a learning environment in which students can learn both independently and collaboratively; organizes and manages time, space, activities, technology, software, and other resources; understands the importance of and builds a functional classroom management plan; seeks, uses, and refines strategies for motivating learners; creates a culturally responsive classroom; learns about and uses resources specific to the school, district, and community; develops appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster supportive learning-based interactions in the classroom.

Related Measures
M 3: Clinical Practice
Candidates are assessed for Clinical Practice with the use of rubrics contained in the Midpoint Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken prior to students' clinical practice) and the Final Teaching Evaluation Instrument (taken near the end of students' clinical practice). Rubrics in these two instruments are based on the Georgia GSTEP standards and are used to assess students on Standard 2: Knowledge of Students and Learning, Standard 3: Learning Environments, Standard 4: Assessment, Standard 5: Planning and Instruction, and Standard 6: Professionalism. The first key assessment for Clinical Practice is given at or near the end of Practicum I. The emphasis in Practicum I is to familiarize candidates with the school through immersion in a middle school setting. Candidates are encouraged to observe a wide variety of settings within the school and to learn as much as possible about the school context, including classroom culture, policies, procedures, and protocols. Candidates plan and teach a limited number of lessons (5-10). At least three of these lessons are observed by the university supervisor, who uses an observation tool based on the Georgia Framework for Teaching. The university supervisor provides immediate feedback to the candidate after the lesson. Near the end of the Practicum semester, the university supervisor completes the Midpoint (Practicum) Teaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the candidate's teaching performance gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate. The second assessment for Clinical Practice is done at or near the end of the candidates’ semester of student teaching. During this semester, which is typically spent in a high school (grades 9-12), the teacher candidates gradually takes on an increasing amount of responsibility until they eventually assume the full role of the classroom teacher. During this semester, the candidates are required to teach a
minimum of four weeks of lessons during which they plan, teach, reflect upon, and evaluate their praxis. The university supervisor conducts a minimum of three formal observations, providing feedback and support to the teacher candidate. Near the end of the student teaching semester, the university supervisor completes the Final StudentTeaching Evaluation Instrument, using knowledge of the student gained through formal observations, oral and written feedback from the mentor teacher, and informal conversations and encounters with the candidate.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of students will score at the level of Adequately Demonstrated and 60% of students will score at the level of Effectively Demonstrated on this standard.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

A total of 100% of students scored at the level of Adequately Demonstrated on this standard. 64% of the students received the an Effectively Demonstrated rating on this standard. The mean was 3.65 with a standard deviation of 0.48.

**SLO 4: Dispositions**

The teacher candidate learns basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education; learns about, locates resources for, and follows laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families; adheres to state and local Codes of Ethics, and models ethical behavior for students; reflects on teaching practice and examines the connections to student learning; self-assesses teaching strengths and areas for improvement, seeking and using guidance from mentors and instructional leaders; works through appropriate channels to seek answers to questions, voice concerns, explore ideas, and speak out about issues that matter to them and their students; accepts entry-level leadership roles (e.g., clubs, special topics, coaching) with support of identified mentors, administrators, coaches, and facilitators.

**Related Measures**

**M 4: Dispositions**

The assessment for Dispositions is entitled "Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals" and is used in all programs in the Professional Education Unit. Each program in the unit administers the assessment at approximately midpoint and end of program. For Social Studies MAT programs, the Dispositions assessment is completed by the university supervisor at the end of Practicum I and at the end of student teaching.

Source of Evidence: Existing data

**Achievement Target:**

100% of students will score at the level of Acceptable and 70% of students will score at the level of Exceptional on this standard.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

A total of 100% of students scored at the level of Acceptable on this standard. 77% of the students received the an Exceptional rating on this standard. The mean was 3.78 with a standard deviation of 0.42.

**G 3: Student Learning**

Our candidates will be effective educators who create learning environments that have a positive impact on student learning.

**Document:**

- [Social Studies Key Assessments Chart](#)
resources to keep accurate and up-to-date records and reports of student work and behavior; examine ways to identify student strengths and weaknesses through various assessment processes and methods.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Impact on Student Learning**

The key assessment for Effects on Student Learning is contained in the rubrics for the Teacher Work Sample. Students are evaluated on their ability to analyze the results of a four-week unit that they teach during the semester of student teaching. A key component of the Teacher Work Sample project is the design and implementation of an assessment plan, which includes a pre-test and a post-test as part of the teaching unit. The instructions relevant to the assessment for Effects on Student Learning are provided for the candidates in the students' course template in the sections for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation (See PDF file for Teacher Work Sample attached below). Students complete the Teacher Work Sample project during the semester of their clinical practice. Working with their mentor teacher and their university supervisor, each candidate begins work on the project during the first week of the semester and continues until the unit is complete. The candidate's TWS project is assessed by the university supervisor, who gives feedback to the candidate on areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Students are assessed for Effects on Student Learning with the rubrics for Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation in the Teacher Work Sample Assessment Instrument.

**Source of Evidence:** Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Achievement Target:**

100% of students will score at the level of Proficient and 80% of students will score at the level of Exemplary on this standard.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

A total of 100% of students scored at the level of Acceptable on this standard. 94% of the students received the a Proficient rating on this standard. 86% of the students received an Exemplary rating on this standard. The mean was 4.84 with a standard deviation of 0.40.

**Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Maintain Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.

**Completion Date:** 05/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.

**Additional Resources:** n/a

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Maintain Student Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
**Measure:** Content and Curriculum | **Outcome/Objective:** Content and Curriculum

**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.

**Completion Date:** 05/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.

**Additional Resources:** n/a

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Maintain Student Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.

**Completion Date:** 05/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.

**Additional Resources:** n/a

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Maintain Student Performance**

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.

**Completion Date:** 05/2010

**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.

**Additional Resources:** n/a

**Budget Amount Requested:** 0
# Maintain Student Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to continue to achieve 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to promote 100% competency.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.  
**Completion Date:** 05/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.  
**Additional Resources:** n/a  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

---

### Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure:** Content and Curriculum  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Content and Curriculum

---

# Classroom Management

The results of student exit survey data indicated student need for more classroom management instruction and skills. Many students stated that more experiences and training in effective classroom management would greatly benefit their teaching and improve their overall instruction. We will devote more instructional time and focus field experiences on the use of effective classroom management strategies.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Within our methods courses and field experiences, instructors will provide additional concentrated instruction on the use of various effective classroom management strategies.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Chantee Earl McBride  
**Additional Resources:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

---

# Maintain Student Performance

Although candidates performed exceptionally well on all outcomes, social studies would like to maintain 100% competency on all standards. Social studies faculty will meet regularly and identify areas for improvement to continue to promote 100% competency. For more information, see the Action Plan Details section of this report.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** At the completion of the upcoming cohorts of teacher candidates' MAT TEEMS SS initial teacher preparation program.  
**Completion Date:** 05/2010  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator and Faculty affiliated with the MAT TEEMS SS program.  
**Additional Resources:** n/a  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

---

# Classroom Management

The results of student exit survey data indicated student need for more classroom management instruction and skills. Many students stated that more experiences and training in effective classroom management would greatly benefit their teaching and improve their overall instruction. We will devote more instructional time and focus field experiences on the use of effective classroom management strategies.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Within our methods courses and field experiences, instructors will provide additional concentrated instruction on the use of various effective classroom management strategies.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Chantee Earl McBride  
**Additional Resources:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

---

# Classroom Management

The results of student exit survey data indicated student need for more classroom management instruction and skills. Many students stated that more experiences and training in effective classroom management would greatly benefit their teaching and improve their overall instruction. We will devote more instructional time and focus field experiences on the use of effective classroom management strategies.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Within our methods courses and field experiences, instructors will provide additional concentrated instruction on the use of various effective classroom management strategies.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Chantee Earl McBride  
**Additional Resources:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0
The faculty members will continue to focus on classroom management and lesson planning. The students exit survey results indicated that students desired more training and resources on effective classroom management. Understanding that effective classroom management is connected to effective planning and instructional delivery, the faculty will infuse more planning and instructional delivery opportunities and activities within the program coursework.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Chantee Earl  
**Additional Resources:** 0  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements** - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment** - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs** - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

N/A

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection** - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

N/A

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

To improve the assessment process for our program, we have included the Teacher Work Sample. This assessment is designed to address the overall program goals and serve as one of the program’s key assessments. It was necessary to provide a clear and concise assessment that would directly align with the state and national standards for Social Studies and Teacher Education. As we continue to review and streamline the assessment process, modifications or additions to the Teacher Work Sample, and overall program course of study will be implemented. We understand the need to constantly evaluate the effectiveness of our assessments in hopes of providing quality educational experiences for all of our aspiring Social Studies teachers.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

The assessment data indicated that our program efforts to impact pre-service teachers content knowledge and planning have been successful. Our Social Studies pre-service teachers performed at adequate and proficient levels on their evaluations in regards to planning and content knowledge. These results indicate that our increased and focused efforts within the coursework and practicum on content and planning of instruction were well received. We will continue to emphasize these
areas within our courses, and in addition, provide more instruction on effective classroom management skills for our students.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:**
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

N/A

---

**Detailed Assessment Report**

**2010-2011 Teaching & Learning EdS**

**Mission / Purpose**

The Ed.S. program with a major in Teaching and Learning is intended for professional educators who demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration and wish both to develop those areas further and to develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders and instructional specialists. The purpose of this applied degree is to extend the academic preparation and teaching skills of experienced classroom teachers and instructional leaders and to foster the application of these skills and abilities to a variety of educational settings. In our department, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT), our mission is to engage in research, teaching and service in urban environments with people from multiple cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. We work collaboratively with people in schools, communities and organizations in metropolitan Atlanta and around the world. We are committed to innovation and creativity and to pushing the boundaries of knowledge and practice. We strive to realize our vision of pluralism, equity, and social justice where individuals have equal access to meaningful learning opportunities throughout their lives and the chance to apply their knowledge and skills for the greater good. The mission of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is to provide scholarship and leadership for the betterment of education and human development.

**Goals and Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Achievement Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**G 1: Develop Education Experts in Concentrations**
Accomplished graduates of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning will demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration. Concentration areas include Art Education, English Education, English as a Second Language Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Childhood Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education.

**O/O 1: Committed to Student Learning and Development**
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates are committed to student learning and development.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: Faculty Rating: Commitment to Student Learning**
Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 1.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.

**Document:**

- **Ed.S. TLG Deactivation Information**

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Future of Ed.S.**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and L...

**O/O 2: O2: Applies Expertise to Promote Student Learning**
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates are experts in their areas of concentration and can effectively apply that expertise to promote student learning and development.

**Related Measures**
**M 2: M2: Faculty Rating: Expertise in Student Learning**
Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 2.
*Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery*

**Achievement Target:**
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.

**Document:**

- **Ed.S. TLG Deactivation Information**

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Future of Ed.S.**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and L...

**O/O 3: O3: Manages/Monitors Student Learning/Development**
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates demonstrate responsibility and expertise in managing and monitoring student learning and development.

**Related Measures**
**M 3: M3: Faculty Rating: Monitoring Student Learning**
Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 3.
*Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery*

**Achievement Target:**
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.

**Document:**

- Ed.S. TLG Deactivation Information

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Future of Ed.S.**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and L...

**O/O 4: O4: Reflects on and Learns from Experience**
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates reflect systematically about their practice and learn from their professional experiences.

**Related Measures**
**M 4: M4: Faculty Rating: Ability to Reflect**
Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 4.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.

**Document:**

- Ed.S. TLG Deactivation Information

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

**Future of Ed.S.**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and L...

**O/O 5: O5: Participates in Learning Communities**
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates demonstrate how their professional growth is impacted through participation in one or more learning communities.

**Related Measures**
**M 5: M5: Faculty Rating: Learning Communities**
Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 5.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.

**Document:**

- Ed.S. TLG Deactivation Information

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Future of Ed.S.**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and L...

**G 2: G2: Develop Education Experts, Inquirers & Leaders**
Accomplished graduates of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning will develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders, and instructional specialists in their areas of concentration. Concentration areas include Art Education, English Education, English as a Second Language Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Childhood Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education.

**O/O 2: O2: Applies Expertise to Promote Student Learning**
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates are experts in their areas of concentration and can effectively apply that expertise to promote student learning and development.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: M2: Faculty Rating: Expertise in Student Learning**
Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 2.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Achievement Target:**
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.

**Document:**

- Ed.S. TLG Deactivation Information

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

**Future of Ed.S.**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and L...

**O/O 4: O4: Reflects on and Learns from Experience**
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates reflect systematically about their practice and learn from their professional experiences.
Related Measures

M 4: M4: Faculty Rating: Ability to Reflect
Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 4.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.

Document:
- Ed.S. TLG Deactivation Information

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Future of Ed.S.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning.

O/O 5: O5: Participates in Learning Communities
Accomplished Ed.S. graduates demonstrate how their professional growth is impacted through participation in one or more learning communities.

Related Measures

M 5: M5: Faculty Rating: Learning Communities
Summary faculty ratings derived from key course assessments will be entered into the STARS assessment survey for Objective 5.
Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Achievement Target:
100% of program completers will demonstrate an intermediate level of knowledge and skill needed to achieve this objective.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated, and students are no longer being admitted to the program.

Document:
- Ed.S. TLG Deactivation Information

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Action Plan Detail section of this report.

Future of Ed.S.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning.

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Future of Ed.S.
We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to make a decision regarding our commitment to the future of the program during 2009-2010.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of Spring Semester 2010
Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair and Ed.S. Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Future of Ed.S.

We are currently evaluating the viability of the Ed.S. because of the persistent low enrollment in concentration areas. We intend to make a decision regarding our commitment to the future of the program during 2009-2010.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: End of Spring Semester 2010
Completion Date: 04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Department Chair and Ed.S. Faculty
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: 0

Future of Ed.S.

For the last two academic years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), faculty have evaluated the viability of the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree because of the persistent low enrollment within individual concentration areas. In September 2010, we are submitting curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure:** M1: Faculty Rating: Commitment to Student Learning | **Outcome/Objective:** O1: Committed to Student Learning and Development
- **Measure:** M2: Faculty Rating: Expertise in Student Learning | **Outcome/Objective:** O2: Applies Expertise to Promote Student Learning
- **Measure:** M3: Faculty Rating: Monitoring Student Learning | **Outcome/Objective:** O3: Manages/Monitors Student Learning/Development
- **Measure:** M4: Faculty Rating: Ability to Reflect | **Outcome/Objective:** O4: Reflects on and Learns from Experience
- **Measure:** M5: Faculty Rating: Learning Communities | **Outcome/Objective:** O5: Participates in Learning Communities

Implementation Description: Once the curriculum review process is completed, the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree will be officially de-activated.

Completion Date: 12/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Department Faculty and Department Chair
In September 2010, we submitted curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education. Our proposals were approved, and we are currently deactivating the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** The Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning is currently being deactivated. Students are no longer being accepted into the program. Faculty are ensuring that students currently enrolled matriculate through the completion of their degree.  
**Completion Date:** 05/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Department Chair and Program Faculty  
**Additional Resources:** None  
**Budget Amount Requested:** 0

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements** - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?

NA

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment** - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?

NA

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs** - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?

NA

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection** - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year's CTW Assessment Report?

NA

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**

What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year's assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

In September 2010, we submitted curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education. Our proposals were approved, and we are currently deactivating the program.
ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2: What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

In September 2010, we submitted curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education. Our proposals were approved, and we are currently deactivating the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:
Explain how your department used the results from last year’s (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

In September 2010, we submitted curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education. Our proposals were approved, and we are currently deactivating the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

In September 2010, we submitted curriculum proposals to de-activate the following eleven (11) Ed.S. concentrations: Art Education, English as a Second Language Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Library Media Technology, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Music Education, Reading Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education. Our proposals were approved, and we are currently deactivating the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT QUESTION 3:
What strategies for improvement will you use over the coming year? What degree of improvement do you anticipate?

Detailed Assessment Report
2010-2011 Teaching & Learning PhD

Mission / Purpose
The mission of the Ph.D. degree program in Teaching and Learning is to prepare accomplished graduates who demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

Goals without Outcome/Objective Relationships Specified
G 1: Develop Researchers in Teaching and Learning
Accomplished graduates of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning degree program will demonstrate advanced knowledge in a major and cognate discipline, expertise in research design and methodologies, and a strong professional identity through their consistent contributions to a community of educational scholars.

Other Outcome/Objective, without Goals, along with Any Associations and Related Goals, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings
O/O 1: O1: Research Competence
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates general research competence including expertise in at least one research paradigm.

**Related Measures**

**M 1: M1: Faculty Rating of Research Competence**

A summary rating describing the candidate’s research competence will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated research competence in at least one paradigm. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**O/O 2: O2: Knowledge of Foundations of Education**

The Ph.D. candidate develops an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological, and economic influences that affect education today.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: M2: Faculty Rating of Foundational Knowledge**

A summary rating describing the candidate’s foundational knowledge will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**

On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**

All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated an in-depth understanding of forces such as historical, social, political, psychological, and economic influences that affect education today. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**O/O 3: O3: Creates New Knowledge in Major**
The Ph.D. candidate engages in scholarship and creates new knowledge about teaching and learning in his/her major discipline of inquiry.

**Related Measures**

**M 3: M3: Faculty Rating of Scholarship within Major**
A summary rating describing the candidate's scholarship within the major will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

**Source of Evidence:** Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated the creation of new knowledge and scholarship in their disciplines or majors. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**O/O 4: O4: Extensive Knowledge of Major Field**
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in the major discipline of inquiry.

**Related Measures**

**M 4: M4: Faculty Rating of Knowledge of Major**
A summary rating describing the candidate's knowledge of the major will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.

**Source of Evidence:** Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated an extended knowledge base in the major discipline. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**O/O 5: O5: Extensive Knowledge in Cognate Area**
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates an extended knowledge base in a cognate area that is associated with or that supports the major discipline of inquiry.
Related Measures

**M 5: M5: Faculty Rating of Knowledge of Cognate**
A summary rating describing the candidate's knowledge of the cognate area will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated an extended knowledge base in a cognate area associated with the major discipline. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**O/O 6: O6: Professional Identity and Contributions**
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates a professional identity by his/her contributions to the community of scholars and educators.

**Related Measures**

**M 6: M6: Faculty Rating of Identity and Contributions**
A summary rating describing the candidate's professional identity and his/her contributions to the profession will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

**Achievement Target:**
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

**Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met**
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated a developing professional identity through their contributions to the community of scholars in their field. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

**O/O 7: O7: Teaching and Professional Development**
The Ph.D. candidate demonstrates leadership through teaching and professional development within his/her major discipline of inquiry.
Program Standards and Student Rating System for the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning

Related Measures
M 7: M7: Faculty Rating of Teaching and Prof Dev
A summary rating describing the candidate’s teaching and professional development will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated leadership through teaching and professional developing in the major discipline of inquiry. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

Document:

O/O 8: O8: Technology as Tool for Inquiry
The Ph.D. candidate understands and uses technology as a tool of inquiry for teaching and learning.

Document:

Related Measures
M 8: M8: Faculty Rating of Technology Skills
A summary rating describing the candidate's technology skills will be derived by the dissertation chair and committee members from review of the residency report and accompanying research artifacts, performance on written and oral comprehensive exams focusing on research methodology, and on the dissertation performance.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Achievement Target:
On a scale from 1 to 5 (with 5 high), students must receive a faculty rating of at least 3.

Findings (2010-2011) - Achievement Target: Met
All completers of the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning demonstrated an in-depth understanding of and expertise in technology as a tool for inquiry for teaching and learning. Thus, 100% of program completers met the achievement target of a faculty rating of level 3 or higher (scale 1=low, 5=high).

Document:

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)
Tracking Our Graduates' Positions in Higher Ed
We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-intensive positions (e.g., an appointment as a faculty member in a research institution of higher education).

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**CTW Reflection 1: Achievements** - What were the major CTW accomplishments in your program for this academic year? How do these relate to the Action Plans that you specified last year?
NA

**CTW Reflection 2: Assessment** - What, if any, improvement in critical thinking among students have you been able to discern in a given class and/or over time from the entry level to the exit class?
NA

**CTW Reflection 3: Needs** - What areas of CTW in your program still need development? What aspects of the implementation of CTW have been problematic? What assistance might you need to address those areas?
NA

**CTW Reflection 4: Overall Reflection** - What have been the primary changes or impact of CTW on your academic program, and on the students and faculty involved in this
initiative? What changes has your department made to the CTW initiative since last year’s CTW Assessment Report?
NA

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

As of 2008-2009, we have begun to document the degree to which our Ph.D. concentrations are preparing researchers/scholars who draw upon their preparation in the Ph.D. degree to become actively involved in academia or in positions as researchers. We have also begun to document the position titles/affiliations of our graduates. In 2008-2009, we graduated 11 doctoral students in this program, and 5 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 45%). In 2009-2010, we graduated 17 doctoral students in this program, and 9 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 53%, a slight increase from the previous year). In 2010-2011, we graduated 14 doctoral students in this program, and 1 was placed in a faculty position in institutions of higher education (or 7%, a decrease from the previous year). We will continue to document our students’ job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year's assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

As of 2008-2009, we have begun to document the degree to which our Ph.D. concentrations are preparing researchers/scholars who draw upon their preparation in the Ph.D. degree to become actively involved in academia or in positions as researchers. We have also begun to document the position titles/affiliations of our graduates. In 2008-2009, we graduated 11 doctoral students in this program, and 5 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 45%). In 2009-2010, we graduated 17 doctoral students in this program, and 9 were placed in faculty positions in institutions of higher education (or 53%, a slight increase from the previous year). In 2010-2011, we graduated 14 doctoral students in this program, and 1 was placed in a faculty position in institutions of higher education (or 7%, a decrease from the previous year). We will continue to document our students’ job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 1:**
Explain how your department used the results from last year's (2009-2010) assessment. What actions did you take? What changes did you make as a result?

In 2009-2010, we developed a new department policy on Doctoral Student Mentoring to help guide both students and faculty in this important mentoring process. We plan to continue to document our students’ job placement as part of our annual program assessment process.

Document:

- MSIT Doctoral Student Mentoring Policy Effective 2-15-10

**ADMINISTRATIVE DEPT QUESTION 2:**
What have you learned from your assessment this year (2010-2011)?

All assessment targets were met for the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning. In 2009-2010, 14 students graduated from the Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning program. One (1) of these graduates (or 7%) now holds a position in higher education (Georgia State University). The others hold teaching or other professional positions in schools or school systems in the Atlanta metro area. We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-
We will continue to track the types of positions/academic appointments our students accept upon their graduation from the Ph.D. program, with the goal of placing a higher percentage of our graduates in research-intensive positions (e.g., an appointment as a faculty member in a research institution of higher education).

App. D2: Course syllabi for WAC courses

EDRD 4600 Reading and Writing in the Content Areas- Fall 2010
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Middle/Secondary Education and Instructional Technology

EDRD 4600
Reading and Writing in the Content Areas

FALL 2010
Monday 1: 30-4:00
COE 654
This is a Critical Thinking Through Writing Course
“Preparing informed, empowered, committed, and engaged educators”
Gladys Yarbrough, Ph.D.
Office: 642
Building: College of Education
Phone: 404/413-8061 (office)
Email: mstgry@langate.gsu.edu
Office Hours: By appointment
Natasha Thornton, Graduate Teaching Assistant
Email: nadams10@student.gsu.edu

Required Texts:
Adolescent Novel Book Groups: Choose one of the following – (After first class meeting).


Professional Book Groups: Choose one of the following – (After first class meeting).

Required Technology:
It is your responsibility to maintain an active LiveText account and to be proficient with the use of this technology tool. Numerous training sessions are offered throughout the year to help students learn to use LiveText. If you are not proficient with LiveText, you should take advantage of these help sessions. For problems or concerns, you may contact the MSIT LiveText Coordinator, Dr. Mary Ariail, at mariail@gsu.edu. You may also contact LiveText Tech Support directly at 1-866-548-3839.

Catalog Course Descriptions (3 Credit Hours):
In this course students examine reading and writing instructional strategies and materials in the content area classroom. Emphases are on adolescent literacy development, the process of reading and writing in middle grades, the role of textbooks and trade books, concept development, comprehension, vocabulary, and study strategies.

College of Education Conceptual Framework

Mission:
The GSU PEF represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, our mission is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are:
- informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice;
- empowered to serve as change agents;
- committed to and respectful of all learners; and
- engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

Our Purpose:
The Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is committed to planning implementing, and assessing programs that prepare educational professionals focused on learning and development.

**Assumptions Guiding Our Programs**

1. Learning and teaching must continually adapt to changes in society and the expanding knowledge base;
2. Learning is an active process;
3. Quality teaching takes into account individual differences, learning styles, and backgrounds;
4. Learning environments are based on the mutual respect of all participants;
5. A variety of teaching strategies and assessments are used to meet the needs of individual learners;
6. An integrated knowledge base consisting of content, skills, attitudes, technologies, and theories is developed and demonstrated in field-based applications.

**College and Department Goals:**

The College of Education seeks to prepare educators as leaders, thinkers, and change agents who are rounded in theory, content, and practice. Our master’s degree program in teaching and learning supports professional educators as inquirers, instructional specialists, and school leaders.

The Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT) is committed to the professional and personal development of students in all of its Bachelor’s, Master’s, Ed.S, and Ph.D. programs as well as students enrolled in our certification and endorsement programs. Since completion of all of these programs leads directly to entry into the professions, the MSIT faculty members place considerable emphasis on academic performance as well as on students’ suitability for responsible participation and professionalism in their chosen field. To meet this obligation, faculty members monitor both academic performance and non-academic behavior in order to identify, nurture, and support appropriate behaviors—and respond and intervene when inappropriate behaviors are noted. *(Excerpt taken from MSIT Policy on Student Development and Retention)*

**Cultural Diversity:**

This course rests upon the assumption that all learners bring a variety of linguistic and cognitive strengths from their families and communities into the classroom, and that these strengths are to be appreciated and utilized to enhance the learning of all students rather than ignored or dismissed. Multicultural education is not simply “about” certain subjects nor does it merely offer “perspectives” on issues; rather, it is an orientation to our purposes in education and life. Emphasizing the importance of cultural diversity in teacher preparation and professional development, EDRD 4600 will provide a focus on content reading and literacy that is infused with multiculturalism.

**Email Policy:**

All teacher candidates should be familiar with Georgia State University’s official email student notification policy: [http://www.gsu.edu/ist/dist_email_students.html](http://www.gsu.edu/ist/dist_email_students.html) and are expected to check their GSU email accounts on a daily basis and to respond promptly to email messages when requested by their supervisors, course instructors, or other university faculty and/or staff. GSU email is used as a regular means of communication during field experiences, including those who are provisionally certified. Messages will not be sent to personal email accounts.

**Student Conduct:**
Students are expected to know and abide by the policies set forth in the Georgia State University student handbook at the following website:  http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwdos/codeofconduct.html

Students should also be familiar with the Georgia State University Administrative Policies related to Disruptive Student Conduct in the Classroom or Other Environment: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwdos/wordFilesEtc/A_Disruptive%20student%20Conduct%20in%20the%20Classroom%20or%20Other%20Learning%20Environment.pdf

MSIT Student Policy on Development and Retention:
Faculty members monitor both academic performance and non-academic behavior in order to identify, nurture, and support appropriate behaviors—and respond and intervene when inappropriate behaviors are noted.  Please review the MSIT Policy on Development and Retention in the Field Experiences Handbook.

Academic Honesty:
Students are expected to know and abide by the policies set forth in the Georgia State University student handbook, which may be accessed at the following website: www.gsu.edu/deanofstudents/codeofconduct.html.

Any student who violates the university’s policy on academic honesty will be subject to disciplinary action(s), which may include a failing grade for the course and possible dismissal from the program and/or the university.

Students with Disabilities:
Students who wish to request accommodation for a disability may do so by registering with the Office of Disability Services. Students may only be accommodated upon issuance by the Office of Disability Services of a signed Accommodation Plan and are responsible for providing a copy of that plan to instructors of all classes in which an accommodation is sought.

Student Evaluation of Instruction:
Your constructive assessment of this course plays an indispensable role in shaping education at Georgia State. Upon completing the course, please take the time to fill out the online course evaluation.

Course Outcomes/Proficiencies – Georgia Framework for Teaching:

The course outcomes are organized by proficiencies that are commonly accepted as quality teaching. Additionally, at the completion of your program all Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) certification standards have been addressed. The Georgia Framework for Teaching was adopted in 2005-06 by the Georgia Department of Education (DOE), PSC and the University System of Georgia Board of Regents (BOR) as the state definition of quality teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content &amp; Curriculum</th>
<th>Knowledge of Students</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Planning and Instruction</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1.1.1 Demonstrate knowledge of major concepts in assigned content area(s).

2.1.1 Believe that all students can learn.

4.1.1 Have a basic understanding of assessment and measurement theory.

5.4.1 Observe students closely and begin to discover how adjustments in teaching can impact learning.

6.1.1 Learn basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education.

1.2.1 Adapt content and teaching to meet observed learner needs.

2.2.1 Understand and use basic theories of learning to create productive classroom instruction.

4.2.1 Collect and use pre-assessment data to select student learning goals.

5.5.1 Explore teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for assigned students.

6.2.1 Learn about, locate resources for, and follow laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families.

1.4.1 Relate content to everyday lives of students.

2.3.1 Communicate respect for and develop rapport with all students.

4.3.1 Use formative and summative assessments at appropriate points in the learning process.

5.6.1 Assess individual learners' needs and seek resources to improve instruction and learning.

6.3.1 Adhere to state and local Codes of Ethics, including school and district policies, in both professional and personal settings, and model ethical behavior for students.

1.5.1 Use available resources, including technology, from preparation programs, personal background and research, and the school/district to learn more about the content area(s).

2.4.1 Analyze student data both independently and with colleagues.

4.4.1 Identify students' learning needs and provide students with goals for learning.

5.7.1 Learn to work and plan productively as part of a team, grade level, and/or department group.

6.4.1 Reflect on teaching practice and begin to examine the connections to student learning.

2.5.1 Identify students' stages of development, multiple intelligences, learning styles, and areas of exceptionality and, with help, begin to develop and use a repertoire of strategies to accommodate individual needs.

4.5.1 Develop and implement consistent, fair, and accurate grading procedures.

5.8.1 Self-assess teaching strengths and areas for improvement, seeking and using guidance from mentors and instructional leaders in order to improve in key areas.

4.8.1 Examine ways to identify student strengths and weaknesses through various assessment processes and methods.

Alignment of Expected Student Outcomes with Georgia Framework for Teaching (Basic)

**Georgia Framework for Teaching Standards Addressed –**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>GFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands students and the multiple ways in which they learn.</td>
<td>2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher has a basic understanding of assessment and measurement theory.</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher can discuss formal and informal methods of student assessment and explain the various methods used.</td>
<td>4.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher can distinguish between poor and best teaching practices.</td>
<td>1.21,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.41,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands the varied and multiple roles related to teaching.</td>
<td>6.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher knows how to analyze student data both independently and with colleagues.</td>
<td>2.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher demonstrates knowledge of content areas.</td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SKILLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses information about the learning–teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment.</td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied, and appropriate learning goals.</td>
<td>1.2.1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction.</td>
<td>4.2.1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5.1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.</td>
<td>1.2.1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses regular and systematic evaluations of student learning to make instructional decisions.</td>
<td>5.4.1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher reflects on his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.</td>
<td>6.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher develops rapport with students.</td>
<td>2.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher communicates with students in a manner that students can understand.</td>
<td>1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher works and plans as part of a team.</td>
<td>5.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISPOSITIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher values professional development.</td>
<td>6.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher appreciates reflective teaching.</td>
<td>6.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher displays professional teaching behavior.</td>
<td>6.1.1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2.1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher examines personal beliefs about teaching.</td>
<td>6.4.1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher voluntarily seeks information to improve teaching skills.</td>
<td>6.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher demonstrates respectful attitudes toward students.</td>
<td>2.3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Requirements:**

**Class Participation, Attendance, and Professionalism** (10 points):

**Class Participation and Attendance:**
This class is intended to be interactive and collaborative. Participants are expected to come to class prepared to discuss assignments or selected readings, and to articulate an informed opinion. Your participation in class is critical to your growth as a professional and for the class to function as a community. Credit for participation will be derived from attendance, punctuality (which includes being on time and not leaving early), respectful listening, active discussion, and in-class writing assignments.
In-class assignments cannot be made up. Students may have one excused absence (approved by the instructor). Additional absences may result in a reduction of one letter grade per absence. (For example: An A in the course will be reduced to an A-). All written work must be professional in appearance (i.e. grammar/spelling conventions, neatness), and you must use American Psychological Association style, 6th edition. The use of cell phones in the classroom is not permitted. If you have an emergency phone call, just excuse yourself. Computers may only be used for note taking purposes only – abuse of this policy may result in a reduction of one letter grade.

Professional Book Group Discussion Reflection and Paper (30 points):
In groups of 3 or 4, you will read one of the professional books outlined in this syllabus. You will meet in groups to discuss the ideas presented by the authors. You will need to audio record (Your phone might be able to do this!) your book discussions in order to include relevant quotes in your paper which highlight your discussion of the ideas. You are not required to agree or reach consensus on the topics. Rather, you are expected to engage in professional conversations about the ideas in the text and how they apply to you as a future classroom teacher. Your group will also share with the whole class the synthesis of the book and your discussion on the day outlined in the course schedule. You will be responsible for posting on Live Text a 1 - page reflection about this experience on 9/16. In addition, you will be expected to write a 2-3 (double spaced) paper containing the following information: 1 A one page summary of the book, 2. Your react to the book, 3. How can this information be used in the classroom. Your paper should be written using APA 6th edition and posted on Live Text by 9/29.

Adolescent Novel Literature Circles and Discussion Reflection (20 points):
Working in groups, you will read one of the adolescent novels outlined in this syllabus. Your group will participate in literature circles, with each one of you taking a ‘role’ as you read the text (vocabulary, main ideas, text-to-world connections, etc). Upon conclusion of your book, your group will develop a visual organizer that represents your book and what you learned. You are expected to post a literature circle reflection to LiveText 1-2 (double spaced) paged paper by 10/7. Your reflection should be a discussion about your react to literature circles, highlighting both the pros and cons of implementing this type of literacy program.

Problem-based Learning Project and Paper (40 points):
You will use various assignments from class, research articles, and information gleaned from class lectures and your readings in this course to answer the question, “How do I teach reading and writing in the content areas?” You should find a way to display this information in a creative way (i.e., Power Point, poster board, I-Movie, or Movie Maker). This project should give your classmates a good idea of what you learned. You will be responsible for writing a 3-4 (double spaced) page paper about this information.. You will be required to use at least 4 research-based articles in your paper, using APA 6th edition. Your paper should be posted on Live Text by 12/1.

Course Evaluation Points:

| Class Participation/ Attendance | 10 points |
| Professional Book Group        | 30 points |
| Problem-based Learning Project  | 40 points |
| Literature Circles Discussion Chart | 20 points |

100 points
The final grade in this course will be based on a system of 100 percentage points (see chart above). Grades for individual assignments will be converted to percentage points that will be counted toward the final grade. The grade of incomplete is rarely given. It is used in extreme cases for non-academic reasons.

Grading Scale for EDRD 4600:

The course syllabus provides a general plan for the course: deviations may be necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>98-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>94-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>88-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>84-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>78-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>74-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>68-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>64-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>60-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Below 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentative Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics Covered</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/22</td>
<td>First Class</td>
<td>No assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is a CTW course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is LiveText</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/29</td>
<td>Professional Book Discussion</td>
<td>Read Rycik &amp; Irvin, Chapter1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What Middle Grade Readers Need and What Their Teachers Understand.</td>
<td>Daniels &amp; Zemelman, Chapters 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading for Real.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How Smart Readers Think.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why Textbooks Are Not Enough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>Problem-based Learning Project Discussion.</td>
<td>Read Rycik &amp; Irvin, Chapter1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Reading Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6</td>
<td>Literature Circles Presentation Using Drama in the classroom (Pt.2)</td>
<td>Post on Live Text Literature Circle Reflections by 10/7 Pogrow, 5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13</td>
<td>Classroom Management (Pt. 2) Reading the World Reading the Internet Reading Textbooks Reading the Test</td>
<td>Burke, (IT) 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20</td>
<td>PAWS WEEK ( No Classes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27</td>
<td>Reading Strategies to use in the Content Areas (Part1) Reading Literature Reading Information</td>
<td>Burke, (IT) 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27</td>
<td>Reading Strategies to use in the Content Areas (Part 2) Reading Images Epilogue: Reading the Future</td>
<td>Burke, (IT) 7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10</td>
<td>Writing Strategies to use in the Content Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17</td>
<td>Action Research Discussions Problem-based Learning Project Presentations</td>
<td>Problem-based Learning Project Presentation Due (1/2 half class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24</td>
<td>Thanksgiving Holiday Week (No classes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1</td>
<td>Final Class Problem-based Learning Project Presentations Wrap up/Review Celebration!</td>
<td>Problem-based Learning Project Presentation Due (1/2 half class) (All papers should be posted on Live Text on 12/1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Critical issues in Middle Grades Education
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“Preparing informed, empowered, committed, and engaged educators”

Gladys Yarbrough, Ph.D.
Office: 642
Building: College of Education
Phone: 404/413-8061
Email: gyarbrough@gsu.edu
Office Hours: By appointment only

Class location: Classroom South 503
Date and Time: Thursday, 4:30-7:00

REQUIRED TEXT:


Other articles as requested by the instructor.

Catalog Course Description:
Taken concurrently with the last semester of the student teaching experience, this course will guide the student in reflection on, and further examination of, contemporary critical issues for educators. Major emphases on middle level teaching and learning, begun in the earlier stages of the program, will receive intense attention during this semester as students integrate theory and practice on the student teaching campus. This course is a Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) course.
College of Education Conceptual Framework

Mission:
The GSU PEF represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, our mission is to prepare educators (i.e., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are:

- informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice;
- empowered to serve as change agents;
- committed to and respectful of all learners; and
- engaged with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

Our Purpose:
The Professional Education Faculty (PEF) is committed to planning implementing, and assessing programs that prepare educational professionals focused on learning and development.

Assumptions Guiding Our Programs
1. Learning and teaching must continually adapt to changes in society and the expanding knowledge base;
2. Learning is an active process;
3. Quality teaching takes into account individual differences, learning styles, and backgrounds;
4. Learning environments are based on the mutual respect of all participants;
5. A variety of teaching strategies and assessments are used to meet the needs of individual learners;
6. An integrated knowledge base consisting of content, skills, attitudes, technologies, and theories is developed and demonstrated in field-based applications.

Required Text and Technology:
It is your responsibility to maintain an active LiveText account and to be proficient with the use of this technology tool. Numerous training sessions are offered throughout the year to help students learn to use LiveText. If you are not proficient with LiveText, you should take advantage of these help sessions. For problems or concerns, you may contact the MSIT LiveText Coordinator, Dr. Mary Ariail, at mariail@gsu.edu. You may also contact LiveText Tech Support directly at 1-866-548-3839.

Cultural Diversity:
This course rests upon the assumption that all learners bring a variety of linguistic and cognitive strengths from their families and communities into the classroom, and that these strengths are to be appreciated and utilized to enhance the learning of all students rather than ignored or dismissed. Multicultural education is not simply “about” certain subjects nor does it merely offer “perspectives” on issues; rather, it is an orientation to our purposes in education and life. Emphasizing the importance of cultural diversity in teacher preparation and professional development EDLA 3200 will provide a focus on content reading and literacy that is infused with multiculturalism.
Email Policy:
All teacher candidates should be familiar with Georgia State University’s official email student notification policy. Students are expected to check their GSU email accounts on a daily basis and to respond promptly to e-mail messages, when requested by their supervisors, course instructors, or other university faculty and/or staff. GSU email is used as a regular means of communication during field experiences, including those who are provisionally certified. Messages will not be sent to personal email accounts.

Student Conduct:
Students are expected to know and abide by the policies set forth in the Georgia State University student handbook at the following website: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwdos/codeofconduct.html

Students should also be familiar with the Georgia State University Administrative Policies related to Disruptive Student Conduct in the Classroom or Other Environment: http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwdos/wordFilesEtc/A_Disruptive%20student%20Conduct%20in%20the%20Classroom%20or%20Other%20Learning%20Environment.pdf

MSIT Student Policy on Development and Retention:
The Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT) is committed to the professional and personal development of students in all of its Bachelor’s, Master’s, Ed.S, and Ph.D. programs as well as students enrolled in our certification and endorsement programs. Since completion of all of these programs leads directly to entry into the professions, the MSIT faculty members place considerable emphasis on academic performance as well as on students’ suitability for responsible participation and professionalism in their chosen field. To meet this obligation, faculty members monitor both academic performance and non-academic behavior in order to identify, nurture, and support appropriate behaviors—and respond and intervene when inappropriate behaviors are noted. (Excerpt taken from MSIT Policy on Student Development and Retention)

Academic Honesty:
Students are expected to know and abide by the policies set forth in the Georgia State University student handbook, which may be accessed at the following website: www.gsu.edu/deanofstudents/codeofconduct.html.

Any student who violates the university’s policy on academic honesty will be subject to disciplinary action(s), which may include a failing grade for the course and possible dismissal from the program and/or the university.

Students with Disabilities:
Students who wish to request accommodation for a disability may do so by registering with the Office of Disability Services. Students may only be accommodated upon issuance by the Office
of Disability Services of a signed Accommodation Plan and are responsible for providing a copy of that plan to instructors of all classes in which an accommodation is sought.

Student Evaluation of Instruction:
Your constructive assessment of this course plays an indispensable role in shaping education at Georgia State. Upon completing the course, please take the time to fill out the online course evaluation.

Course Outcomes/Proficiencies – Georgia Framework for Teaching

The course outcomes are organized by proficiencies that are commonly accepted as quality teaching. Additionally, at the completion of your program all Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) certification standards have been addressed. The Georgia Framework for Teaching was adopted in 2005-06 by the Georgia Department of Education (DOE), PSC and the University System of Georgia Board of Regents (BOR) as the state definition of quality teaching.

Course Outcomes/Proficiencies – Georgia Framework for Teaching

The course outcomes are organized by proficiencies that are commonly accepted as quality teaching. Additionally, at the completion of your program all Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) certification standards have been addressed. The Georgia Framework for Teaching was adopted in 2005-06 by the Georgia Department of Education (DOE), PSC and the University System of Georgia Board of Regents (BOR) as the state definition of quality teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content &amp; Curriculum</th>
<th>Knowledge of Students</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Planning and Instruction</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Demonstrate knowledge of major concepts in assigned content area(s).</td>
<td>2.1.1 Believe that all students can learn.</td>
<td>4.1.1 Have a basic understanding of assessment and measurement theory.</td>
<td>5.4.1 Observe students closely and begin to discover how adjustments in teaching can impact learning.</td>
<td>6.1.1 Learn basic information about the history, ethics, organization, and practices of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 Adapt content and teaching to meet observed learner needs.</td>
<td>2.2.1 Understand and use basic theories of learning to create productive classroom instruction.</td>
<td>4.2.1 Collect and use pre-assessment data to select student learning goals.</td>
<td>5.5.1 Explore teaching roles to discover appropriate approaches for assigned students.</td>
<td>6.2.1 Learn about, locate resources for, and follow laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1 Relate content to everyday lives of students.</td>
<td>2.3.1 Communicate respect for and develop rapport with all students.</td>
<td>4.3.1 Use formative and summative assessments at appropriate points in the learning process.</td>
<td>5.6.1 Assess individual learners' needs and seek resources to improve instruction and learning.</td>
<td>6.3.1 Adhere to state and local Codes of Ethics, including school and district policies, in both professional and personal settings, and model ethical behavior for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1 Use available resources, including technology, from preparation programs, personal background and research, and the school/district to learn more about the content area(s).</td>
<td>2.4.1 Analyze student data both independently and with colleagues.</td>
<td>4.4.1 Identify students’ learning needs and provide students with goals for learning.</td>
<td>5.7.1 Learn to work and plan productively as part of a team, grade level, and/or department group.</td>
<td>6.4.1 Reflect on teaching practice and begin to examine the connections to student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1 Identify students’ stages of development, multiple intelligences, learning styles, and areas of exceptionality and, with help, begin to develop and use a repertoire of strategies to accommodate individual needs.</td>
<td>4.5.1 Develop and implement consistent, fair, and accurate grading procedures.</td>
<td>6.5.1 Self-assess teaching strengths and areas for improvement, seeking and using guidance from mentors and instructional leaders in order to improve in key areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.1 Examine ways to identify student strengths and weaknesses through various assessment processes and methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation**

**Participation and Professionalism**
- Critical Friends Reflection Journals: 20 points
- Critical Incident Video: 20 points
- Lesson Study: 20 points
- Key Concepts in Middle Level Education: 30 points

**Total Points**

100 points

**Grading Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98% - 100%</td>
<td>(490 – 500) = A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94% - 97%</td>
<td>(470 – 489) = A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% - 93%</td>
<td>(450 – 469) = A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88% - 89%</td>
<td>(440 – 449) = B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84% - 87%</td>
<td>(420 – 439) = B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% - 83%</td>
<td>(400 – 419) = B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78% - 79%</td>
<td>(390 – 399) = C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74% - 77%</td>
<td>(370 – 389) = C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% - 73%</td>
<td>(350 – 369) = C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68% - 69%</td>
<td>(340 – 349) = D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64% - 67%</td>
<td>(320 – 339) = D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Requirements

A. Class Participation and Attendance: (10 points)
This class is intended to be interactive and collaborative. Participants are expected to come to class prepared to discuss assignments or selected readings, and to articulate an informed opinion. Your participation in class is critical to your growth as a professional for the class to function as a community. Credit for participation will be derived from attendance, punctuality (which included being on time and not leaving early), respectful listening, active discussion, and in-class writing assignments. In-class group assignments cannot be made up. Points will also be taken away for more than one unexcused lateness. Students who have one excused absence (approved by the instructor) will be allowed to meet with the instructor to make arrangements for making up the class. Additional absences will result in a reduction of one letter grade per absence. (For example: An A in the course will be reduced to an A-). The use of cell phones (including texting) in the classroom is not permitted. If you have an emergency phone call, just excuse yourself. Computers and other electronic devices may only be used for note taking purposes only – abuse of this policy may result in a reduction of one letter grade.

Please note: the semester midpoint is February 24, 2012. This is the last day to withdraw from this class with the possibility of receiving a “W.” You are responsible for your own withdrawal if this is what you choose to do. If a student withdraws by this date, but is failing the course, he or she will receive a “WF.” All students who withdraw after this date will receive a “WF.”

B. Critical Friends Reflection Journal (20 points):
You will be responsible for maintaining a journal (written in letter format) that you will share with several other cohort members. Your journals should reflect your experiences in the classroom, accentuate personal milestones, and note questions, concerns, and challenges. You will also be responsible for responding to the letters of your group members, starting on the second round of letters. See appendix for more assignment details.

C. Critical Incident Video and Reflection (20 points):
You will video-tape yourself teaching during at least 2 class sessions. From these video-recordings, you will extract a 5-10 minute video segment to share with your critical group. The incident may be something that ‘amused’ or ‘annoyed’, was ‘typical’ or ‘atypical’, or ‘felt difficult or ‘felt successful.’ Part 1 of the assignment (the video segment and your initial reflection) is due on 3/15. The final project is due on 4/12. See appendix for more assignment details.

D. Lesson Study (20 points):
In your critical friends group, you will jointly develop a lesson plan for each member of your group. Each group member will then teach the lesson on a day when the other group members are available to observe, take notes, and provide detailed feedback. After the lesson, a debriefing session between the teacher and observers takes place. All group members will produce an individual written reflection of the process. The final paper due to LiveText will include all the individual reflections in addition to a group written introduction and “final thoughts” section. See appendix for more assignment details.

E. Key Concepts in Middle Education (30 points)
You are to present a 2-3 page paper (APA 6th edition) and a presentation (i.e., PowerPoint, Prezi, I-movie, Movie Maker Poster on one of the topics I have outlined:

Effective teacher practices in standardized testing
How to recognize student achievement, both in and out of school – and helping them remain “cool”
How to effectively encourage student motivation and encouragement
Effective practices for curbing absenteeism and tardiness
Understanding popular and youth culture as effective forms of instruction
Effective uses of technology and social media in the classroom to enhance instruction
Understanding the Responses to Intervention (RTI) and Student Support Team (SST) process
Working effectively with students with behavior issues (i.e., disruptive, defiant, bullying, cyperbullying)
Team teaching with another educator
Working effectively with LGBT, and culturally and linguistically diverse students
Come up with your own idea – but check with me first.

You are to use at least 2 scholarly journals and 3-5 citations in your paper. You must also include your own ideas based upon what you have seen in the classroom and/or your own personal experiences. You can work with a partner on the presentation, but you are required to write your own individualized paper. Please see due dates on schedule.

This course syllabus provides a general plan for the course: deviations may be necessary.
Tentative Course Schedule
(This schedule is subject to change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>Course Introduction</td>
<td>No assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>No class</td>
<td>Assignment #1 on LiveText</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Text Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26</td>
<td>What is 21st century learning?</td>
<td>Trilling &amp; Fadel, Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>What are 21st century skills?</td>
<td>Trilling &amp; Fadel, Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9</td>
<td>No class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>PAWS Week (We will have class)</td>
<td>Trilling &amp; Fadel, Part 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21st century learning in practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>Differentiation, Mastery and Assessment</td>
<td>Wormeli, Chapters 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>Spring break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Wormeli, Chapters 7-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Natasha Thornton will teach this class – I will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attending a conference)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15</td>
<td>Implementation and the Big Picture</td>
<td>Wormeli, Chapters 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22</td>
<td>No class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29</td>
<td>Teacher stories</td>
<td>Friedman and Reynolds, Chapters 1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal 4 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key Concept #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>No class</td>
<td>Friedman and Reynolds, Chapters, 10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson Study Due to LiveText</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/12</td>
<td>Teacher studies</td>
<td>Friedman and Reynolds, Chapters, 10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Incident Video (part 2) due to Live Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key Concept # 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/19</td>
<td>(Last day of class)</td>
<td>Key Concepts # 9 &amp; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Celebration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX: Assignment Details**

**Critical Incident Assignment Guidelines**

Critical Incidents are the ‘oops,’ ‘ouch,’ ‘aha...,’ or ‘oh...’ moments that you experience during a teaching episode or as you watch your videotaped lesson. The incident may be something that ‘amused’ or ‘annoyed’, was ‘typical’ or ‘atypical’, or ‘felt difficult’ or ‘felt successful.’ One goal of using critical incidents is to help you look beyond the experience of the incident to the **meaning** of the incident. This is a form of *reflection-on-action*. Another goal is to help you develop your ability to reflect on these incidents as they happen, or *reflection-in-action*. Finally, using critical incidents can help you adjust your lesson and strategies for future teaching cycles, or *reflection-for-action*. Remember, there is no “right” or “wrong” way to select an incident. It should be something useful and meaningful to you.

**Video and Presentation Requirements:**

You will be required to share your critical incidence video with your critical friends group on 3/12. The following pieces of the project are due during this time:

1. Copies of the lesson plan for the lesson covered in your video (for your group members)
2. 5-10 minute edited video segment(s) to share with your group
3. Questions to guide your group in discussion of / reflection on your video segment (one copy for Dr. Yarbrough and one copy for you) 4. A written description and analysis of the critical incident (#1 and #2 below) (one copy for Dr. Yarbrough)

Reflection Paper Requirements:
Parts 1 and 2 are due in class (with your video) on 3/12. Parts 1, 2, and 3 are due to LiveText on 4/9.

1. Description of the Critical Incident:
   a. What: Provide an in-depth description of the event. Try to write this without judgment or interpretation.
   b. Emotions: Describe the feelings you had as you ‘experienced’ the incident.
   c. Why: Explain the incident from the perspective of each participant (student, teacher, etc.).

2. Analysis of the Critical Incident:
   a. Position: What are some of your personal beliefs related to teaching and learning that you identified when reflecting on this incident. You might begin with “As a teacher, this incident shows that I believe/value…”
   b. Actions: What do you learn from viewing the critical incident? Specify steps that you will take to improve your teaching practices in response to this critical incident. After considering this incident, what will you do differently in light of your new understanding? You might begin with “As a teacher, this incident directs me to…”

3. Reflection:
   a. Peer feedback: Summarize the feedback you received from peers and respond to it briefly.
   b. Learning through collaboration: Describe any new ideas you have about your critical incident video after sharing with your critical friends group. Discuss the benefits and drawbacks of sharing your teaching in this way.

Adapted from, “The Role of Digital Video and Critical Incident Analysis In Learning to Teach.” Laurie Dias, AERA, 2008.

Critical Friends Group Reflection Journal Guidelines
Introduction:

You will be responsible for maintaining a critical friends group journal (written in letter format) that you will share with 2 other cohort members. Your journals should highlight your experiences in the classroom and reflect on the course readings. You will also be responsible for responding to the letters of your group members, starting on the second round of letters. Details are described below, but first please read about reflection below:

*What is reflection?* Reflection is an activity in which you: recapture your experience, think about it (alone or with others), evaluate it, and then act upon the evaluation.

*Why reflect?*
Reflective learning requires that you think through issues for yourself, ask questions and seek out relevant information to aid your understanding. The experiences, incidents or ideas most worthy of reflection are usually those that provoke feelings of discomfort, pleasure or confusion.

**What are the benefits of reflection?**
Reflective learners are more likely to develop a deeper understanding of their subject and therefore to achieve better grades. They tend to be motivated and pro-active and know what they are trying to achieve, are able to identify, explain and address their strengths and weaknesses, understand new concepts by relating them to previous experiences and use their existing knowledge to help them to develop their understanding of new ideas.

Project Requirements:
(1) Every few weeks (see due dates on syllabus), you will write a 2-page (single-spaced) letter to your critical friends group reflecting on your student teaching experience.

a. Requirements for Journal 1:
i. Reflection on Trilling & Fadel (All)
ii. Any topic related to your teaching experiences so far (see list of possible topics below)

b. Requirements for Journal 2:
i. A response to your other two triad members’ journal 1 entries on the readings and their topic of choice
ii. Reflection on Wormeli chapters (All)
iii. Any new topic related to your teaching experiences since your last letter (see list of possible topics below)

c. Requirements for Journal 3:
i. A response to your other two triad members’ journal 2 entries on the readings and their topic of choice
ii. Reflection on Friedman & Reynolds chapters 1-9
iii. Any new topic related to your teaching experiences since your last letter (see list of possible topics below)

d. Requirements for Journal 4:
i. A response to your other two triad members’ journal 3 entries on the readings and their topic of choice
ii. Reflection on Friedman & Reynolds chapters 10-17
iii. Any new topic related to your teaching experiences since your last letter (see list of possible topics below)
iv. Final words of advice to your critical friends group members

(2) You will post your letter at the LiveText discussion board tab for your triad group by 11pm on the day they are due.
At the end of the semester, you should copy and paste all journal entries from the LiveText discussion board to one word file. This file should be submitted for a grade via the LiveText assignments page. There will be 4 rounds of letters total.

Questions* to consider as you go along:

1. Was my level of enthusiasm/involvement high or low this week? Explain why.
2. Did I challenge the students? How?
3. Was my lesson appropriately adapted for all learners? What other suggestions do you have?
4. Was my lesson developmentally appropriate? If not, what was inappropriate? What would I do to change it?
5. Were concepts presented too abstractly? Too concretely? How could I change my presentation?
6. What were some of the ways that the students demonstrated that they were actively engaged in the learning process?
7. Did I set clear expectations so that students knew what was expected of them? If not, how can I make them clearer?
8. What content areas did I integrate within the lesson? Was this integration appropriate and successful?
9. Did I find it necessary to make adjustments while teaching the lesson? If so, what adjustments, and were these adjustments effective?
10. What worked with classroom behavior management? What didn’t work? How would I change what didn’t work?
11. How did I integrate and use technology effectively in instruction and assessment, if appropriate?
12. The most positive aspect of my experience (or an area I showed strength) since my last journal has been...
13. The areas where I feel particular pressure are...
14. The aspects of my experience which most need improvement or adjustment include...


Lesson Study*

Assignment Overview

What is lesson study?

Lesson study is a professional development process that Japanese teachers engage in to systematically examine their practice, with the goal of becoming more effective. This examination centers on teachers working collaboratively on a small number of "study lessons". Working on these study lessons involves planning, teaching, observing, and critiquing the
lessons. While working on a study lesson, teachers jointly draw up a detailed plan for the lesson, which one of the teachers uses to teach the lesson in a real classroom (as other group members observe the lesson). The group then comes together to discuss their observations of the lesson. Finally, the teachers produce a report of what their study lessons have taught them.

Why use lesson study?

- To improve the quality of teaching and learning through open discussion and systematic critique
- To help cultivate a collegial atmosphere through dialogue about common issues of concern
- To provide a safe space for the evaluation of teaching by examining aspects not covered by someone who may be assigning a grade or working as a supervisor

Assignment Steps and Guidelines

Project Part 1 – Individual Work
1. Pick a Lesson Topic: Each team member will identify a lesson they will teach for their upcoming observation.

2. Develop Learning Goals: Each team member articulates what they would like students to know and be able to do as a result of their lesson. Note: This happens individually at first, and then becomes a joint effort with the entire team.

Project Part 2 – Group Work
3. Design the Lesson: The team designs a lesson to achieve the learning goals. This will happen in class and outside of class during the “off” weeks.

4. Plan the Study: The team decides how to observe and collect evidence of student learning and teacher effectiveness.

5. Teach and Observe: One team member teaches the lesson while others observe and collect evidence of student learning. Note – each team member will act as the teacher exactly one time, and will act as the observer at least one time.

6. Analyze and Revise: The team discusses the results and assesses student progress toward learning goals.

Project Part 3 – Individual and Group Work
7. Document and Disseminate: The team documents the lesson study through reflection.
   a. Individual: Each group member will write up their own reflection paper (2-3 double spaced pages) on the lesson study process. This reflection should include information on what was learned about teaching and learning throughout the project from the perspective of both a teacher and an observer. Specific details from both the lessons taught and observed, and from the planning and debriefing sessions should be included.
   b. Group: The group will combine their individual reflections into one paper for
App. D3: Degree requirements for each program

4140 Middle Level Education (B.S.E.)
Program Offered:

1. **Bachelor of Science in Education in Middle Level Education**
   
   Additional Teacher Education information is found in section 1600 of the catalog.

Program Theme: Teacher as Facilitator of Learning in a Supportive Environment

The B.S.E. major in Middle Level Education prepares outstanding middle level educators who can meet the needs of young adolescents in today's diverse, highly technological, and changing society. Graduates have a well developed content knowledge in two fields (language arts, mathematics, reading, science, or social studies), and they are able to construct and implement interdisciplinary instruction creatively.

Successful completion of this program and the appropriate GACE Content Assessment tests leads to a recommendation for licensure for grades four through eight in the two areas of concentration.

Program Degree Requirements

B.S.E. Middle Level Education

Students must complete 42 semester hours in Areas A-E of the Undergraduate Core Curriculum with the recommendations listed in this section. Courses in Area A must be completed with "C" or higher grades.

Semester hours are shown in parentheses following an entry.

**Area A. Essential Skills**

Students who choose mathematics or science as one of their areas of concentration should select pre-calculus or a more advanced mathematics course) to fulfill the mathematics requirement.

**Area C. Humanities and Fine Arts**
Students who choose language arts as one of their areas of concentration should select ENGL 2110 World Literature (3), ENGL 2120 British Literature (3), or ENGL 2130 American Literature (3) to fulfill three semester hours of the Humanities and Fine Arts requirements.

**Area D. Science, Mathematics, and Technology**

Students who choose mathematics as one of their areas of concentration should select calculus of one variable (or a more advanced mathematics course) to fulfill three semester hours of the Science, Mathematics, and Technology requirements. Students who choose science as one of their concentration areas are encouraged to choose CHEM 1101K and 1102K or BIOL 1103K and BIOL 1104K. Students who choose Social Studies as an area of concentration are encouraged to choose GEOG 1112 and 1113.

**Area E. Social Science**

Students who choose social studies as one of their areas of concentration should select either AAS 1140


**Area F. Preparation for a Major (18 semester hours)**

Students must earn a grade of "C" or higher in each course used to fulfill Area F requirements.

Required (9):

- EDUC 2110 Investigating Critical and Contemporary Issues in Education (3)
- EDUC 2120 Exploring Socio Cultural Perspectives on Diversity (3)
- EDUC 2130 Exploring Teaching and Learning (3)

Select three (9):

With advisor approval, students select two additional 1000- or 2000-level courses for a minimum of six semester hours in one concentration area and one course for three semester hours in a second concentration area.

- **Language Arts**: ENGL 2110 World Literature, ENGL 2120 British Literature, or ENGL 2130 American Literature
- **Reading**: English 2110 World Literature, ENGL 2120 British Literature, or ENGL 2130 American Literature
- **Mathematics**: MATH 2008 Foundations of Numbers and Operations (3); MATH 2212 Calculus of One Variable II (4) or MATH 2420 Discrete Mathematics (3)
- **Sciences**: CHEM 1101K and/or CHEM 1102, or BIOL 1103K and/or BIOL 1104K are recommended if not taken in Area D.
• **Social Studies**: GEOG 1101 Introduction to Human Geography, GEOG 1112 Introduction to Weather and Climate or GEOG 1113 Introduction to Landforms recommended if not taken in Area D

**Area G. Major/Teaching Field (48 semester hours)**

Students must apply for teacher education prior to beginning coursework in G.3 (Pedagogical Knowledge) of their program. To be accepted into teacher education:

- students must have a 2.50 composite grade point average on all undergraduate coursework previously completed;
- Students must present passing scores on the GACE Basic Skills Assessment or demonstrate an exemption upon application to an initial educator preparation program. The current options for satisfying the Basic Skills Assessment, including the exemptions, are outlined at [www.gapsc.com/documentation/basicskillsinfo.asp](http://www.gapsc.com/documentation/basicskillsinfo.asp). Under "Basic Skills Testing," go to "Options to Satisfy the Basic Skills Requirement";
- students must have successfully completed Areas A through F of the program of study;
- students must have successfully completed at least 18 of the 24 hours in Area G.1 Content Concentration courses (at least 9 hours in each concentration); and
- students must have successfully completed all Area G.2 Core Knowledge courses

1. **Content Concentrations for Middle Level Education (24)**
   In consultation with their advisors, students select two areas of concentration from among language arts, mathematics, reading, science, and social studies. Each area of concentration consists of 12 semester hours of coursework, at least 6 of which must be numbered 3000 or higher. Students are expected to have completed all prerequisites prior to enrolling in any of the following courses requiring prerequisites. Students must earn a grade of “C” or higher in each course used to fulfill Area G.1 requirements.
   - Language Arts Concentration (12)
     - Required (3):
       - EDLA 3200 Topics in Middle Childhood Language Arts (3)
     - *Literature/Folklore*
       - Select one (3):
         - ENGL 3040 Introduction to Literary Studies (3)
         - ENGL 3290 English Fiction (3)
         - ENGL 3850 American Poetry (3)
         - ENGL 3860 American Drama (3)
         - ENGL 3870 American Fiction (3)
         - ENGL 3890 Contemporary Ethnic American Literature (3)
         - ENGL 3910 The Tradition of Children's and Young Adults' Literature (3)
         - ENGL 3920 Southern Literature (3)
         - ENGL 3950 African-American Literature (3)
         - ENGL 3960 African-American Literature by Women (3)
         - ENGL 3970 Caribbean Literature (3)
         - ENGL 4130 Shakespeare, Earlier Works (3)
- ENGL 4140 Shakespeare, Later Works (3)
- FOLK 3000 American Folklore (3)
- FOLK 4000 Georgia Folklore (3)
  (Another course may be selected with consent of advisor.)

- **Composition**
  Select one (3):
  - ENGL 3080 History, Theory, and Practice of Argumentative Writing (3)
  - ENGL 3090 History, Theory, and Practice of Expository Writing (3)
  - ENGL 3100 Twentieth-Century Composition Theory and Practice (3)
  - ENGL 3150A Introduction to Creative Writing - Poetry (3)
  - ENGL 3150B Introduction to Creative Writing - Fiction (3)
  (Another course may be selected with consent of advisor.)

- **Language**
  Select one (3):
  - AL 3021 Introduction to Linguistics (3)
  - AL 3031 English Grammar in Use (3)
  - ENGL 3105 Practical Grammar (3)
  - ENGL 3190 Language Analysis for Teachers of English (3)
  - ENGL 3200 Introduction to the English Language (3)
  - ENGL 3220 History of the English Language (3)
  - ENGL 3955 Language in the African-American Community (3)
  - SPCH 3550 Oral Techniques of Group Decision Making (3)
  - SPCH 3750 Intercultural Communication (3)
  - SPCH 4500 Visual Communication (3)
  (Another course may be selected with consent of advisor.)

- **Mathematics Concentration (12)**
  - **Required (9):**
    - EDMT 3350 Topics in Middle Childhood Mathematics (3)
    - MATH 3050 Geometry and Spatial Sense (3)
    - MATH 3070 Introduction to Probability and Statistics (3)
  - **Select one (3):**
    - MATH 3000 Bridge to Higher Mathematics (3)
    - MATH 3090 Algebraic Concepts (3)
    - MATH 3420 Applied Combinatorics (3)
    - MATH 3820 Historical and Cultural Development of Mathematics I (3)
(Another course may be selected with consent of advisor.)

- **Reading Concentration (12)**
  - **Required (9)**
    - EDRD 3490 Topics in Middle Childhood Reading (3)
    - EDRD 3500 Assessment and Instruction of Middle Childhood Students with Reading Difficulty (3)
    - EDLA 3200 Topics in Middle Grades Language Arts (3)
      (Students selecting Language Arts as their second concentration may select another literacy elective with recommendation of their advisor.)
    - **Select one (3)**
      - AL 3021 Introduction to Linguistics (3)
      - AL 3031 Language in Society (3)
      - AL 3101 English Grammar in Use (3)
      (Another course may be selected with consent of advisor.)

- **Science Concentration (12)**
  - Select three or four (12):
    - *Students are required to take 6 hours of upper-level (3000-level or above) science courses.*
      - BIOL 2240 Intro to Human Physiology (3)
      - BIOL 2250 Human Physiology Lab (1)
      - BIOL 2300 Micro and Public Health (3)
      - BIOL 2310 Fundamental Micro Lab (1)
      - BIOL 2800 Intro to Molecular Biology (3)
      - BIOL 4050K Natural Environment of Georgia (4)
      - CHEM 4590 Special Topics in Physical Chemistry (3)
      - EDSC 3250 Topics in Middle Grades Science (4)
      - NSCI 3001 Integrated Science I: Physics and Astronomy (4)
      - NSCI 3002 Integrated Science II: Chemistry and Geology (4)
      - NSCI 3003 Integrated Science III: Geology and Biology (4)
      (Another course may be selected with consent of advisor.)

- **Social Studies Concentration (12)**
  - **Required (6):**
    - EDSS 3400 Topics in Middle Grades Social Science/History (3)
    - HIST 4310 Georgia History (4)
  - **Select two (6):**
    - *North American or World Studies*
      - GEOG 4400 Geography of the United States and Canada (3)
      - HIST 3200 North American before 1800 (4)
- HIST 3210 United States in the Nineteenth Century (4)
- HIST 3220 United States in the Twentieth Century (4)
- HIST 3500 The Ancient Mediterranean (4)
- HIST 3510 Medieval Europe to 1500 (4)
- HIST 3520 Early Modern Europe, 1500-1789 (4)
- HIST 3530 Europe since 1789 (4)
- HIST 3620 Atlantic World (4)
- HIST 3700 China and Japan to 1600 (4)
- HIST 3710 China and Japan after 1600 (4)
- HIST 3720 Colonial Latin America (4)
- HIST 3730 Latin America since 1810 (4)
- HIST 3780 The Middle East, 600-1800 (4)
- HIST 3790 The Middle East since 1800 (4)
- HIST 3800 South Asia to 1757 (4)
- HIST 3810 South Asia after 1757 (4)
- HIST 4320 Metropolitan Atlanta (3)
- HIST 4750 East Africa and the Horn (4)
- HIST 4760 Central and South Africa (4)
  (Another course may be selected with consent of advisor.)

Political Science
- POLS 3110 State Government (3)
- POLS 3170 American Legislative Process (3)
- POLS 3200 Comparative Politics (3)
- POLS 3400 International Politics (3)
- POLS 3800 Introduction to Political Research (3)
- POLS 4115 Urban Politics (3)
- POLS 4130 American Constitutional Law (3)
- POLS 4131 Civil Liberties and Rights (3)
- POLS 4180 American Chief Executives (3)
  (Another course may be selected with consent of advisor.)

Core Knowledge for Middle Level Education (12)

Students must earn a grade of “B” or higher in each course used to fulfill Area G.2 requirements.

Required (12)
- EDCI 3200 Organization and Instruction of the Middle Grades Curriculum (3)
- EDCI 3220 Understanding and Supporting Middle School Learners (3)
- EXC 4020 Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities (3)
Students must earn a grade of “B” or higher in each course used to fulfill Area G.3 requirements.

Students must complete the majority of their Content Concentrations (at least 9 of 12 hours in each concentration) and their Core Knowledge concentration prior to enrolling in the pedagogical knowledge courses. These courses must be taken concurrently.

- **Required (6):**
  - EDCI 4600 Practicum (3)
  - EDRD 4600 Reading and Writing in the Content Areas-CTW (3)
- **Select two (6):**
  - EDLA 4400 Concepts and Methods in Language Arts for Middle Childhood Education (3)
  - EDMT 4460 Concepts and Methods in Middle Childhood Mathematics (3)
  - EDRD 4450 Concepts and Methods in Reading for Middle Childhood Education (3)
  - EDSC 4470 Concepts and Methods in Middle Childhood Science (3)
  - EDSS 4480 Concepts and Methods in Middle Childhood Social Studies (3)

**Area H: Student Teaching (12 semester hours)**

Students must successfully complete all courses in Area G.2 and Area G.3 with a grade of “B” or higher to be authorized to enroll in Area H courses.

Students must earn a grade of “B” or higher in each course used to fulfill Area H requirements.

**Required (12):**

- EDCI 4640 Critical Issues in Middle Grades Education-CTW (3)
- EDCI 4700 Student Teaching in Middle Grades (9)

**Exit Criteria:**

- Successful completion of all program coursework.
- Successful completion of professional portfolio.

**Total Program: minimum of 120 semester hours**
4230 Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) Programs

Students seeking certification from the State of Georgia Professional Standards Commission are required to pass the GACE Basic Skills Assessment (or provide an exemption) and GACE Content Assessment in their fields.

4230.05 English Education (M.A.T.)

Program Theme: Teachers as Critical Inquirers in Multicultural, Urban Settings

The M.A.T. major in English Education provides initial teacher preparation for individuals holding bachelor's degrees in English.

Program Admission

All applicants must meet the College of Education's requirements for admission to graduate study. Additional admission requirements specific to this program include:

1. An undergraduate or graduate degree in English or the equivalent from a regionally accredited college or university (Coursework must have included at least 24 semester hours of upper-division or equivalent acceptable credit in English content, including a minimum of three semester hours in each of the following areas: American literature, British literature, written composition, and history or structure of the English language.)
2. Three letters of recommendation as follows: (a) one academic or professional letter; (b) one letter from someone who can evaluate the applicant's personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of potential to work successfully with adolescents, and (c) one letter from a current work supervisor (if applicable).
3. Documentation of previous work experience.
4. Interviews conducted by faculty and school-based personnel. The department may specify additional requirements.

Program Academic Regulations

The M.A.T. program is a carefully sequenced program. Students who do not follow the prescribed program sequence will be withdrawn from the program and may reapply to enter the next program cycle.

Each student is advised by a committee consisting of faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences and faculty from the College of Education. Exit requirements for this program are:

- Completion of all program coursework with a grade point average of no less than 3.00,
- Successful completion of the teaching internships with a grade of "B" or higher, and
- Successful presentation of a professional portfolio.
Students in this program will be eligible to be recommended for Georgia initial certification after earning passing scores on the GACE Basic Skills Assessment and GACE Content Assessment for English and successfully completing:

1. All content courses recommended for each individual by MSIT and Arts and Sciences faculty upon admission to the program;
2. Students must complete EXC 4020 Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities (3) or its equivalent to be eligible for recommendation for certification in addition to the program of study requirements;
3. EPY 7080, The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3), and
4. EDCI 6600, Introduction to Secondary Teaching (3); EDCI 7660, Practicum I (3); EDCI 7670, Practicum II (3); EDCI 7680, Practicum III (3); EDLA 6550, Principles of English Instruction (3); EDLA 7550, Theory and Pedagogy of English Instruction (3); and EDRD 7630, Literacy in the Content Areas (3); and
5. Successful presentation of a professional portfolio.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Arts in Teaching in English Education

A. Professional Studies (9)
   o Select one (3):
     ▪ EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     ▪ EPRS 7910 Action Research (3)
   o Select one (3):
     ▪ EPSF 7100 Critical Pedagogy (3)
     ▪ EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education (3)
     ▪ EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)
   o Required (3):
     ▪ EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (27)
   o Required (12):
     ▪ EDCI 6600 Introduction to Secondary Teaching (3)
     ▪ EDLA 6550 Principles of English Instruction (3)
     ▪ EDLA 7550 Theory and Pedagogy of English Instruction (3)
     ▪ EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Area (3)
     ▪ Elective in the Teaching Field/Major (3)
   o Select One (3):
     ▪ EDLA 7150 Children's and Adolescent's Literature (3)
     ▪ EDLA 7480 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of the English Language (3)
     ▪ IT 7360 Integrating Technology in School-Based Learning Environments (3)
• TSLE 7260 Cultural Issues for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
  o Select Advanced Studies in English or Folklore (12): In consultation with an advisement committee, students select coursework numbered 6000 to 8999. The coursework should lead to the development of an understanding of the history, philosophy, conceptual underpinnings, and applications of English in secondary education.

C. Internship (9)
  o Required (9):
    • EDCI 7660 Practicum I (3)
    • EDCI 7670 Practicum II (3)
    • EDCI 7680 Practicum III (3)

Program total: minimum of 45 semester hours

4230.10 Mathematics Education (M.A.T.)

Program Theme: Educator as Reflective Professional

The M.A.T. major in Mathematics Education provides initial teacher preparation for an individual holding a bachelor's degree in mathematics or its equivalent.

Program Admission

All applicants must meet the College of Education's requirements for admission to graduate study. Additional admission requirements specific to this program include:

1. An undergraduate or graduate degree in mathematics or the equivalent from a regionally accredited college or university (Coursework must have included at least 24 semester hours of upper-division or equivalent acceptable credit in mathematics content, including a minimum of three semester hours in each of four of the following areas: modern or abstract algebra [similar to Math 4441], linear algebra [similar to Math 4435], college geometry [similar to Math 4301], mathematical statistics [similar to Math 4751], and advanced calculus [similar to Math 4661]. How recently these courses have been completed will be a consideration.
2. A minimum overall grade-point average of 2.75 for the four courses is used to meet the previous requirement.
3. Three letters of recommendation as follows: (a) one academic or professional letter; (b) one letter from someone who can evaluate the applicant's personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of potential to work successfully with adolescent; and (c) one letter from a current work supervisor (if applicable).
4. Documentation of previous work experience.
5. Interviews conducted by faculty and school-based personnel.

Program Academic Regulations
The department may specify additional requirements.

The M.A.T. program is a carefully sequenced program. Students who do not follow the prescribed program sequence will be withdrawn from the program and may reapply to enter the next program cycle.

Each student is advised by a committee consisting of faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences and faculty from the College of Education. Exit requirements for this program are:

- Completion of all program coursework with a grade point average of no less than 3.00,
- Successful completion of the teaching internships with a grade of "B" or higher, and
- Successful presentation of a professional portfolio.

Students in this program will be eligible to be recommended for Georgia initial certification after earning passing scores on the GACE Basic Skills Assessment and GACE Content Assessments for Mathematics and successfully completing:

1. All content courses recommended for students by MSIT and Arts and Sciences faculty upon admission to the program;
2. Students must complete EXC 4020 Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities (3), or its equivalent to be eligible for recommendation for certification in addition to the program of study requirements;
3. EPY 7080, The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3), and
4. EDCI 6600, Introduction to Secondary Teaching (3); EDCI 7660, Practicum I (3); EDCI 7670, Practicum II (3); EDCI 7680, Practicum III (3); EDMT 6560, Principles of Math Instruction (3); EDMT 7560, Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction (3).
5. Successful presentation of a professional portfolio.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Arts in Teaching in Mathematics Education

A. A. Professional Studies (12)
   o Required (3):
     ▪ IT 7360 Integrating Technology in School-Based Learning Environments (3)
   o Select one (3):
     ▪ EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     ▪ EPRS 7910 Action Research (3)
   o Select one (3):
     ▪ EPSF 7100 Critical Pedagogy (3)
     ▪ EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education (3)
     ▪ EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundation of Education (3)
   o Required (3):
- EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)

B. B. Teaching Field/Major (24)
   - Required (9):
     - EDCI 6600 Introduction to Secondary Teaching (3)
     - EDMT 6560 Principles of Mathematics Instruction (3)
     - EDMT 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction (3)
     - Select Advanced Studies (15): In consultation with his or her advisement committee, the students select coursework numbered 6000 or higher from the Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

C. C. Internship (9)
   - Required (9):
     - EDCI 7660 Practicum I (3)
     - EDCI 7670 Practicum II (3)
     - EDCI 7680 Practicum III (3)

Program total: minimum of 45 semester hours

4230.15 Middle Level Education (M.A.T.)

Program Theme: Teacher as Reflective Professional

The M.A.T. major in Middle Level Education provides initial teacher preparation for individuals holding bachelor's degrees and who have an interest in teaching students in grades 4-8 in two areas of a concentration. The course of study meets the requirements for professional certification in Middle Level Education (grades 4-8) with concentrations in either language arts and social studies education or mathematics and science education.

Program Admission

All applicants must meet the College of Education's requirements for admission to graduate study. Additional requirements specific to this program include:

1. An undergraduate or graduate degree or the equivalent from a regionally accredited college or university.
2. The academic preparation of applicants must include the coursework listed below. Students may be admitted to the program and allowed to complete their academic preparation concurrently. Academic preparation must be completed prior to recommendation for certification.
   - Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities (EXC 4020 or its equivalent)
   - Language Arts and Social Studies Education Concentration
     - 12 hours of English courses with at least 6 hours of upper division coursework.
12 hours of social studies courses with at least 6 hours of upper division coursework.
Students must demonstrate academic proficiency in the following areas: (a) literature and folklore, (b) composition, (c) languages and (d) children's and adolescent's literature.
Students must demonstrate academic proficiency in the following areas: (a) Georgia History, (b) geography, (c) World History/studies, (d) U.S. History/studies.

- **Mathematics and Science Education Concentration**
  - 12 hours of mathematics courses with at least 6 hours of upper division coursework.
  - 12 hours of science courses with at least 6 hours of upper division coursework.
  - Students must demonstrate academic proficiency in the following areas: (a) geometry, (b) algebra, (c) number theory, and (d) probability/statistics.
  - Students must demonstrate academic proficiency in the following areas: (a) biology, (b) physical science, and (c) earth/space sciences.

3. Three letters of recommendation as follows: (a) one academic or professional letter, (b) one letter from someone who can evaluate the applicants' personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of the potential to work successfully with pre-adolescents and adolescents, and (c) one letter from a current work supervisor (if applicable).
4. Documentation of previous work experience.
5. Interviews conducted by faculty and school-based personnel.
6. The department may specify additional requirements.

Program Academic Regulations

The M.A.T. program is a carefully sequenced program. Students who do not follow the prescribed program sequence will be withdrawn from the program and may reapply to enter the next program cycle.

Students are advised by a committee of education and arts and sciences faculty including representatives from the students' two areas of concentration. The committee and the students complete a planned program of study in light of the needs of the individual students. Exit requirements for this program are:

- Completion of all program coursework with a grade point average of no less than 3.00.
- Successful completion of the teaching internships with a grade of "B" or higher.
- Successful presentation of a professional portfolio.
Students in this program will be eligible to be recommended for Georgia initial certification after earning passing scores on the GACE Basic Skills Assessment and GACE Content Assessments for Middle Grades and successfully completing:

1. All content courses recommended for all individuals by the advisement committee upon admission to the program.
2. EXC 4020 Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities (or its equivalent) and EPY 7080.
3. EDCI 7020, EDRD 7630, IT 7360, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, EDCI 7680, and either EDCI 6540 and EDCI 7540 (Math/Science option) or EDCI 6560 and EDCI 7560 (Language Arts/Social Studies option).

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Arts in Teaching in Middle Level Education

A. Professional Studies (9 semester hours)
   o Required (3):
     - EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3).
   o Select one (3):
     - EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     - EPRS 7910 Action research (3)
   o Select one (3):
     - EPSF 7100 Critical Pedagogy (3)
     - EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education (3)
     - EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (27 semester hours)
   o Required (6):
     - EDCI 7020 Middle Schools in a Diverse Society (3)
     - EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas (3)
   o Elective (3):
     - Select an elective with the approval of the Middle Level Education Advisor.
   o Choose one concentration:
     - *Mathematics and Science Concentration* Required (6):
       - EDCI 6540 Principles of Instruction in Middle Childhood Science and Mathematics (3)
       - EDCI 7540 Theory and Pedagogy of Middle Childhood Science and Mathematics Instruction (3)
     - *Advanced Studies – Mathematics* (6)
     - In consultation with their advisement committee, students select coursework numbered 6000 or higher. The coursework should lead to the development of an understanding of the
history, philosophy, conceptual underpinnings, and applications of mathematics education at the middle level. One course should be taken from the Department of Mathematics and Statistics and one course from mathematics education in the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology.

- **Advanced Studies – Science (6)**
  In consultation with their advisement committee, students select coursework numbered 6000 or higher. The coursework should lead to the development of an understanding of the history, philosophy, and conceptual underpinnings of science as well as the applications of science education at the middle level.

- **Language Arts and Social Studies Concentration**
  Required (6):
  - EDCI 6560 Principles of Instruction in Middle Childhood Language Arts and Social Studies (3)
  - EDCI 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Middle Childhood Language Arts and Social Studies Instruction (3)

- **Advanced Studies – Language Arts (6)**
  In consultation with their advisement committee, students select coursework numbered 6000 or higher. The coursework should lead to the development of an understanding of the history, philosophy, conceptual underpinnings, and applications of language arts education at the middle level. One course (Eng) should be taken from the Department of English and one course (EDLA) from Language and Literacy Education in the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology.

- **Advanced Studies – Social Studies (6)**
  In consultation with their advisement committee, students select coursework numbered 6000 or higher. The coursework should lead to the development of an understanding of the history, philosophy, conceptual underpinnings, and applications of social studies education at the middle level. One course should be taken from the College of Arts and Sciences and one course (EDSS) from social studies education.

C. Internship (9 semester hours)
   - Required (9):
     - EDCI 7660 Practicum I (3)
     - EDCI 7670 Practicum II (3)
     - EDCI 7680 Practicum III (3)
Program total: minimum of 45 semester hours

4230.20 Reading, Language, and Literacy Education (M.A.T.)

Program Theme: Teachers as Critical Inquirers in Multicultural, Urban Settings

The M.A.T. major in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education provides initial teacher preparation in ESOL for individuals holding bachelor's degree and who have an interest in English to speakers of other languages in K-12 settings. The course of study meets the requirements for professional certification at the initial level in ESOL and the requirements for a Reading Endorsement.

Program Admission

All applicants must meet the College of Education's requirements for admission to graduate study. Additional requirements specific to this program include:

1. An undergraduate or graduate degree or the equivalent from a regionally accredited college or university.
2. The academic preparation of applicants should include the coursework listed below. Students may be admitted to the program and allowed to complete their academic preparation concurrently. Academic preparation must be completed prior to recommendation for certification.
   o Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities (EXC 4020 or its equivalent)
3. Students must meet a language requirement that is intended to ensure that all graduates have had the experience of studying a second or foreign language. This requirement can be met in one of the following ways:
   a. Successful completion of one academic year of a university-level foreign language sequence (three quarters or two semesters of the same language), or
   b. Successful completion of two quarters or one semester of a non-Western language, or
   c. One year living/studying abroad as an adult, or
   d. The acquisition of English as a second language for non-native English speakers.
4. Two letters of recommendation as follows: (a) an academic or professional letter, (b) a letter from someone who can evaluate the applicant's personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of the potential to work successfully with students at the K-12 levels, or (c) a letter from a current work supervisor (if applicable).
5. Documentation of previous work experience.
6. Interviews conducted by faculty and school-based personnel.
7. The department may specify additional requirements.
Program Academic Regulations

The M.A.T. program is a carefully sequenced program. Students who do not follow the prescribed program sequence will be withdrawn from the program and may reapply to enter the next program cycle.

Each student is advised by a committee of education faculty including representatives from the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology and the Department of Applied Linguistics. The committee and the students complete a planned program of study in light of the needs of individual students. Exit requirements for this program are:

- Completion of all program coursework with a grade point average of no less than 3.0.
- Successful completion of the teaching internships with a grade of "B" or higher.
- Successful presentation of a professional portfolio.

Students in this program will be eligible to be recommended for Georgia initial certification after earning passing scores on the GACE Basic Skills Assessment and GACE Content Assessments for Teaching English as a Second Language and successfully completing:

1. EXC 4020 Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities (or its equivalent) and EPY 7080.
2. AL 8240, TSLE 7250, TSLE 7260 or AL 8330, TSLE 7440, AL 8460, AL 8470, EDRD 7600, EDRD 7630, EDRD 7650, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, and EDCI 7680.
3. Presentation of a professional portfolio.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Arts in Teaching in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education

A. Professional Studies (9 semester hours)
   - Required (3):
     - EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)
   - Select one (3):
     - EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     - EPRS 7910 Action Research (3)
   - Select one (3)
     - EPSF 7100 Critical Pedagogy (3)
     - EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education (3)
     - EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations in Education (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (27 semester hours)
   - Required (24):
     - AL 8240 General Linguistics (3)
     - AL 8460 English Grammar for ESL/EFL Teachers (3)
     - AL 8470 Sociolinguistics (3)
- EDRD 7600 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Reading (3)
- EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas (3)
- EDRD 7650 Individualized Literacy Assessment and Instruction (3)
- TSLE 7250 Applied Linguistics for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
- TSLE 7440 Methods and Materials for Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
  - Select one (3):
    - TSLE 7260 Cultural Issues for Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
    - AL 8330 Intercultural Communication (3)

C. Internship (9 semester hours)
   - EDCI 7660 Practicum I (3)
   - EDCI 7670 Practicum II (3)
   - EDCI 7680 Practicum III (3)

Program total: minimum of 45 semester hours

4230.25 Reading, Language, and Literacy Education (M.A.T.) Online Program

Program Theme: Teachers as Critical Inquirers in Multicultural, Urban Settings

The online program in M.A.T. major in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education is offered through the Georgia ONmyLINE (GOML) system. GOML provides access to a full array of online and distance education offerings from the 35 colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. To find out more about GOML, please go to education.gsu.edu/main/Distance_Learning.htm. Students can apply to a Georgia State University GOML program at education.gsu.edu/main/4427.htm.

The M.A.T. major in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education (ESOL) Online Program provides initial teacher preparation in ESOL for individuals holding bachelor's degree and who have an interest in English to speakers of other languages in P-12 settings. This program addresses the needs of teachers who work with literacy learners from diverse cultures. Although these teachers can have an undergraduate degree in any area, they must have had experience learning a second language. They must also be currently employed teaching P-12 ESOL students, either as a provisionally certified ESOL teacher in Georgia or as an ESOL paraprofessional in Georgia. (Note: Some counties will not allow para-professionals to complete the field-based program requirements within the context of their job placement. Applicants should check on the policies in the place with the county in which they work prior to applying to the program.) The M.A.T. RLL ESOL course of study is designed to meet the requirements for professional certification at the initial level in ESOL and the requirements for a Reading Endorsement.
The M.A.T. RLL ESOL online program is 45 hours (9 hours of college core courses; 9 hours English as a Second Language; 9 hours reading endorsement; 9 hours of applied linguistics; 9 hours of practicum). Entry into the program could begin in any semester; however, applicants are required to take TSLE 7440 prior to enrolling in practicum hours, and EDRD 7600 or EDRD 7630 prior to enrolling in EDRD 7650. Consequently, M.A.T. students (who are required to complete a year-long fall/spring practicum) could enroll in summer and complete the program in a minimum of 4 semesters; otherwise, the program would take a minimum of 5 semesters. This degree addresses the professional standards from IRA for classroom teachers of reading and from TESOL for teachers of ELL learners.

Program Academic Regulations

Each student is advised by a committee of education faculty including representatives from the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology and the Department of Applied Linguistics. Exit requirements for this program are:

- Completion of all program coursework with a grade point average of no less than 3.0.
- Successful completion of the teaching internships with a grade of "B" or higher.
- Successful presentation of a professional portfolio.

Students in this program will be eligible to be recommended for Georgia initial certification after earning passing scores on the GACE Basic Skills Assessment and GACE Content Assessments for Teaching English as a Second Language and successfully completing:

1. EXC 4020 Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities (or its equivalent) and EPY 7080.
2. AL 8240, TSLE 7250, TSLE 7260 or AL 8330, TSLE 7440, AL 8460, AL 8470, EDRD 7600, EDRD 7630, EDRD 7650, EDCI 7660, EDCI 7670, and EDCI 7680.
3. Presentation of a professional portfolio.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Arts in Teaching in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education Online Program

A. Professional Studies (9 semester hours)
   o Required (9):
     - EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)
     - EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     - EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations in Education (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (27 semester hours)
   o Required (27):
     - AL 8240 General Linguistics (3)
     - AL 8460 English Grammar for ESL/EFL Teachers (3)
     - AL 8470 Sociolinguistics (3)
- EDRD 7600 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Reading (3)
- EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas (3)
- EDRD 7650 Individualized Literacy Assessment and Instruction (3)
- TSLE 7250 Applied Linguistics for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
- TSLE 7260 Cultural Issues for Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
- TSLE 7440 Methods and Materials for Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)

C. Internship (9 semester hours)
   - EDCI 7660 Practicum I (3)
   - EDCI 7670 Practicum II (3)
   - EDCI 7680 Practicum III (3)

Program total: minimum of 45 semester hours

4230.30 Science Education (M.A.T.)

Program Theme: Teacher as Reflective Professional

The M.A.T. major in Science Education provides initial teacher certification for those holding bachelor’s degrees in engineering, science, or a related area.

Program Admission

All applicants must meet the College of Education's requirements for admission to graduate study. Additional admission requirements specific to this program include:

- An undergraduate or graduate degree in engineering, a science field, or a related field from a regionally accredited college or university. A minimum of a major (24 upper-division semester hours) in a science area must be part of prior coursework.
- Three letters of recommendation as follows: (a) one academic or professional letter, (b) one letter from someone who can evaluate the applicant's personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of potential to work successfully with adolescents, and (c) one letter from a current work supervisor (if applicable).
- Documentation of previous work experience
- Interviews conducted by faculty and school-based personnel

Undergraduate students in the Bachelor of Science with a major in Physics can apply to the M.A.T. in Science Education if they meet the following requirements.

- Students must participate in pre-advising sessions with faculty in the Department of Physics and Astronomy.
• Students must have completed at least 30 hours of academic credit (including MATH 2211 and PHYS 2211K).

• Students must have earned a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.3.

• Students may apply to the option at any time after completing 30 hours but prior to completing 90 hours of undergraduate coursework.

  • Complete the B.S./M.A.T. application form. This will be kept on file in the Department of Physics and Astronomy and in the Office of Academic Assistance in the College of Arts and Sciences.

  • Documentation of previous work experience (resume or curriculum vitae).

  • Personal statement of goals and/or reasons for teaching.

• Formal acceptance into the M.A.T. portion of the program will be contingent upon the following:

  • Filing an application to the M.A.T. program by the appropriate deadline at education.gsu.edu/oaa/4427.html

  • Maintaining a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher;

  • Completion of 90 hours towards the B.S. degree in Physics (including PHYS 7460 and PHYS 7850):

  • Submission of passing scores on the GACE Basic Skills Assessment or demonstrate an exemption upon application to the program. The current options for satisfying the Basic Skills Assessment, including the exemptions, are outlined at www.gapsc.com/documentation/basicskillsinfo.asp. Under "Basic Skills Testing," go to "Options to Satisfy the Basic Skills Requirement".

  • Submission of acceptable GRE scores;

  • Acceptance into the Teacher Education track is contingent upon acceptance into the M.A.T. portion, completion of 24 hours in physics, and passing or exempting the GACE Basic Skills test.

  • 2-3 letters of recommendation: (a) one academic or professional letter; (b) one letter from someone who can evaluate the applicant’s personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of potential to work successfully with adolescents; (c) one letter from a current work supervisor, if applicable.

Program Academic Regulations

The department may specify additional requirements.

The M.A.T. program is a carefully sequenced program. Students who do not follow the prescribed program sequence will be withdrawn from the program and may reapply to enter the next program cycle.
Exit requirements for this program are:

- Completion of all program coursework with a grade point average of no less than 3.00,
- Successful completion of the teaching internships with a grade of "B" or better, and
- Successful presentation of a professional portfolio.

Students in this program will be prepared to teach in broad field science or in one of the science specialties of biology, chemistry, earth/space science and physics in grades 6-12. The student's advisory committee will approve the student's planned program of study for either the broad field science preparation or preparation in one of the specialties of biology, chemistry, earth/space science and physics after a transcript analysis of previous work and consultation with the student.

Students in this program will be eligible to be recommended for Georgia initial certification after earning passing scores on the GACE Basic Skills Assessment and GACE Content Assessments for licensure in Science or in their specialty area and successfully completing:

1. All content courses recommended for the students by MSIT and Arts and Sciences faculty upon the students' admission to the program;
2. Students must complete EXC 4020 Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities (3) or its equivalent to be eligible for recommendation for certification in addition to the program of study requirements;
3. EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)
4. EDCI 6600 Introduction to Secondary Teaching (3)
   - EDCI 7660 Practicum I (3)
   - EDCI 7670 Practicum II (3)
   - EDCI 7680 Practicum III (3)
   - EDSC 6550 Principles of Science Instruction (3)
   - EDSC 7550 Theory and Pedagogy of Science Instruction (3)
5. Successful presentation of a professional portfolio.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Arts in Teaching in Science Education

A. Professional Studies (12)
   - Select one (3):
     - EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     - EPRS 7910 Action Research (3)
   - Select one (3):
     - EPSF 7100 Critical Pedagogy (3)
     - EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education (3)
EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)
- Required (3):
  - EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)
- Select One (3):
  - EDSC 8430 The Nature of Science (3)
  - IT 7360 Integrating Technology in School-Based Learning Environments (3)
  - TSLE 7440 Methods and Materials for Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (24)
- Required (9):
  - EDCI 6600 Introduction to Secondary Teaching (3)
  - EDSC 6550 Principles of Science Instruction (3)
  - EDSC 7550 Theory and Pedagogy of Science Instruction (3)
- Select Advanced Studies (15): In consultation with their advisory committee, the students select coursework numbered 6000 or higher related to science education. The coursework should lead to the development of an understanding of the history, philosophy, conceptual underpinnings, and applications of science education. Students in this program will be prepared to teach in broad field science or in one of the science specialties of biology, chemistry, earth/space science and physics in grades 6-12. The student's advisory committee will approve the student's planned program of study for either the broad field science preparation or preparation in one of the specialties of biology, chemistry, earth/space science and physics after a transcript analysis of previous work and consultation with the student.

C. Internship (9)
- Required (9):
  - EDCI 7660 Practicum I (3)
  - EDCI 7670 Practicum II (3)
  - EDCI 7680 Practicum III (3)

Program total: minimum of 45 semester hours

4230.35 Social Studies Education (M.A.T.)

Program Theme: Teachers as Critical Inquirers in Multicultural, Urban Settings

The M.A.T. major in Social Studies Education provides initial teacher preparation for individuals holding bachelor's degrees in history or one or more of the social sciences.

Program Admission
All applicants must meet the College of Education's requirements for admission to graduate study. Admission to the program occurs once each year. Additional admission requirements specific to this program include:

- An undergraduate or graduate degree in history or in one or more of the social sciences from a regionally accredited college or university. A minimum of a major (24 upper-division semester hours) in history or a social science must be part of prior coursework.
- Three letters of recommendation as follows: (a) one academic or professional letter, (b) one letter from someone who can evaluate the applicant's personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of potential to work successfully with adolescents, and (c) one letter from a current work supervisor (if applicable)
- Documentation of previous work experience
- Interviews conducted by faculty and school-based personnel

Program Academic Regulations

The department may specify additional requirements.

The M.A.T. program is a carefully sequenced program. Students who do not follow the prescribed program sequence will be withdrawn from the program and may reapply to enter the next program cycle.

Exit requirements for this program are:

- Completion of all program coursework with a grade point average of no less than 3.00,
- Successful completion of the teaching internships with a grade of "B" or higher, and
- Successful presentation of a professional portfolio.

Students in this program will be eligible to be recommended for Georgia initial certification after earning passing scores on the GACE Basic Skills Assessment and GACE Assessments in Economics, Geography, History, and/or Political Science for licensure in the Social Studies content area(s) on the GACE and successfully completing:

1. All content courses recommended for the students by MSIT and Arts and Sciences faculty upon the students' admission to the program;
2. Students must complete EXC 4020 Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities (3) or its equivalent to be eligible for recommendation for certification in addition to the program of study requirements;
3. EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3) and
5. Successful presentation of a professional portfolio.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Arts in Teaching in Social Studies Education

A. A. Professional Studies (9)
   o Select one (3):
     ▪ EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     ▪ EPRS 7910 Action Research (3)
   o Select one (3):
     ▪ EPSF 7100 Critical Pedagogy (3)
     ▪ EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education (3)
     ▪ EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)
   o Required (3):
     ▪ EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)

B. B. Teaching Field/Major (27)
   o Required (9):
     ▪ EDCI 6600 Introduction to Secondary Teaching (3)
     ▪ EDSS 6560 Principles of Social Studies Instruction (3)
     ▪ EDSS 7540 Theory and Pedagogy of Social Studies Instruction (3)
   o Elective in Teaching Field/Major (6)
     Select Two:
     ▪ EDCI 7980 Teaching and Learning in Urban Contexts (3)
     ▪ EDSS 7560 Teaching History and the Social Sciences (3)
     ▪ EDSS 7570 Social Studies Concepts and Issues (3)
     ▪ IT 7360 Integrating Technology in School-Based Learning Environments (3)
     ▪ TSLE 7260 Cultural Issues for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
     ▪ Other education electives may be selected with consent of the advisor.
   o Select Advanced Studies in Social Studies (12):
     o The students select at least 12 semester hours of 6000-level and above coursework related to history and the social sciences in consultation with their advisory committee. Because students will be certified in single fields of social studies, additional undergraduate or graduate coursework may be required for the students to demonstrate competence in these four areas: economics, geography, history, and political science. The advisement committee will approve the students' planned program of study after a transcript analysis of previous work and consultation with the students.

C. C. Internship (9)
Required (9):
- EDCI 7660 Practicum I (3)
- EDCI 7670 Practicum II (3)
- EDCI 7680 Practicum III (3)

Program total: minimum of 45 semester hours

4230.40 Collaborative Program

Georgia Institute of Technology-Georgia State University B.S./M.A.T. Option

Undergraduate students in a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) program at the Georgia Institute of Technology can apply to Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) program at Georgia State University in the Department of Middle-Secondary and Instructional Technology if they meet the following requirements.

- Students must participate in pre-advising sessions with faculty in their academic department and the Director of Pre-Teaching at Georgia Tech.
- Students must have completed at least 30 hours of academic credit at Georgia Tech.
- Students must have earned a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.5.
- Students may apply to the option at any time after completing 30 hours but prior to completing 90 hours of undergraduate coursework.
- Applicants are applying for early acceptance into a M.A.T. program and therefore must submit the following documentation in addition to meeting the GPA requirement.
  - Complete the B.S./M.A.T. application form. This will be kept on file in both the student’s academic major department and in the office of the Director of Pre-Teaching at Georgia Tech.
  - 2-3 letters of recommendation: (a) one academic or professional letter; (b) one letter from someone who can evaluate the applicant’s personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of potential to work successfully with adolescents; (c) one letter from a current work supervisor, if applicable.
  - Documentation of previous work experience (resume or curriculum vitae).
  - Personal statement of goals and/or reasons for teaching.
  - Successful interview with the faculty in the Department of Middle-Secondary and Instructional Technology.
- Formal acceptance into the M.A.T. portion of the program will be contingent upon the following:
  - Maintaining a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher at Georgia Tech;
Completion of an undergraduate degree in a field appropriate for the MAT program;
Submission of passing scores on the GACE Basic Skills Assessment or demonstrate an exemption upon application to the program. The current options for satisfying the Basic Skills Assessment, including the exemptions, are outlined at www.gapsc.com/documentation/basicskillsinfo.asp. Under "Basic Skills Testing," go to "Options to Satisfy the Basic Skills Requirement".
Submission of acceptable GRE scores;
Filing an application to the M.A.T. program by the appropriate deadline.

4240 Master of Education (M.Ed.) Programs
Students seeking certification from the State of Georgia Professional Standards Commission are required to pass the GACE Basic Skills Assessment (or provide an exemption) and GACE Content Assessment in their fields. Exception: Communication Disorders (Speech and Language Pathology).

4240.30 English Education (M.Ed.)

Program Theme: Teachers as Critical Inquirers in Multicultural, Urban Settings

The M.Ed. major in English Education requires initial preparation in secondary English education. This program requires the completion of a professional portfolio in the area of English education.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Education in English Education

A. Professional Studies (9).
   The students should take the following professional studies courses early in the program.
   o Select one (3):
     - EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     - EPRS 7910 Action Research (3)
   o Select one (3):
     - EPSF 7100 Critical Pedagogy (3)
     - EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education (3)
     - EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)
   o Required (3):
     - EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (27)
   o Required (12):
     - EDLA 7150 Children's and Adolescents' Literature (3)
     - EDLA 7440 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Literature (3)
     - EDLA 7460 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Writing (3)
     - EDLA 7480 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of the English Literature (3)
Select English Content (12): With the written consent of their adviser, the students select coursework appropriate to their interests and plans from English courses offered at the 6000, 7000, or 8000 level.

Select one Literacy Elective (3):
- EDLA 8330 Language Variation and Learning (3)
- EDRD 7550 Linking Literacy Assessment and Classroom Instruction (3)
- EDRD 7600 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Reading (3)
- EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas (3)
- EDRD 7650 Individualized Literacy Assessment and Instruction (3)
- EDRD 8280 Literacy for a Diverse Society (3)
- EDRD 8550 Trends and Issues in Language and Literacy Education (3)
- IT 7360 Integrating Technology in School-Based Learning Environments (3)
- TSLE 7250 Applied Linguistics for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
- TSLE 7260 Cultural Issues for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
- TSLE 7440 Methods and Materials for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)

Alternative graduate courses at 6000 and 7000 levels in English, English Education, or related fields may be selected with the consent of the students' major adviser.

Program total: minimum of 36 semester hours

4240.40 Mathematics Education (M.Ed.)

Program Theme: Educator as Reflective Professional

The M.Ed. major in Secondary Mathematics Education seeks to advance early and mid-career mathematics teachers' ability to effectively implement standards-based instructional practices. The program's chief goal—to strengthen secondary students' mathematical understandings—is achieved, in part, by providing mathematics teachers with opportunities to deepen their understandings of learners from diverse backgrounds and to explore issues of equity in mathematics classrooms within urban environments. The program prepares teachers to conduct action research in the context of their own classrooms in order to inform instruction, and to share the knowledge gained in a professional community of teachers. Through engaging teachers in advanced mathematics coursework, the program strengthens teachers' mathematical content knowledge. In general, the Program of Study is framed by the principles and standards of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Education in Mathematics Education
A. Professional Studies (9)
   o Select one (3):
      EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
      EPRS 7910 Action Research (3)
   o Select one (3):
      EPSF 7100 Critical Pedagogy (3)
      EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education (3)
      EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)
   o Required (3):
      EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (27)
   o Required (12):
      EDMT 7360 Integration of Technology in Mathematics Instruction (3)
      EDMT 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction (3)
     Take with EPRS 7900 or EPRS 7910
      EDMT 8430 Sociocultural and Sociohistorical Issues of Mathematics Education (3)
      IT 7360 Integrating Technology in School-Based Learning Environments (3)
   o Required 15 hours with MATH prefix: With the consent of their adviser, students select coursework numbered 6000 or higher related to mathematics. The coursework should lead to the development of an understanding of the history, philosophy, conceptual underpinnings, and applications of mathematics.

Program total: minimum of 36 semester hours

4240.45 Mathematics Education (M.Ed.) Online Program

Program Theme: Educator as Reflective Professional

The online program in M.Ed. major in Mathematics Education is offered through the Georgia ONmyLINE (GOML) system. GOML provides access to a full array of online and distance education offerings from the 35 colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. To find out more about GOML, please go to education.gsu.edu/main/Distance_Learning.htm. Students can apply to a Georgia State University GOML program at education.gsu.edu/main/4427.htm.

The M.Ed. major in Mathematics Education Online Program is a parallel program to the traditional Master of Education Mathematics that has been offered at Georgia State University as a major since Fall 1982. This entirely online program is designed to be completed in four semesters. The M.Ed. major in Mathematics Education seeks to advance early and mid-career mathematics teachers' ability to effectively implement standards-based instructional practices. The program's chief goal – to strengthen secondary students' mathematical understandings – is achieved, in part, by providing mathematics teachers with opportunities to deepen their understandings of learners from diverse backgrounds and to explore issues of equity in
mathematics classrooms. The program prepares teachers to conduct action research in the context of their own classrooms in order to inform instruction, and to share the knowledge gained in a professional community of teachers. Through engaging teachers in advanced mathematics coursework, the program strengthens teachers' mathematical content knowledge. In general the program of study is framed by the Extended Georgia Framework for Teaching, the principles and standards of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

The online program is 36 hours (9 hours of college core courses; 9 hours mathematics education, 15 hours Mathematics, 3 hours of teachers and technology). The M.Ed. online program will be available to teachers holding a clear and renewable T4 certificate in Math.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Education in Mathematics Education Online Program

A. Professional Studies (9)
   - Required (9):
     - EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     - EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)
     - EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (27)
   - Required (12):
     - EDMT 7360 Integration of Technology in Mathematics Instruction (3)
     - EDMT 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction (3)
     - EDMT 8430 Sociocultural and Sociohistorical Issues of Mathematics Education (3)
     - IT 7360 Integrating Technology in School-Based Learning Environments (3)
   - Select 5 courses (15 hours):
     - MATH 6301 College Geometry (3)
     - MATH 6435 Linear Algebra (3)
     - MATH 6547 Introduction to Mathematical Statistics (3)
     - MATH 7820 Historical and Cultural Development of Mathematics I (3)
     - MATH 7821 Historical and Cultural Development of Mathematics II (3)
     - With the consent of their adviser, students can select other coursework with the MATH prefix numbered 6000 or higher related to mathematics. The coursework should lead to the development of an understanding of the history, philosophy, conceptual underpinnings, and applications of mathematics.

Program total: minimum of 36 semester hours
4240.50 Middle Level Education (M.Ed.)

Program Theme: Scholarship and Leadership Focused on Learning and Development

The M.Ed. major in Middle Level Education is designed to provide learning experiences for teachers who have been initially prepared in middle childhood education. Program should be planned in consultation with each student's major adviser. This program requires the completion of a professional portfolio reflecting standards in the area of middle level education and in the area of concentration. Students who choose a concentration in reading must also complete a reading endorsement portfolio to be eligible for recommendation for a reading endorsement.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Education in Middle Level Education

A. Professional Studies (9).
   Students should take the following professional studies courses early in their programs:
   o Select one (3):
     - EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     - EPRS 7910 Action Research (3)
   o Select one (3):
     - EPSF 7100 Critical Pedagogy (3)
     - EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education (3)
     - EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)
   o Required (3):
     - EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)

B. Teaching Field/Area of Advanced Study (24). Students should take EDCI 7020 among the first 12 semester hours of program coursework. Students should take EDCI 8550 after completing at least 27 semester hours of program coursework.
   o Required (15):
     - EDCI 7020 Middle Schools in a Diverse Society (3)
     - EDCI 7400 Curriculum Issues in Middle Childhood Education (3)
     - EDCI 7420 Assessment Issues in the Middle Grades (3)
     - EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas (3)
     - IT 7360 Integrating Technology in School-Based Learning Environments (3)
   o Select three (9):
     Each student selects an area of advanced study of three courses (9 semester hours) from one of the options below. (health, language arts, mathematics, reading, science, or social studies).

2. Health Option
   o Required (9):
     - KH 6940 Workshop in Kinesiology and Health (3)
3. **Language Arts Option**
   - Select Two (6):
     - EDLA 7440 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Literature (3)
     - EDLA 7460 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Writing (3)
     - EDLA 7480 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of the English Language (3)
   - Select one (3):
     - EDLA 7150 Children's and Adolescents' Literature (3)
     - EDRD 7360 Literacy and Technology (3)
     - Any 6000 level or higher ENGL course for which the students meet prerequisites or other literacy coursework with the consent of a Language and Literacy advisor.

4. **Mathematics Option**
   - Required (9):
     - EDMT 7530 Mathematics Concepts for Middle Childhood Education I (3)
     - EDMT 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction (3)
     - EDMT 8430 Sociohistorical and Sociocultural Issues of Mathematics Education (3)

5. **Reading Option**
   - Required (6):
     - EDRD 6600 Introduction to Methods and Materials in Reading Instruction (3)
     - EDRD 7550 Linking Literacy Assessment and Classroom Instruction (3)
   - Select one (3):
     - EDRD 7360 Literacy and Technology (3)
     - EDRD 7650 Individualized Literacy Assessment and Instruction (3)
     - EDRD 8610 Supervision of School Literacy Programs (3)
     - Any 7000 level or higher EDRD course for which the students meet prerequisites.

6. **Science Option**
   - Required (3):
     - EDSC 7120 Science Concepts and Issues (3)
   - Select two (6):
     - EDSC 7550 Theory and Pedagogy of Science Instruction (3)
     - EDSC 8600 Science in the School Curriculum (3)
     - Any 6000-level or higher ASTR, BIOL, CHEM, GEOL, or PHYS course for which the students meet prerequisites.

7. **Social Studies Option**
Select Two (6):
  - EDCI 7980 Teaching and Learning in Urban Contexts (3)
  - EDSS 7560 Teaching History and the Social Sciences (3)
  - EDSS 7570 Social Studies Concepts and Issues (3)
  - EDSS 8420 Topics in the School Social Studies Curriculum (3)
  - Other education courses may be substituted with advisor consent.

Select one (3):
  - Any 6000 level or higher ANTH, ECON, GEOG, HIST, or POLS course for which the students meet prerequisites.

C. Elective (3)
   - Select one course (3) numbered 6000 or higher.

Program total: minimum of 36 semester hours

4240.60 Reading, Language, and Literacy Education (M.Ed.)

Program Theme: Teachers as Critical Inquirers in Multicultural, Urban Settings

The program for the major in reading, language, and literacy provides for master's level study of literacy processes and literacy instruction for culturally diverse learners with specialization in one of three options: reading instruction, early literacy, or teaching English as a second language. Option 1: Reading Instruction is designed to prepare the graduate to work as a teacher of reading in grades P-12. Option 2: Early Literacy focuses on language and literacy development and instruction for children from ages three to eight and leads to a reading endorsement. The Early Literacy option is a collaborative program between the departments of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology and Early Childhood Education. Option 3: Teaching English as a Second Language leads to an endorsement for teaching English to Speakers of other Languages (ESOL) and a reading endorsement. This program requires the completion of a professional portfolio in the area of specialization.

Program Admission

Entry into the program for the major in reading, language, and literacy education requires a bachelor's-level certification in any area of teaching or a service certificate in speech-language pathology.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Education in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education

  A. Professional Studies (9).
     Students are encouraged to complete the following professional studies courses early in their programs.
     - Select one (3):
       - EPRS 7900 Methods of Research (3)
- EPRS 7910 Action Research (3)
- EPRS 7920 Classroom Testing, Grading, and Assessment (3)
  - Select one (3):
    - EPSF 7100 Critical Pedagogy (3)
    - EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education (3)
    - EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)
  - Required (3):
    - EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (27)
   Required (12):
   - EDCI 7660 Practicum I (3) (*C) (*E)
   - EDRD 7600 *Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Reading (3) (*C) (Teachers who have been selected for training in Reading Recovery may substitute ECE 7360 for EDRD 7600)
   - EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas (3) (*C)
   - EDRD 7650 Individualized Literacy Assessment and Instruction (3) (*C)
   - Select one of the following options:
     1. Reading Instruction (15)
        - Required (9):
          - EDLA 7150 Children's and Adolescents' Literature (3) (*C)
          - EDRD 7550 Linking Literacy Assessment and Classroom Instruction (3) (*C)
          - EDRD 8610 Supervision of School Literacy Programs (3) (*C)
          - (Courses with a "*C" are those required for nondegree students with a Master's degree in Education who are seeking an "add-on" certificate in Reading)
        - Select one (3) (*C):
          - EDLA 7580 Language Foundations of Literacy Learning: From Acquiring Oral Language to Reading Words (3)
          - EDRD 7260 Early Literacy Development and Instruction (3)
          - (Courses with a "*C" are those required for nondegree students with a Master's degree in Education who are seeking an "add-on" certificate in Reading)
        - Select one (3):
          - Courses may be selected from the list below or from other literacy-related courses with consent of a language and literacy education adviser.
          - ECE 7380 Reading Recovery Clinical Teacher III (3)
- EDLA 7440 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Literature (3)
- EDLA 7460 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Writing (3)
- EDLA 7480 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of the English Language (3)
- EDRD 7360 Literacy and Technology (3)
- EDRD 8280 Literacy for a Diverse Society (3)
- EDRD 8550 Trends and Issues in Language and Literacy Education (3)
- EXC 7190 Alternative Approaches to Literacy Instruction for Students with Disabilities (3)
- IT 7360 Integrating Technology in School-Based Learning Environments (3)
- TSLE 7250 Applied Linguistics for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
- TSLE 7260 Cultural Issues for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
- TSLE 7440 Methods and Materials for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)

2. Early Literacy (15)
   - EDLA 7280 Early Writing Development
   - EDLA 7580 Language Foundations of Literacy Learning: From Acquiring Oral Language to Reading Words (3)
   - EDLA 8020 Social, Cultural, and Political Contexts Shaping Early Literacy Instruction (3)
   - EDRD 7260 Early Literacy Development and Instruction (3)
   - EDRD 7550 Linking Literacy Assessment and Classroom Instruction (3)

3. Teaching English as a Second Language (15)

   7. Required (3):
      - TSLE 7440 Methods and Materials for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3) (*E)
      - Select one (3): (*E)
        - AL 8250 Second Language Acquisition (3)
        - TSLE 7250 Applied Linguistics for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
• Select one (3): (*E)
  • AL 8330 Intercultural Communication (3)
  • TSLE 7260 Cultural Issues for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
  • (Courses with an "*E" are those required for nondegree students with a Master's degree in Education who are seeking an ESOL endorsement.)

• Select two (6):
  • AL 8240 General Linguistics (3)
  • AL 8460 English Grammar for ESL/EFL Teachers (3)
  • AL 8470 Socio Linguistics (3)

Program total: minimum of 36 semester hours

4240.75 Reading, Language, and Literacy Education (M.Ed.)

Online Program

Program Theme: Teachers as Critical Inquirers in Multicultural, Urban Settings

The online program in M.Ed. major in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education is offered through the Georgia ONmyLINE (GOML) system. GOML provides access to a full array of online and distance education offerings from the 35 colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. To find out more about GOML, please go to education.gsu.edu/main/Distance_Learning.htm. Students can apply to a Georgia State University GOML program at education.gsu.edu/main/4427.htm.

The M.Ed. major in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education (ESOL) Online Program provides advanced teacher preparation in ESOL for individuals holding bachelor's degree and who have an interest in English to speakers of other languages in P-12 settings. This program addresses the needs of teachers who work with literacy learners from diverse cultures and is open to all certified teachers, regardless of their initial preparation area. The course of study has been designed to meet the Georgia Professional Standards System requirements for an ESOL Endorsement (P-12) and the requirements for a Reading Endorsement (at the level of the candidate's base certificate).

The M.Ed. program is 36 hours (9 hours of college core courses; 9 hours English as a Second Language; 9 hours reading endorsement; a choice of 6 out of 9 offered hours of applied linguistics, and 3 hours of practicum). Candidates are required to take TSLE 7440 prior to enrolling in practicum hours and EDRD 7600 or EDRD 7630 prior to enrolling in EDRD 7650. M.Ed. students could enroll in any semester and complete the course work within 4 semesters if they averaged 3 courses per semester. This degree addresses the professional standards from IRA for classroom teachers of reading and from TESOL for teachers of ELL learners.
Program Admission

Entry into the program for the major in reading, language, and literacy education requires a bachelor's-level certification in any area of teaching or a service certificate in speech-language pathology.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Education in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education Online Program

A. Professional Studies (9).
   o Required (9):
     ▪ EPRS 7900 Methods of Research (3)
     ▪ EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)
     ▪ EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (27)
   o Required (21):
     ▪ EDCI 7660 Practicum I (3)
     ▪ EDRD 7600 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Reading (3)
     ▪ EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas (3)
     ▪ EDRD 7650 Individualized Literacy Assessment and Instruction (3)
     ▪ TSLE 7250 Applied Linguistics for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
     ▪ TSLE 7260 Cultural Issues for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
     ▪ TSLE 7440 Methods and Materials for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
   o Select two courses (6):
     ▪ AL 8240 General Linguistics (3)
     ▪ AL 8460 English Grammar for ESL/EFL Teachers (3)
     ▪ AL 8470 Socio Linguistics (3)

Program total: minimum of 36 semester hours

4240.80 Science Education (M.Ed.)

Program Theme: Educator as Reflective Professional

The M.Ed. major in Secondary Science Education seeks to advance early and mid-career science teachers' ability to effectively implement standards-based instructional practices. The program's chief goal—to strengthen secondary students' science understandings—is achieved, in part, by providing science teachers with opportunities to deepen their understandings of learners from diverse backgrounds and to explore issues of equity in science classrooms within urban environments. The program prepares teachers to continue to develop teaching strategies and self-analysis in the context of their own classrooms in order to inform instruction, and to share the knowledge gained in a professional community of teachers. Through engaging teachers in advanced science coursework, the program strengthens teachers' science content
knowledge. In general, the Program of Study is framed by the principles and standards of the National Science Education Association and the National Science Education Standards.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Education in Science Education

A. Professional Studies (9)
   o Select one (3):
     ▪ EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     ▪ EPRS 7910 Action Research (3)
   o Select one (3):
     ▪ EPSF 7100 Critical Pedagogy (3)
     ▪ EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education (3)
     ▪ EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)
   o Required (3):
     ▪ EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (27)
   o Required (12):
     ▪ EDSC 7550 Theory and Pedagogy in Science Instruction (3)
     ▪ EDSC 8400 Strategies of Instruction in Science (3)
     ▪ EDSC 8600 Science in the School Curriculum (3)
     ▪ IT 7360 Integrating Technology in School-Based Learning Environments (3)
   o Required 15 hours with science prefixes such as ASTR, BIOL, GEOL, GEOG, PHIL, PHYS, NSCI, or EDSC 8430 Nature of Science. With the consent of their adviser, students select from among 6000 – 8000 level courses related to science in terms of its history, philosophy, conceptual underpinnings, applications and relationships to the secondary curriculum. Courses selected must have academic advisor permission/approval.
   o Students must complete a portfolio as an exit requirement.

Program total: minimum of 36 semester hours

4240.85 Science Education (M.Ed.) Online Program

Program Theme: Educator as Reflective Professional

The online program in M.Ed. major in Science Education is offered through the Georgia ONmyLINE (GOML) system. GOML provides access to a full array of online and distance education offerings from the 35 colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. To find out more about GOML, please go to education.gsu.edu/main/Distance_Learning.htm. Students can apply to a Georgia State University GOML program at education.gsu.edu/main/4427.htm.

The M.Ed. major in Science Education Online Program is a separate but parallel program to the traditional Master of Education in Science that has been offered at Georgia State University as a
major since Fall 1982, and it is designed for teachers who are already certified in science at the secondary level. This program will provide students an opportunity to expand their knowledge of science content which will aid them in implementing a standards based curriculum. If teachers become proficient in their implementation of a standards based curriculum then ultimately student performance will improve as well as their knowledge of science. In addition to strengthening their knowledge base, the M.Ed. Science Education (GOML) will enhance the teaching dispositions of the participants which will provide them opportunities to deepen their understandings of learners from diverse backgrounds and to explore issues of equity in the science classroom. A need exists for science teachers to expand their knowledge of research; therefore, program participants will be expected to engage in action research in the context of their own classrooms in order to inform instruction, and to share the knowledge gained in a professional community of teachers. The ultimate goal of the program is to engage teachers in advanced courses that will strengthen their scientific content and broaden their pedagogical practices. In general the Program of Study is framed by the principles and standards of the National Science Standards and the core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

This entirely online 36 hour program [9 hours of college core courses; 9 hours science education, 15 hours of science (biology, chemistry, physics, astronomy, etc.), 3 hours of teachers and technology] is designed to be completed in four semesters. The M.Ed. major in Science Education Online Program will be available to teachers holding a clear and renewable certificate in science.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Education in Science Education Online Program

A. Professional Studies (9)
   o Required (9):
     ▪ EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     ▪ EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)
     ▪ EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (27)
   o Required (12):
     ▪ EDSC 7550 Theory and Pedagogy in Science Instruction (3)
     ▪ EDSC 8400 Strategies of Instruction in Science (3)
     ▪ EDSC 8600 Science in the School Curriculum (3)
     ▪ IT 7360 Integrating Technology in School-Based Learning Environments (3)
   o Required (15 hours):
     ▪ BIOL 7440 Fundamentals of Evolution (3)
     ▪ EDSC 8430 Nature of Science (3)
     ▪ GEOL 6097 Topics in Geological Sciences (3)
     ▪ PHYS 7110 Conceptual Physics I (3)
     ▪ PHYS 7120 Conceptual Physics II (3)
With the consent of their advisor, students select from among 6000–8000 level courses with prefixes ASTR, BIOL, GEOL, GEOG, PHIL, PHYS, or NSCI, related to science in terms of its history, philosophy, conceptual underpinnings, applications and relationships to the secondary curriculum.

- Students must complete a portfolio as an exit requirement.

Program total: minimum of 36 semester hours

4240.90 Social Studies Education (M.Ed.)

Program Theme: Teachers as Critical Inquirers in Multicultural Urban Settings

The M.Ed. major in Social Studies Education provides learning experiences for teachers who have been initially prepared in secondary social studies education.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Education in Social Studies Education

A. Professional Studies (9)
   - Select one (3):
     - EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     - EPRS 7910 Action Research (3)
   - Select one (3):
     - EPSF 7100 Critical Pedagogy (3)
     - EPSF 7110 Multicultural Education (3)
     - EPSF 7120 Social and Cultural Foundations of Education (3)
   - Required (3):
     - EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)

B. Teaching Field/Major (27)
   - Select four (12):
     - EDCI 7980 Teaching and Learning in Urban Contexts (3)
     - EDSS 7560 Teaching History and the Social Sciences (3)
     - EDSS 7570 Social Studies Concepts and Issues (3)
     - EDSS 8420 Topics in the School Social Studies Curriculum (3)
     - TSLE 7260 Cultural Issues for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)
   - Other education courses may be substituted with consent of his or her advisor.
   - Select Advanced Studies in Social Studies (15): With consent of their adviser, students select coursework numbered 6000 or higher in the following areas: anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, psychology, and sociology.

Program total: minimum of 36 semester hours
4260 Master of Science (M.S.)

4260.25 Instructional Design and Technology (M.S.)

The M.S. major in Instructional Design and Technology provides students with the basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to perform as instructional technologists. An instructional technologist is a professional educator who can combine knowledge of the learning process, knowledge of instructional systems theory, and knowledge of various forms of media and learning environments to create the most effective and efficient learning experiences. The program is designed for individuals interested in working in the field of instructional technology in a wide variety of education, training, and development areas such as those found in P-12 schools, business, and industry. To meet the individual needs and interests of the instructional technology students, the program provides a maximum amount of flexibility in course selection. In addition, ample opportunities are provided for applying the competencies learned in the classroom to job-related situations.

The M.S. major in Instructional Design and Technology program is offered online by the Instructional Technology faculty in the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology. To find out more information about the online program and courses, please go to msit.gsu.edu/index.htm.

Program Admission

The applicant must aspire to or currently hold a position related to the application of instructional technology in an education or training environment. In addition, the applicant must possess basic computing technology skills.

Program Degree Requirements

Master of Science in Instructional Design and Technology

A. Professional Studies (9)
   o Select one (3):
     - EPRS 7900 Methods of Research in Education (3)
     - EPRS 7910 Action Research (3)
     - EPRS 7920 Classroom Testing, Grading, and Assessment (3)
   o Select two (6):
     - EPSF 8440 Foundations of Curriculum Development (3)
     - EPY 7080 The Psychology of Learning and Learners (3)
     - EPY 8070 Understanding and Facilitating Adult Learning (3)

B. Major (24)
   o Required (15):
     - IT 7100 Design of Performance and Instructional Systems (3)
     - IT 7150 Analysis of Performance and Instructional Systems (3)
     - IT 8000 Foundations of Instructional Technology (3)
     - IT 8150 Managing Instructional Technology Projects (3)
IT 8200 Diffusion and Adoption of Technological innovation (3)

- Select three (9):
  - IT 7360 Integrating Technology in School-Based Learning Environments (3)
  - IT 8050 Evaluation and Assessment of Online Learning (3)
  - IT 8090 Internet for Educators (3)
  - IT 8360 Design and Development of Multimedia for Education and Training (3)
  - IT 8370 Advanced Studio Project (3)
  - IT 8390 Analysis of Education, Training, and Performance Support Centers (3)
  - IT 8400 Advanced Authoring Technologies (3)
  - IT 8420 Topics in Instructional Technology (3)
  - IT 8440 eLearning Environments (3)
  - IT 8550 Human Performance Technology (3)
  - Other courses may be selected with consent of advisor.

C. Internship (3)

- Required (3): IT 8660 Internship in Instructional Technology (3)
  Students must have completed at least 24 semester hours of program coursework before taking IT 8660.

Exit Requirement: Students must achieve a satisfactory score on a written departmental examination and successfully present a portfolio of their work in instructional technology.

Program total: minimum of 36 semester hours

4320 Ph.D. Programs of Study

4320.35 Instructional Technology (Ph.D.)

Program Theme: Educator as Researcher

The Ph.D. major in Instructional Technology provides specialization for individuals in the following areas: instructional design, alternative instructional delivery systems, research, management, and consulting. The program is designed for highly competent individuals who are working in the instructional technology field in a wide variety of educational, training, and development areas such as those found in schools, higher education, business, industry, and government agencies.

Program Degree Requirements

Doctor of Philosophy in Instructional Technology

A. Core Area (18)
The students must meet all general core area requirements.

B. Major Area (21)

The required courses provide a conceptual base of research, emerging issues in education, and an in-depth examination of research in the major field. The internship (IT 9660) facilitates the application of theory to practice in the major field of study.

Required (6):
- EDCI 9900 Critique of Education Research (3)
- IT 8660 Internship in Instructional Technology (3)

Select (15):

The students and Doctoral Advisory Committee select additional departmental courses relating to instructional technology.

C. Cognate (18)

Required (6):
- EDCI 8970 Seminar in Teaching and Learning (3)
- EDCI 9850 Research Seminar (3)

Select (12):

The students and Doctoral Advisory Committee select additional coursework.

D. Dissertation (9)

Required (9):
- EDCI 9990 Dissertation (9)

Program total: minimum of 66 semester hours

4320.50 Teaching and Learning (Ph.D.)

Program Theme: Educator as Researcher

Concentration Areas: Art Education, Language and Literacy Education; Mathematics Education; Music Education; Science Education; Social Studies Education

The Ph.D. major in Teaching and Learning is designed to prepare professional educators for leadership positions by developing a substantial knowledge base in one of the following areas of concentration: Art Education, Language and Literacy Education, Mathematics Education,
Music Education, Science Education, and Social Studies Education. In addition, the program prepares professional educators as scholarly inquirers who ask thoughtful questions, who can conduct sound inquiry, and who can recommend informed policy.

Program Degree Requirements

Doctor of Philosophy in Teaching and Learning

A. Core Area (18)

The students must meet all general core area requirements.

B. Major Area (21)

Required (9):

- EDCI 9660 Internship (3)
- EDCI 9850 Research Seminar (3)
- EDCI 9900 Critique of Educational Research (3)

Select (12): The students select a concentration area and complete coursework from courses in the area of concentration.

C. Cognate Area (18)

Required (3):

- EDCI 8970 Seminar in Teaching and Learning (3)

Select (15): The students and Doctoral Advisory Committee select additional coursework.

D. Dissertation (9)

Required (9):

- EDCI 9990 Dissertation (9)

Program total: minimum of 66 semester hours

4410 NonDegree Programs

Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology

4410.65 English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Endorsement

The Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology of the College of Education and the Department of Applied Linguistics and English as a Second Language of the College of Arts and Sciences offer graduate courses in bilingual/English as a second language to
give teachers additional training to work with non-English speaking or limited English speaking students at the early childhood, middle childhood, and secondary school levels.

Successful completion of the following coursework and completion of a portfolio demonstrating competencies established for ESOL teachers by TESOL qualifies a person for the bachelor's, master's, or specialist level endorsement, depending upon the students' current level of certification. The program presupposes certification at least at the bachelor's level. Students must be admitted as graduate students to the College of Education. (See the program description for the M.Ed. major in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education for application of TSLE courses to a degree program. Students who do not hold an initial certification in a teaching field may apply to the M.A.T. major in Reading, Language, and Literacy Education to receive initial certification in ESOL and a reading endorsement.)

Required (6):

- EDCI 7660 Practicum I (3)
- TSLE 7440 Methods and Materials for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)

Select one (3):

- AL 8250 Second Language Acquisition (3)
- TSLE 7250 Applied Linguistics for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)

Select one (3):

- AL 8330 Intercultural Communication (3)
- TSLE 7260 Cultural Issues for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (3)

Total hours for endorsement: minimum of 12 semester hours

4410.70 Reading Endorsement

The Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology and the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education offer graduate courses in literacy which apply to Georgia's Reading Endorsement for classroom teachers. These courses focus on three areas (a) understanding readers and the reading process, (b) linking assessment and instruction, and (c) using instructional strategies in specific content areas. All students who wish to obtain a reading endorsement must attend a MSIT orientation session and complete an exit requirement of a portfolio. The portfolio will be aligned with the PSC requirements and will require the demonstration of the ability to teach reading at the applicable levels of the base certificate.

The Reading Endorsement Program presupposes certification at least at the bachelor's level. Successful completion of three of the following courses qualifies a person for the bachelor's, master's, or specialist level endorsement, depending on the current level of certification. This
endorsement qualifies an individual to be considered 'in field' in reading at the level of the base certificate. Teachers pursuing the reading endorsement may be enrolled as nondegree students or may be enrolled in specific programs.

Strand 1: Understanding Readers and the Reading Process

Select one (3):

- EDRD 6600 Introduction to Materials and Methods in Reading Instruction (3)
- EDRD 7600 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Reading (3)

Strand 2: Linking Assessment and Instruction

Select one (3):

- EDRD 7550 Linking Literacy Assessment and Classroom Instruction (3)
- EDRD 7650 Individualized Literacy Assessment and Instruction (3)

Strand 3: Using Instructional Strategies in Specific Content Areas

Select one (3):

- EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas (3)
- EXC 7190 Alternative Approaches to Literacy for Students with Disabilities (3)

Total hours for endorsement: minimum of 9 semester hours

4410.75 Online Teaching Endorsement

The Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology of the College of Education offers online graduate courses that give teachers additional training to teach online classes. Being an effective online teacher presents a different set of challenges and opportunities than traditional face-to-face instruction. This program will provide students with the knowledge, skills, attitudes and abilities they need to succeed in an online learning environment.

Candidates for the Online Teaching Endorsement Program must hold a clear renewable teaching certificate (including the Technical Specialist certificate) at level 4 or higher. Successful completion of the program qualifies a person for teaching classes online in accordance with the State of Georgia’s Online Teaching Endorsement Program (505-3-.85). Students seeking only the endorsement must be admitted to the Graduate program in the College of Education as a non-degree student.

Required (12):

- IT 7360 Integrating Technology into School-Based Environments (3)
- IT 8050 Evaluation and Assessment for Online Learning (3)
Students are also required to complete an electronic portfolio for this program.

**Total hours for endorsement: minimum of 12 semester hours.**

**Ed.S. Teaching and Learning -Deactivated**
A collaborative program between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education
Program Theme: Educator as Inquirer, Program Leader, and Instructional Specialist
The Educational Specialist degree is a unique professional degree in the field of education, a degree that reflects a high level of knowledge and expertise. The Ed.S. major in Teaching and Learning is intended for professional educators who demonstrate high levels of expertise in their areas of concentration and who wish both to develop those areas further and to develop themselves as inquirers, program leaders, and instructional specialists.

**Program Degree Requirements**

**Specialist in Education in Teaching and Learning**

A. Professional Studies (9)

Required (9):
EDCI 8400 Dynamics of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum Development (3)
EDCI 8900 Educational Inquiry (3)
EDCI 8960 Seminar in Leadership and Supervision in Teaching and Learning (3)

B. Teaching Field/Area of Concentration (21)
Select one of the following 12 concentration areas (21 hours):

1 - Art Education Concentration
Required Courses (15): (Select 5 courses)
AE 8010 Philosophy and Curriculum (3)
AE 8020 Learning Theory (3)
AE 8030 Leadership and Supervision in Art Education (3)
AE 8100 Seminar in Art Education (3)
AE 8200 History, Culture, and Communities in Art Education (3)
AE 8300 Research in Art Education (3)
AE 8400 Aesthetics and Critical Theory (3)
AE 8500 Directed Study (3)
AE 8980 Special Problems (3)
Select two courses (6):
Select two additional graduate courses from art history, studio or art education, with consent of advisor.

2 - English Education Concentration
Required (6):
EDRD 8310 Theoretical Models and Processes of Literacy Learning (6)
Select three courses (9):
EDLA 7440 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Literature (3)
EDLA 7460 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Writing (3)
EDLA 7480 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of the English Language (3)
EDLA 8330 Language Variation and Learning (3)
EDRD 8280 Literacy for a Diverse Society (3)
EDRD 8550 Trends and Issues in Language and Literacy Education (3)
Other graduate literacy courses may be selected with consent of adviser.
Select two courses (6):
Select two ENGL courses numbered 6000 to 8999 with consent of adviser.

3 - English as a Second Language (ESOL) Concentration
Required (9):
EDLA 8330 Language Variation and Learning (3)
EDRD 8280 Literacy for a Diverse Society (3)
EDRD 8310 Theoretical Models and Process of Literacy Learning (3)
Select two courses (6):
EDLA 7150 Literature for Children and Adolescents (3)
EDRD 7480 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of the English Language (3)
EDRD 8310 Theoretical Models and Process of Literacy Learning (3)
EDRD 8550 Trends and Issues in Language and Literacy Education (3)
Other graduate level literacy courses may be selected with the consent of the adviser.

Select two courses (6):
AL 8490 Second Language Reading: Theory and Practice (3)
AL 8500 Pragmatics and Language Teaching (3)
AL 8520 Psycholinguistics (3)
AL 8530 Issues in Second Language Writing (3)
AL 8550 Second Language Evaluation (3)
AL 8570 Second Language Reading-Writing Relationships (3)

Other Applied Linguistic courses in the 6000-8000 range may be selected with consent of the adviser.

4 - Foreign Language Education (French, German, or Spanish) Concentration Required (3):
FORL 8850 Education Specialist Research and Portfolio Development (3)

Select three courses (9):
Select three courses in the major language numbered 6000 to 8999.
Select three courses (9):
AL 8330 Intercultural Communication (3)
FORL 6021 Foreign Language Educators and Technology (3)
FORL 8223 Modern Foreign Language Pedagogy: Theory and Practice (3)
FORL 8225 Applied Linguistics for Foreign Language Teachers (3)
FORL 8226 Teaching Literature in the Foreign Language Classroom (3)
FORL 8227 Teaching Culture in the Foreign Language Classroom (3)
FORL 8250 Topics in Pedagogy (3)

Students may take other 6000-8000-level foreign language educator or linguistics related courses upon the recommendation of the Modern and Classical Languages advisor.

5 - Instructional Technology Concentration: This program is not accepting applications.
Required (12):
IT 7100 Design of Performance and Instructional Systems (3)
IT 8000 Foundations of Instructional Technology (3)
IT 8150 Managing Instructional Technology Projects (3)
IT 8200 Diffusion and Adoption of Technology Projects (3)
Electives (9):
EPEL 7000 Educational Leadership and Organizational Culture (3)

Additional 8000-level IT courses or other relevant courses may be selected with consent of adviser.

6 - Library Media Technology Concentration
Required (3):
EDCI 8990 Educational Specialist Scholarly Inquiry (3)
Electives (18):
EDRD 8280 Literacy for a Diverse Society (3)
EDRD 8550 Trends and Issues in Language and Literacy Education (3)
IT 7360 Integrating Technology into School-Based Environment (3)
IT 8050 Evaluation and Assessment for Online Learning (3)
IT 8090 The Internet for Educators (3)
IT 8440 E-Learning Environments (3)

Additional 7000-8000 Level IT, Literacy, or relevant MSIT courses may be selected with the consent of adviser.

7 - Mathematics Education Concentration 2010-2011 Graduate Catalog 286
Select three courses (9):
EDMT 8290 The Study of Learning and Instruction in Mathematics (3)
EDMT 8420 Topics in the School Mathematics Curriculum (3)
EDMT 8430 Sociocultural and Sociohistorical Issues in Mathematics (3)
EDMT 8550 Trends and Issues of Teaching Mathematics (3)

Select four courses (12):
Select EDMT, MATH, CSC or Stat courses numbered 8000 to 8999 and courses related to the major themes of the program. *

8 - Middle Level Education Concentration
Required (3):
EDCI 8550 Trends and Issues in Middle Childhood Education (3)

Select six courses (18):
Select with consent of adviser courses numbered 7000 to 8999 that address program theme, including at least three in one content area of teaching (language arts, mathematics, reading, science, or social studies). *

9 - Music Education Concentration
Required (12):
MUS 8240 Research in Music Education (3)
MUS 8260 Curriculum Development in Music Education (3)
MUS 8580 Leadership and Supervision of Music Education (3)
MUS 8980 Advanced Research Project in Music Education (3)
Select one course (3):
MUS 7700 Psychology of Music Learning (3)
MUS 8210 Arts, Education and the Community (3)
MUS 8400 Philosophy of Music Education (3)
MUS 8950 Practicum in Music Education (3)
Other music education courses numbered 7000 or higher may be selected with consent of adviser.
Select two courses (6):
Graduate courses in music education, music history, music theory, performance, and conducting and other courses directly related to the students' teaching or research interests may be selected with consent of adviser.

10 - Reading Education Concentration
Required (6):
EDLA 8020 Social, Cultural, and Political Contexts Shaping Early Literacy Instruction (3)
EDRD 8310 Theoretical Models and Processes of Literacy Learning (3)
Select five courses (15):
EDLA 7480 Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of the English Language (3)
EDLA 8330 Language Variation and Learning (3)
EDRD 7550 Linking Literacy Assessment and Classroom Instruction (3)
EDRD 8280 Literacy for a Diverse Society (3)
EDRD 8610 Supervision of School Literacy Programs (3)
Other literacy courses may be selected with consent of adviser.
Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders in Training may count up to three (9) of the following courses as part of the teaching field for the concentration in Reading Education: ECE 8300, ECE 8310, ECE 8320, ECE 8700.

11 - Science Education Concentration
Required (12):
EDSC 8400 Strategies of Instruction in Science (3)
EDSC 8440 Advanced Science Concepts and Issues (3)
EDSC 8550 Trends and Issues in Teaching Science (3)
EDSC 8600 Science in School Curriculum (3)
Select one course (3):
One education course numbered 8000 or above may be selected with consent of the adviser.
Select two courses (6):
College of Arts and Sciences courses in astronomy, biology, chemistry, geology, and physics may be selected with consent of adviser.

12 - Social Studies Education Concentration
Required (6):
EDSS 8290 Learning, Curriculum and Instruction in Social Studies (3)
EDSS 8420 Topics in the School Social Studies Curriculum (3)
Select five courses (15):
Select with consent of adviser courses numbered 7000 to 8999 that support the program theme and that are offered by one of the following departments: Anthropology, Geosciences, Economics, History, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology.*
*Appropriate College of Arts and Sciences courses numbered 6000-7999 may be used to fulfill this requirement.
Program total: minimum of 30 semester hours

App. Table D4: Course offerings
A list of courses offered by the department for the past three years with the frequency with which the courses were offered in the review period, the number of sections, the total number of students and the average number of students per section. Please indicate courses which are cross-listed. This information will be organized by the categories of undergraduate lower division, undergraduate upper division, graduate. (Appendix Table D-1) [provided by OIR].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>XLIST</th>
<th># SECTIONS</th>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>AVG. ENROLLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>EDUC 2120</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>GSU 1010</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>IT 2010</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>IT 2210</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>RGTR 0198</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>ECE 3600</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>ECE 3601</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>ECE 3606</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>EDBT 3020</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>EDBT 3360</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>EDBT 3690</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>EDBT 3700</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>EDBT 3710</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>EDBT 4250</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>EDBT 4570</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>EDCI 3250</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>EDSC 3250</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY09</td>
<td>EDSS 3400</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT 3210</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 6540</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 6560</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 6600</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7020</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7420</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7540</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7560</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7660</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7670</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7680</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7975</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 8400</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 8550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 8810</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 8900</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 8960</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 8970</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 8990</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 9660</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 9850</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 9900</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 9990</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 6550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 7150</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 7280</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 7440</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 7460</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 7480</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 7550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 8020</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 8330</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDMT 6560</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDMT 7360</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDMT 7530</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDMT 7560</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDMT 78290</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDMT 8420</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDMT 8430</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDMT 8550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EDMT 9870</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>EDRD 6600</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EDRD 7260</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EDRD 7550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>EDRD 7600</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>EDRD 7630</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>EDRD 7650</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EDRD 7660</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>EDRD 7680</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>EDRD 7680</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDRD 7750</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>EDRD 7750</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EDRD 7820</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>IT 8200</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>IT 8360</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>IT 8390</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>IT 8400</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>IT 8440</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>IT 8500</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>IT 8660</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>NSCI 7003</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>TSLE 7250</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>TSLE 7260</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>TSLE 7440</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSIT</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>EDRD 0071</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>3.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDUC 2120</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>GSU 1010</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>HON 1000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 2010</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 2210</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>RGTR 0198</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSIT</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>ECE 3360</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>30.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>ECE 3606</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDBT 3020</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDBT 3360</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDBT 3690</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDBT 3700</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDBT 3710</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDBT 4250</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDBT 4570</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 3200</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 3220</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 3250</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDLA 3200</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDMT 3350</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 3490</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRO 3500</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSF 3250</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSS 3400</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 3100</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 3210</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>NSCI 3002</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>NSCI 7002</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>AL 8460</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 6540</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 6560</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 6600</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 7020</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 7420</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 7540</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 7560</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 7660</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 7760</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 7860</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 7975</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 7990</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 8400</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 8410</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 8900</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 8960</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 8970</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 9660</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 9850</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 9950</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDCI 9990</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDLA 6550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDLA 7150</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDLA 7460</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDLA 7480</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDLA 7550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDLA 7580</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDLA 8020</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDMT 6560</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDMT 7360</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDMT 7530</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDMT 7560</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDMT 8290</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDMT 8420</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDMT 8430</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDMT 8550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 6600</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 7260</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 7550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 7600</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 7630</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 7650</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 7680</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 7630</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 7650</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 7680</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 7630</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 7650</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 8280</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 8310</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 8550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 8610</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDRD 9870</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSC 6550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSC 7550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSC 8400</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSC 8430</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSC 8600</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSC 9870</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSS 6560</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSS 7540</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSS 7560</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSS 7570</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EDSS 8550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>ELMT 7020</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>ELMT 7140</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>ELMT 7200</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>ELMT 7250</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>ELMT 7370</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>ELMT 7410</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>ELMT 7660</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>EPRS 7900</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>HIST 8890</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 7100</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 7150</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 7360</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 8000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 8050</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 8090</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 8150</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 8200</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 8390</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 8440</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>IT 8660</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>MGMS 7401</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>NSCI 7002 NSCI 3002</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>TSLE 7250</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>TSLE 7260</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>TSLE 7440</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 0071</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDUC 2120</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>GSU 1010</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 2010</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 2210</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>PERS 2002</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>ECE 3021</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>ECE 3360</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>ECE 3600</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>ECE 3606</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>ECE 3607</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>ECE 3661</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>ECE 3662</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>ECE 4661</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDBT 3020</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDBT 3360</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDBT 3690</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDBT 3700</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDBT 3710</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDBT 4250</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDBT 4570</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 3200</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 3220</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 4600</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 4640</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 4700</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 4810</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDLA 3200</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDLA 4400</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDMT 3350</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDMT 4460</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 3490</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 3500</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 4450</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 4600</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDSC 3250</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDSC 4470</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDSS 3400</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 6540</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 3100</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>NSCI 3002</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>NSCI 7002</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 6540</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 6560</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 6600</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 7020</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 7540</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 7560</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 7660</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 7670</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 7680</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 7975</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 7980</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 8400</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 8550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 8810</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 8900</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 8960</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 8970</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 9660</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 9850</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 9900</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDCI 9990</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDLA 6550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDLA 7150</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDLA 7440</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDLA 7460</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDLA 7550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>EDLA 8020</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDLA 8330</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDMT 6560</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDMT 7360</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDMT 7530</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDMT 7560</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDMT 8290</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDMT 8420</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDMT 8430</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDMT 8550</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDMT 9870</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 6600</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 7260</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 7550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 7600</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 7630</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 7650</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 8280</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 8310</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 8550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 8610</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDRD 9870</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSC 6550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSC 7550</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSC 8400</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSC 8430</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSC 8440</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSC 8550</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSC 8600</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSS 6560</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSS 7540</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSS 7560</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSS 7570</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSS 8290</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>EDSS 8420</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>ELMT 7020</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>ELMT 7130</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>ELMT 7150</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>ELMT 7200</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>ELMT 7250</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>ELMT 7370</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT FY11</td>
<td>ELMT 7410</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>ELMT 7660</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>ELMT 8390</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>HIST 8890</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 7100</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 7360</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 8000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 8050</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 8090</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 8150</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 8200</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 8420</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 8440</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>IT 8660</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>NSCI 7002</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>TSLE 7250</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>TSLE 7260</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>TSLE 7440</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
App. D5: Summary of survey results
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Table 1
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your experience as a graduate student in the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (MSIT).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members in the department are interested in the academic development of MSIT graduate majors.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MSIT graduate program of study is academically challenging.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department are appropriately prepared for their courses.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the graduate program in MSIT is preparing me for my professional career and/or further study.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is open communication between faculty and graduate students about student concerns.</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size is suitable for effective learning.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean range: 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree; “NA” (not applicable) excluded from analysis. Percentile rank based on 44 departments.

Table 2
Please rate the quality of the faculty and programs in the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisement available in the department</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean range: 1=Poor to 4=Excellent; “NA” (not applicable) excluded from analysis. Percentile rank based on 44 departments.
Career advisement available in the department
Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom
Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty
Procedures used to evaluate student performance
Frequency of MSIT graduate course offerings
Variety of MSIT graduate course offerings
Clarity of degree requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 Excellent</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>Univ. M (SD)</td>
<td>COE M (SD)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarship of the faculty in the department
Frequency of required course offerings
Variety of advanced course offerings
Level of clerical staff support
Clarity of departmental goals for the next two years
Availability of computer/data base software relevant to your work

Note. Mean range: 1=Poor to 5=Excellent; "NA" (not applicable) excluded from analysis. Percentile rank based on 46 departments.

Table 2
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your department.
Table 3

The following is a list of faculty tasks for which the department has various expectations. Please indicate the amount of emphasis you believe the department has placed on each task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Significantly too little emphasis</th>
<th>Significantly too much emphasis</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N (SD)</th>
<th>Univ. M (SD)</th>
<th>COE M (SD)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research tasks</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.0 25.9</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to department</td>
<td>3.7 11.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing in certain journals</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>7.4 11.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean range: 1=Significantly too little emphasis to 5=Significantly too much emphasis; “NA” (not applicable) excluded from analysis. Percentile rank based on 46 departments.

Table 4

Please answer the following questions based on your experience or background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Univ.</th>
<th>COE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean range: 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree; “NA” (not applicable) excluded from analysis. Percentile rank based on 46 departments.
Have you ever been the editor of any journals or served on any editorial boards in your field?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>7 or more</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>Univ. M (SD)</td>
<td>COE M (SD)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you been awarded any grants from Georgia State University to support research in your field?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>7 or more</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>Univ. M (SD)</td>
<td>COE M (SD)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you been awarded any grants from a source other than Georgia State University to support research in your field?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>7 or more</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>Univ. M (SD)</td>
<td>COE M (SD)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the last two years, have you refereed or served as a reviewer of one or more articles submitted to journal(s) in your field?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>7 or more</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>Univ. M (SD)</td>
<td>COE M (SD)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Please answer the following questions based on your experience or background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>7 or more</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many professional articles or chapters in books have you published in the last five years?</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many authored books or edited books have you published in the last five years?</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many monographs, manuals, or reviews have you published in the last five years?</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many formal presentations have you given at professional meetings over the last five years?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many formal presentations have you given at other colleges or institutions over the last five years?</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Mean range: 0=0, 1=1-2, 2=3-4, 3=5-6, 4=7 or more; "NA" (not applicable) excluded from analysis. Percentile rank based on 46 departments.
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your experience as a graduate student in the Department of Middle-Secondary Education & Instructional Technology.

| Strongly disagree | 2 | 3 | 4 | Strongly agree | NA | % | % | % | % | % | N | M (SD) | Univ. M (SD) | COE M (SD) | Rank |
|-------------------|---|---|---|----------------|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------|------------|----------|------|
| Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of graduate majors. | 1.0 | 9.1 | 12.1 | 22.2 | 55.6 | .099 | 4.22 | 4.18 | 4.21 | 45 | 4.09 | 1.05 | 1.01 | 1.00 |
| The graduate program of study was academically challenging. | 2.0 | 12.1 | 16.2 | 25.3 | 44.4 | .099 | 3.98 | 3.97 | 3.95 | 40 | 4.09 | 1.13 | 1.07 | 1.10 |
| Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses. | 3.0 | 7.1 | 14.1 | 29.3 | 46.5 | .099 | 4.09 | 4.26 | 4.27 | 29 | 4.09 | 1.08 | 0.91 | 0.95 |
| I feel the graduate program prepared me for my professional career and/or further study. | 7.1 | 4.0 | 17.2 | 26.3 | 45.5 | .099 | 3.99 | 3.97 | 4.05 | 55 | 4.09 | 1.20 | 1.12 | 1.10 |
| There was open communication between faculty and graduate students about student concerns. | 6.1 | 11.2 | 9.2 | 23.5 | 50.0 | .098 | 4.00 | 3.95 | 4.01 | 50 | 4.00 | 1.27 | 1.16 | 1.15 |
| Class size was suitable for effective learning. | 1.0 | 6.1 | 2.0 | 23.2 | 67.7 | .099 | 4.51 | 4.38 | 4.40 | 55 | 4.00 | 0.89 | 0.94 | 0.97 |

Note. Mean range: 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree; "NA" (not applicable) excluded from analysis. Percentile rank based on 44 departments.

Table 2
Please rate the quality of the faculty and programs in the Department of Middle-Secondary Education & Instructional Technology.

| Poor | 2 | 3 | 4 Excellent | NA | % | % | % | % | % | % | N | M (SD) | Univ. M (SD) | COE M (SD) | Rank |
|------|---|---|-------------|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------|------------|----------|------|
| Academic advisement available in the department | 10.1 | 7.1 | 13.1 | 27.3 | 39.4 | 3.0 | 99 | 3.81 | 3.68 | 3.65 | 52 | 1.32 | 1.21 | 1.25 |
| Career advisement available in the department | 10.1 | 7.1 | 18.2 | 22.2 | 18.2 | 24.2 | 99 | 3.41 | 3.18 | 3.24 | 64 | 1.32 | 1.27 | 1.27 |
| Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom | 5.1 | 9.2 | 10.2 | 29.6 | 43.9 | 2.0 | 98 | 4.00 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 35 | 1.19 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty | 2.0 | 6.1 | 21.2 | 22.2 | 48.5 | 0.99 | 4.09 | 4.06 | 4.16 | 45 | 1.06 | 0.85 | 0.83 |
### Procedures used to evaluate student performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>(1.04)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency of graduate course offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>(1.08)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variety of graduate course offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Clarity of degree requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>(1.17)</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>(0.95)</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Mean range: 1=Poor to 5=Excellent; "NA" (not applicable) excluded from analysis. Percentile rank based on 44 departments.
Survey trends

Faculty

Publications
How many formal presentations have you given at professional meetings over the last five years?
2003 7 or more- 48%
2011 7 or more- 77.8%
+30%

How many professional articles or chapters in books have you published in the last five years?
2003 7 or more- 37%
2011 7 or more- 48%
+11%

Have you ever been the editor of any journals or served on any editorial boards in your field? (% yes)
2003 33%
2011 66.7%
+33%

Have you been awarded any grants from Georgia State University to support research in your field? (%yes)
2003 37%
2011 63.0%
+26%

Have you been awarded any grants from a source other than Georgia State University to support research in your field? (% yes)
2003 44%
2011 66.7%
+22%
During the last two years, have you refereed or served as a reviewer of one or more articles submitted to journal(s) in your field? (% yes)
2003 52%
2011 85.2%
+33%

Scholarship and Faculty
The department's program of study is academically challenging. (Agree or Strongly Agree)
2003 81.4%
2011 89%
+8%

Scholarship of the faculty in the department (% rating VG-Exc)
2003 85%
2011 85%
No change

Guidelines regarding job performance are clear to faculty in the department. (Agree or Strongly Agree)
2003 approx 50%
2011 74%
+24%

Clarity of departmental goals for the next two years (% rating VG-Exc)
2003 40.7%
2011 77%
+37%

Faculty in the department work together toward program goals. (Agree or Strongly Agree)
2003 approx 74%
2011 66.6%
-8%

In our department, faculty feel comfortable expressing different views and opinions. (Agree or Strongly Agree)
2003 77.8%
2011 51.8%
-26%

I have adequate opportunities to influence decisions made in the department about our programs (Agree or Strongly Agree)
2003 74%
2011 59.2%
-14.8%

Administrative Resources
Level of clerical staff support (% rating VG-Exc)
Availability of computer/data base software relevant to your work (% rating VG-Exc)
2003 77%
2011 85.2%
+8%

Course Offerings
Frequency of required course offerings (% rating VG-Exc)
2003 77.7%
2011 66.6%
-11%
Variety of advanced course offerings (% rating VG-Exc)
2003 80.8%
2011 66.6%
-14%

Graduate Students

Experiences as a Student
(% Agree or Strongly Agree)

Faculty members in the department are interested in the academic development of MSIT graduate majors.
2003 80.2%
2011 83.7%
+3.5%

The MSIT graduate program of study is academically challenging.
2003 74.1%
2011 80.6%
+6.5%

Faculty in the department are appropriately prepared for their courses.
2003 78.9%
2011 81.6%
+2.7%

I feel the graduate program in MSIT is preparing me for my professional career and/or further study.
2003 76.7%
2011 85.1%
+8.4%
There is open communication between faculty and graduate students about student concerns.
2003 69.9%
2011 68%
-2%

Class size is suitable for effective learning.
2003 89%
2011 84%
-5%

Quality of Faculty and Programs
(% Very Good Excellent)
Academic advisement available in the department
2003 56%
2011 80%
+24%

Career advisement available in the department
2003 30.6%
2011 43%
+12.4%

Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom
2001 63.3%
2011 72.1%
+8.8%

Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty
2003 77.1%
2011 83%
+4%

Procedures used to evaluate student performance
2003 ?
2011 77%

Frequency of MSIT graduate course offerings
2003 50.4%
2011 53.3%
+3%

Variety of MSIT graduate course offerings
2003 53.5%
2011 54.4%
+.9%

Clarity of degree requirements
2003 73.6%
Graduate Alumni

Experiences as a Student
(% Agree or Strongly Agree)

Faculty members in the department were interested in the academic development of MSIT graduate majors.
2003 85.3%
2011 77.8%
-7.5%

The MSIT graduate program of study was academically challenging.
2003 71.1%
2011 69.7%
-1.4%

Faculty in the department were appropriately prepared for their courses.
2003 80.3%
2011 75.8%
-4.5%

I feel the graduate program in MSIT prepared me for my professional career and/or further study.
2003 81%
2011 71.8%
-9.2%

There was open communication between faculty and graduate students about student concerns.
2003 82.4%
2011 73.5%
-8.9%

Class size was suitable for effective learning.
2003 91%
2011 91%
nc

Quality of Faculty and Programs
(% Very Good Excellent)

Academic advisement available in the department
2003 62%
2011 66.7%
+4.7%

Career advisement available in the department
2003 42.9%
2011 40.4%
2.5%

Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom
2003 80.9%
2011 73.5%
7.4%

Effectiveness of teaching methods used by faculty
2003 79.5%
2011 70.7%
8.8%

Procedures used to evaluate student performance
2003
2011 74.7%

Frequency of MSIT graduate course offerings
2003 66.2%
2011 50.5%
15.7%

Variety of MSIT graduate course offerings
2003 66.9%
2011 63.3%
3.6%

Clarity of degree requirements
2003 82.4%
2011 71.7%
10.7%
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FACULTY SURVEY COMMENTS
April 2011

The following statements are in response to the comment section in the online survey. All responses are exported directly into a Word document without any changes to wording, punctuation, or grammar. Please note that each paragraph represents one individual respondent's comment.
If you wish to make any comments or suggestions concerning the Department of Middle-Secondary Education & Instructional Technology, please use the space provided.

- Workload and support within the department seems highly inequitable. Faculty interactions are not necessarily collegial/respectful. Goals/responsibilities and the enactment of departmental guidelines and procedures could be better aligned.

I wish the College of Education would value teaching and service more and give credit towards tenure for teaching and service instead of research. We do more work in these two areas than any department on campus. We have too many state and national reports to complete that take hours of time to finish. We do not have enough time.

If the University aspires to be a research institution, it must do a better job of supporting faculty - the amount of staff support, the amount of financial support as in leaves faculty are able to take. Most importantly, the distribution of work across units; those in teacher education must write an inordinate number of reports every year and not to mention when NCATE is pending. How is all this taken into consideration?

In my experience as a graduate student and faculty member, my faculty colleagues at MSIT department here at GSU are among the best faculty that I have had the pleasure to work with.

The low score on software is perhaps a university issue for not providing free access to software for qualitative data management. We have access to software for quantitative data.

The MSIT Department is currently in its best shape and function over the past three years.

The MSIT department is far too large and some of the units should be split into separate departments.

The research goals for the department and faculty are very inspiring, and I applaud our unit for having such high expectations for their faculty. Unfortunately, the support from the top offices within COE and university for the MSIT department and faculty toward accomplishing such inspirational goals had decreased within the last 3 years. I recommend that the department work closely with these offices to improve the nature and intensity of support for faculty in the areas of research and service. To reduce clerical workloads and responsibilities for faculty and staff members the department must advocate for hiring more faculty and staff members.

The staff question was hard to answer because we have some excellent, very hard-working staff. However, there is a staff member who doesn't pull an equal share of the weight and we have had considerable turnover in the business manager position. Sometimes we give the appearance of shared decision making, but in reality the direction for degree programs comes from the Dean's office or the President's office, or the state Professional Standards Commission.

There seems to be a gap between clinical and tenure track faculty. Tenure track faculty appear to get more resources and support.

We need to look to other aspirant institutions to examine how they run teacher preparation programs (MAT, etc.). We are asking faculty to do too much with administrative issues regarding teacher preparation programs. An ADVISING CENTER makes sense with a staff person (M.Ed. or higher) in charge of running the programs. Other programs are fine for research faculty to "run" such as M.Ed., Ph.D. as there are far fewer administrative details and maintenance required.
Graduate Survey Comments

Advising

1. I've had some serious concerns with the advisement program, and the response time as far as grading is concerned on certain parts of our placement programs. Also, many of the methods courses duplicate lesson units, especially inquiry.

2. I have not developed relationships with my instructors since Dr. ___ left. I would love to have a mentor. I went for a year without an advisor. This area needs improvement.

3. The department as a whole needs to be more organized. As a first time grad student I never received the orientation I was promised, so I spent a lot of my first semester confused as to what was expected of me. Also, more talk w/ the History Dept.

4. The career support and advisement is sorely lacking, particularly in this difficult job environment. Several professors I have had have been obviously unprepared for the day's lesson, or have requirements that are little more than busy work.

5. I think there needs to be more clarification about which courses to take at certain times during the program of study in order to gain certification when completing the program. Many courses are only offered at certain times during the school year.

6. Need more clarity on graduation requirements from the beginning and a closer relationship with advisors.

7. There is not a high level of communication with respect to degree requirements. Advisement meetings are uninformative and not prepared in advance, and 'concrete' requirements change often. We were informed of our second required portfolio only this semester.

8. A bit more guidance upon entrance into the program would have been nice. For example, a required or even suggested meeting with an advisor would have answered many questions that were unanswered until PAWS.

9. There should be more help in giving information about financial aid.

10. Some classes should be pre-requisites to others. There were several times that I found myself taking one class that should have prepared me for a second one in the wrong order.
When I was trying to determine a way to do a career switch into Education (before I had even applied to GSU), Dr. ___ was extremely helpful and kind. She answered all questions and was happy to spend an hour with me. That meant a lot.

Throughout my participation in this program, I have received conflicting information from faculty in regards to academic and career advisement. In addition, practicum I requirements varied from student to student in the program.

As a graduate student in the School of Music at GSU, I was confused as to why I was listed under the Middle School Instructional Technology area in the College of Education. There are not many courses that I am required to take, but there are some course.

Communication, Professionalism, and Clear Requirements are something that is a very strong area of opportunity or weakness.

Learning, in my 2nd semester that I would need to have all courses required for certification done before summer semester was disappointing. As a result of this, I am overloading while student teaching and have only two courses to take during the summer.

I believe the degree requirements and check-off list should be better laid out and easier to understand.

My only issue is the confusion regarding the requirements for the program. I received several different answers from different people while graduation was at stake. Unacceptable at this level of education. Especially when I'm the one paying.

Degree requirements are confusing.

I am concerned about changing guidelines or requirements such as pre-qual and 4th comp question - the program is difficult enough without other things added to an already loaded program - we do have plenty to do without adding in more; more is not rigor.

Teaching & Learning Environment

1. I wish that there was an opportunity to take more challenging courses in the program. The required content courses are almost painfully easy, though I understand that is the content taught in the middle grades.
2. The graduate portfolio was insufficiently explained on the MSIT website and was not mentioned in the first course I took in the department. It was not until my third course that I had a full understanding and that was thanks to Dr. __

3. Courses have good content, but are definitely not geared toward being able to actually apply that information.

4. There needs to be courses that deal with classroom management and discipline. That is the concept most of us struggle with. And the classes aren't hard...they just require a lot of tedious and often unnecessary shorter pieces of work.

5. The introductory to teaching course (EDCI 6600) needs to address a lot more practical concerns that will come up when you are a teacher, like how to deal with absent students.

**Practicum Field placement and related**

1. It is sometimes very hard to get in contact with supervisors for student teaching, particularly those who are graduate students. While I value and understand their use and limitations, they do not necessarily provide the feedback necessary.

2. Changes to lesson plan format during middle of '09 practicum—not starting from the point of chg, students required to revise EVERY L.P. previously submitted. Many multi-cultural classes = redundant. Prof = good. Poor communication b/t s.teaching schools

3. Practicum III is too long, especially when coupled with the TWS. It's overkill, and the longer it goes on (and the TWS assignments) get to the point where they are no longer truly helpful. Shorter practicum and a reflection class would be better.

4. I learned the most during my student teaching. I believe we would get even more from that experience if the amount of assignments were lowered during practicum. Many of the assignments felt more like busy work rather than authentic testing.

5. Practicum II needs to be revised so that students all have adequate mentor teachers and advisors who are grading student teachers according to the same rubric or set of expectations. Some GSU advisors are inadequate and not offering helpful instruction.

6. The Teacher Work Sample is not a very helpful tool for our career training and development, and it takes too much time away from our actual teaching
The field placement department and the academic teachers are not in the same alignment. There were several instances when there were obvious miscommunications amongst staff. Also field placement is not doing a quality job placing students.

Course Offerings

1 Frequency of offerings for PhD needs help. I believe many motivated lose motivation when a year goes by and you are only able to take 1 or two classes because of the low offerings. Also most offerings seem to cater more to Master level students

2 Thirty students in a class is not appropriate for graduate school. Also some courses are offered too infrequently (every other year). Some courses overlap in content. Some courses provide academic development, while others are busywork.

3 Offer more of the required courses in the summer. Do not assign busywork.

4 Because there is usually a small number of graduate students in an area, it is not fair to those students to cancel courses due to low enrollment. It compounds the problem of not offering courses very frequently.

5 Cancelling classes due to 'low enrollment’ has put me back 2 semesters from graduating. Some classes need to be offered more frequently and if they are required ALLOW them to be served if 'only' 7 people need it.

6 Offer all of the course year round, because having some of the course only offered during certain times of the year, makes it harder for full time teachers.

Recommendations

1 There should be more content-based courses & classes that offer more in terms of unit/lesson planning

2 As a middle school teacher, I would like to see a course focusing on world issues for social studies and a course on teaching grammar. I believe the children and adolescent lit. course I took was too singularly focused on multicultural literature.
3 TEEMS ESOL should be a 2-year program for both instructors and students' sake. Need to incorporate live coaching into practicum. Need different methods instructor. Need behavior management class, full class on assessment. Human Learning awesome class.

4 Suggestion: 1 of the required English core courses should be a composition course -- Composition Theory is an especially good course

6 I expected more on-line courses.

Library Media
1 my responses are based on the MLM program - even thought its going away the excellence is still there.

2 I am so dissapointed that the MLS degree will not longer be offered. I think Dr. ___ is an exemplary professor, and I was strongly considering earning my speicalists degree or doctorate at Georgia State just to be under Dr. ___.

3 I am very disappointed in losing the LMT department. My LMT teachers were great but I get the feeling the MSIT department as a whole is not very student-centered.

Positive Comments

Class sizes are sometimes a bit large (especially for the locations they are offered in - the 6th floor room in COE is quite small for 32 students). That said, all of the professors have been incredibly welcoming and the advisement is very useful.

4 My experience in MSIT has been wonderful, but that is due to specific faculty that I have worked with. I know of many other students who have had horrible experiences and do not think that I could remain in MSIT if I were in a different unit.

5 The faculty is simply outstanding. They have done an excellent job selecting members representing a variety of specializations and theoretical viewpoints while maintaining a cohesive 'fit' in terms of personalities and dedication to teaching and research.

6 I am please with my experience thus far in ALL aspects of the graduate study. However, I have only been enrolled since January 2011.
The department's greatest resource is the diverse, supportive faculty. In my experience, they always know an answer or where to find it.
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DEPARTMENT OF MIDDLE-SECONDARY EDUCATION
AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY

GRADUATE ALUMNI SURVEY COMMENTS
April 2011

The following statements are in response to the comment section in the online survey. All responses are exported directly into a Word document without any changes to wording, punctuation, or grammar. Please note that each paragraph represents one individual respondent's comment.

If you wish to make any comments or suggestions concerning the Department of Middle-Secondary Education & Instructional Technology, please use the space provided.

A mentoring environment needs to be developed between advisement faculty and the students. One on one advisement sessions should be required for every semester of attendance. Graduating semester - in house resume writing & mock interviews should be offered.

Absolutely not one staff member informed us that we had to take specific GACE II tests, so many of us took certain GACE II tests and then applied for the certificates, only to be told that we had wasted time and money on the wrong ones. MSIT owes us!

Although I spent many years at GSU (undergrad, masters and specialist in your department) I never felt valued as a student. I would like to eventually earn a doctoral degree but I would never consider returning to GSU for my PhD.

Both the masters and specialists in library media were great. I would advise professors to evaluate current practices in local schools and see what is REALLY needed and include it in part of the instruction.

Dr. __ headed the program that I was in. The ball was dropped with students having a math/science focus. There was no advisement for courses and no response to student teaching concerns. I was very impressed with the faculty outside of math/science.

Excellent Faculty - Excellent administrative and support staff - front receptionist is amazingly pleasant and thoughtful,
For Masters LMT degrees, be helpful to have a session on applying for creditals from the state; possibly have details on website or receive packet to complete. I never knew I had to apply for accreditation b/c I have never been a teacher but completed.

Great program. I could not have done an M.A.T. if it had been any longer. It was perfect in length and prepared me well for my new teaching career.

I did not enjoy my time in the department of education at all. My advisor rarely responded to my emails and when she did she never had the information I needed. There was constant confusion among my cohort in the TEEMS-ESOL program about EVERYTHING.

I enjoyed the classes I took during my course of study, however the availability of classes really limited me

I feel the expectations of the graduate portfolio required for graduation were explained poorly. When I asked my advisor questions, I was not given much help. When I asked to see an example, I was told my class was creating the examples.

I found the following professors to be especially competent and helpful: Dr. ___, Dr. ___, Dr. ___ and Dr. ____.

I had the worst professors I have ever had in nine years of college / graduate school. This institution needs to find professors who understand the modern education field. I would never recommend anyone going to GSU for an MEd.

I personally had trouble with some of the support services for graduate students. That is, I had trouble with the office of graduate assistance. It was often hard to find out due dates, locate forms, get responses to questions etc.

I really enjoyed my experience--partly due to Dr. ___. My only comment would be to make sure there are people in place who are just as seasoned as her--and Dr. ____ of course. She was honest and fair.

I still am bothered that the department did NOTHING and took NO RESPONSIBILITY to help our class find jobs.

I think a course on cognition and learning would be helpful and more information about differentiation of instruction and inclusion.

I went through the MCE program 2 years ago and had some of the best and worst professors of my life at GSU, so it is hard to evaluate. The NSCI classes were excellent!!!

I wish I had a job. Maybe, once we graduate we could get advisement in the area for what jobs are available or a clue about how to make ourselves stand out.

It is an honor to complete this survey, especially since my experience within the MSIT program cultivated my teaching abilities. I visited the COE MSIT floor last week and saw renovations and upgrades that make me want to return. Kudos!
It seemed to me that all my professors, except Dr. ____, were examples of how not to teach rather than examples of how to teach. The classes I speak were Science Education specific. These were not explicit, organized or focused.

My experience in the program was fantastic!

My graduate school experience was both challenging and beneficial to me as a teacher. Top notch professors and courses.

Near the end of my EdS program classes were cancelled and alternate non major courses were required.

PLEASE (I CAN'T STRESS THIS ENOUGH) INCORPORATE A CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT COURSE IN THE PROGRAM-NOT JUST IN A COURSE BUT IT NEEDS TO BE A COURSE ITSELF! SUPERVISORS NEED TO HAVE TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN A K-12 CLASSROOM BEFORE THEY CAN EVALUATE STUDENT TEACHER

The course of Methods of Research should be required during the 1st semester. I took it the last semester of my degree and it was irrelevant by then.

The only suggestion I would make is more emphasis on student discipline.

The portfolio process in our program (RLL) was ridiculous. It was the most disorganized mess I've had to deal with in years. It is hands down the biggest reason I didn't stick with GSU for my doctorate program.

This was the most awful educational experience I have ever had. Expectations were not clear, the program changed totally midway in the program, faculty would not respond in a timely manner, everything was last minute, more a cult of personality.

Wish more connections could've been made for outgoing alumni in the field. Little job opportunities available for the 30+ students coming out each semester. Only know of a handful of classmates in my cohort that got jobs after graduation.
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April 2011
The following statements are in response to the comment section in the online survey. All responses are exported directly into a Word document without any changes to wording, punctuation, or grammar. Please note that each paragraph represents one individual respondent's comment.

Still confused on what is needed before application. Seems like it changes every semester 3's because of identifiers at each end of spectrum. Program change 3 times in 3 mos.? Who knows what, where, how?
Dr. ____ is Superwoman. Give her a raise!
the academic advisory dept. is not very good
I think that I’d feel more prepared for teaching if I got more time in schools. Maybe a 2 semester practicum before student teaching. And a classroom management class would be great.
We need to be better prepared for real life school situations instead of the blue-sky theories and ideas. Although they are great in a perfect world, that is not where we are at. Faculty that have actually taught at urban public schools.

App. D6: Undergraduate and Graduate Advisement procedures
In all MSIT program, we meet on campus or virtually online for an advisement session with our students. These sessions are held during a specific week in the fall semester and again in the spring semester (titled Professional Advisement Week or PAW). Typically, these are group advising sessions where students check in on their progress, finalize programs of study, advisers determine if there are courses that should be changed on the projected schedule to meet the needs of students, and requirements for progression to completion of the degree are discussed. These sessions sometimes devote time to work sessions where students and advisers examine portfolio requirements and progress.
In addition to PAW, advisers meet with student on an as-needed basis. Email communication and course announcement often facilitate this process.

App. D7: 2009-2010 GACE Reports
Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE)
ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE
Program Completers For: 2009-2010
Institution: 419 Georgia State University

ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST

Test: 015 Middle Grades Social Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Approximately Number of Selected-Response Questions</th>
<th>Approximately Number of Constructed-Response Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 U.S. History</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 World Regions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Georgia Studies &amp; Social Science Skills</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Average Performance Index by ----- Test Section and Subarea(e) ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree Code(f)</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>MAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
<th>Number Selected(Response(d))</th>
<th>Number Constructed(Response(d))</th>
<th>Mean Score(e)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mode of Delivery (g)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
<th>Statewide (h)</th>
<th>Average Percent Correct (i)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institution Statewide (h) SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide(h)</th>
<th>SUBAREA 1: U.S. HISTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0001 Understand Native American cultures and the European settlement of North America.
0002 Understand the causes, events, and outcomes of the American Revolution and the development of the U.S. Constitution.
0003 Understand the growth, development, and expansion of the United States from 1800 through the Civil War.
0004 Understand the growth and transformation of U.S. society from Reconstruction through the 1920s.
0005 Understand the experience of the Great Depression and U.S. involvement in World War II.
0006 Understand the emergence of the Cold War and the political, economic, and cultural developments in the United States from 1945 to the present.
0007 Understand major historical, social, political, and economic developments in Latin America and the geographic factors influencing them.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS CONFIDENTIAL AND MUST NOT BE DISCLOSED TO UNAUTHORIZED PERSONS. APPROPRIATE SAFEGUARDS MUST BE IMPLEMENTED BY ALL PERSONNEL TO PROTECT AGAINST IMPROPER DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION. THE ACCOMPANYING NOTES ARE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THIS DOCUMENT. Page 25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Percent Correct(i)</th>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:
(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test(s) at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.
(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.
(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."
(d) "Mean Scaled Score" is the average of the total test scores for the program completers included in "Number Tested." Total test scores for the GACE are reported on a scale of 100 to 300 with the passing score equal to a scaled score of 220.
(e) "Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea" is the average of the program completers' performance index for that subarea and question type (selected-response or constructed-response), reported on a scale of 1-4 (see Reporting Elements above).
(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.
(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.
(h) "Statewide" indicates data for program completers from all Georgia teacher education programs.
(i) "Average Percent Correct" for subareas and objectives indicates the average percent of selected-response questions answered correctly within the subarea or objective by all program completers included in "Number Tested." This average percent is based only on questions that contribute to candidate scores. Results are provided for the institution and statewide.
Site Code: 4191 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

ANNUAL RESULTS BY ASSESSMENT

Middle Grades Social Science (Test 015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test 015 M Social S</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Tests Within Assessment(h) 20 20 100%

Notes:

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(j) The GACE assessments are composed of one to three tests (e.g., the Basic Skills Assessment is composed of three tests, most Content Assessments are composed of two tests, the Middle Grades Assessments are composed of a single test). "Number Tested" for "All Tests Within Assessment" is the number of program completers who took all the tests within the assessment and passed all the tests within the assessment.
### ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE

**Program Completers For: 2009-2010**

**Institution:** 419 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

### Test: 020 English Test I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Selected-Response Questions</th>
<th>Number of Constructed-Response Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Comprehension of Literary &amp; Info. Texts</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Reading Skills and Strategies</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Average Performance Index by -----

**Test Section and Subarea(e)** ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Scaled Number(A)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Selected Number(B)</th>
<th>Percent Scaled Number(B)</th>
<th>Response Score(d) 1 2</th>
<th>Response Score(e) 1 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mode of Delivery(g)**

| Traditional | 23               | 22               | 96%                        | 249  | 3.3                | 3.5                      | 2.7                    | 2.8                    |
| Online      | 0                | 0                | ---                        | ---  | ---                | ---                      | ---                    | ---                    |
| Hybrid      | 0                | 0                | ---                        | ---  | ---                | ---                      | ---                    | ---                    |

**Statewide (h)**

| 325 | 317 | 98% | 243 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 2.8 |

### Average Percent Correct(i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide(h)</th>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>SUBAREA 1: COMPREHENSION OF LITERARY &amp; INFO. TEXTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0001 Understand various genres (i.e., prose, poetry, and drama) and identify the use and purpose of literary elements, themes, styles, and structures in works of literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0002 Understand the purposes, structures, elements, and meanings of U.S. prose, poetry, and drama of different movements and periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0003 Understand the purposes, structures, elements, and meanings of British and Commonwealth prose, poetry, and drama of different movements and periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0004 Understand the purposes, structures, elements, and meanings of world prose, poetry, and drama of different movements and periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0005 Understand the purposes, structures, elements, and meanings of informational and technical texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>SUBAREA 2: READING SKILLS AND STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0006 understand strategies for the comprehension and interpretation of texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0007 Understand strategies for the critical analysis and evaluation of texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent Correct(i)</td>
<td>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Statewide(h)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0008 Understand skills for effective reading across the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test(s) at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(d) "Mean Scaled Score" is the average of the total test scores for the program completers included in "Number Tested." Total test scores for the GACE are reported on a scale of 100 to 300 with the passing score equal to a scaled score of 220.

(e) "Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea" is the average of the program completers' performance index for that subarea and question type (selected-response or constructed-response), reported on a scale of 1-4 (see Reporting Elements above).

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(h) "Statewide" indicates data for program completers from all Georgia teacher education programs.

(i) "Average Percent Correct" for subareas and objectives indicates the average percent of selected-response questions answered correctly within the subarea or objective by all program completers included in "Number Tested." This average percent is based only on questions that contribute to candidate scores. Results are provided for the institution and statewide.
Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE)
ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE

Program Completers For: 2009-2010
Institution: 419 Georgia State University

Site Code: 4191 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST

Test: 021 English Test II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Selected-Response Questions</th>
<th>Number of Constructed-Response Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Writing Conventions &amp; Writing Process</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Writing for Various Purposes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oral and Visual Communications</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea

### Average Percent Correct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>SUBAREA 1: WRITING CONVENTIONS &amp; WRITING PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0009 Understand the conventions of Standard American English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0010 Understand writing as a process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0011 Understand the use of research and technology in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>SUBAREA 2: WRITING FOR VARIOUS PURPOSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0012 Understand techniques for developing organized, focused narrative writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0013 Understand techniques for developing organized, focused expository or technical writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>SUBAREA 3: ORAL AND VISUAL COMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0016 Understand principles and techniques for preparing and delivering oral and visual communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0017 Understand techniques for developing organized, focused persuasive writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0016 Understand techniques for developing organized, focused persuasive writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS CONFIDENTIAL AND MUST NOT BE DISCLOSED TO UNAUTHORIZED PERSONS.
APPROPRIATE SAFEGUARDS MUST BE IMPLEMENTED BY ALL PERSONNEL TO PROTECT AGAINST IMPROPER DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION. THE ACCOMPANYING NOTES ARE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THIS DOCUMENT.
ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST
Test: 021 English Test II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide(h)</th>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0017 Understand techniques for the critical analysis of oral and visual messages delivered through various media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test(s) at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.
(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.
(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."
(d) "Mean Scaled Score" is the average of the total test scores for the program completers included in "Number Tested." Total test scores for the GACE are reported on a scale of 100 to 300 with the passing score equal to a scaled score of 220.
(e) "Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea" is the average of the program completers' performance index for that subarea and question type (selected-response or constructed-response), reported on a scale of 1-4 (see Reporting Elements above).
(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.
(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.
(h) "Statewide" indicates data for program completers from all Georgia teacher education programs.
(i) "Average Percent Correct" for subareas and objectives indicates the average percent of selected-response questions answered correctly within the subarea or objective by all program completers included in "Number Tested." This average percent is based only on questions that contribute to candidate scores. Results are provided for the institution and statewide.
ANNUAL RESULTS BY ASSESSMENT

English (Tests 020,021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test 020 English I</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test 021 English II</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Tests Within Assessment(h)</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(j) The GACE assessments are composed of one to three tests (e.g., the Basic Skills Assessment is composed of three tests, most Content Assessments are composed of two tests, the Middle Grades Assessments are composed of a single test). "Number Tested" for "All Tests Within Assessment" is the number of program completers who took all the tests within the assessment and passed all the tests within the assessment.
## ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE

### Program Completers For: 2009-2010

**Institution:** 419 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

### ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST

#### Test: 022 Mathematics Test I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Selected-Response Questions</th>
<th>Number of Constructed-Response Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Number Concepts and Operations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Algebra</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Precalculus and Calculus</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea And Objective</th>
<th>% Passed</th>
<th>Scaled Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBAREA 1: NUMBER CONCEPTS AND OPERATIONS</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>3.5, 3.5, 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBAREA 2: ALGEBRA</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>3.5, 3.5, 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBAREA 3: PRECALCULUS AND CALCULUS</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>3.5, 3.5, 3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Average Percent Correct:**

| Institution | 86 | 79 |

---

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS CONFIDENTIAL AND MUST NOT BE DISCLOSED TO UNAUTHORIZED PERSONS. APPROPRIATE SAFEGUARDS MUST BE IMPLEMENTED BY ALL PERSONNEL TO PROTECT AGAINST IMPROPER DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION. THE ACCOMPANYING NOTES ARE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THIS DOCUMENT.
Notes:

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test(s) at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(d) "Mean Scaled Score" is the average of the total test scores for the program completers included in "Number Tested." Total test scores for the GACE are reported on a scale of 100 to 300 with the passing score equal to a scaled score of 220.

(e) "Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea" is the average of the program completers' performance index for that subarea and question type (selected-response or constructed-response), reported on a scale of 1-4 (see Reporting Elements above).

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(h) "Statewide" indicates data for program completers from all Georgia teacher education programs.

(i) "Average Percent Correct" for subareas and objectives indicates the average percent of selected-response questions answered correctly within the subarea or objective by all program completers included in "Number Tested." This average percent is based only on questions that contribute to candidate scores. Results are provided for the institution and statewide.
## ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST

**Test: 023 Mathematics Test II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Selected-Response Questions</th>
<th>Number of Constructed-Response Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Geometry and Measurement</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Data Analysis and Probability</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mathematical Processes and Perspectives</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide(h)</th>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>SUBAREA 1: GEOMETRY AND MEASUREMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0009 Understand the principles of measurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0010 Understand principles of Euclidean geometry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0011 Understand coordinate and transformational geometry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>SUBAREA 2: DATA ANALYSIS AND PROBABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0012 Understand methods of collecting, organizing, and describing data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0013 Understand the theory and applications of probability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0014 Understand the process of analyzing and interpreting data to make statistical inferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>SUBAREA 3: MATHEMATICAL PROCESSES AND PERSPECTIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0015 Understand how to use a variety of representations to communicate mathematical ideas and concepts and connections between them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0016 Understand mathematical reasoning, the construction of mathematical arguments, and problem-solving strategies in mathematics and other contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:
(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test(s) at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.
(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.
(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."
(d) "Mean Scaled Score" is the average of the total test scores for the program completers included in "Number Tested." Total test scores for the GACE are reported on a scale of 100 to 300 with the passing score equal to a scaled score of 220.
(e) "Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea" is the average of the program completers' performance index for that subarea and question type (selected-response or constructed-response), reported on a scale of 1-4 (see Reporting Elements above).
(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.
(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.
(h) "Statewide" indicates data for program completers from all Georgia teacher education programs.
(i) "Average Percent Correct" for subareas and objectives indicates the average percent of selected-response questions answered correctly within the subarea or objective by all program completers included in "Number Tested." This average percent is based only on questions that contribute to candidate scores. Results are provided for the institution and statewide.
ANNUAL RESULTS BY ASSESSMENT

Mathematics (Tests 022, 023)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Number Tested</th>
<th>Number Passed</th>
<th>Percent Passing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test 022 Math I</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test 023 Math II</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Tests Within Assessment(h)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(j) The GACE assessments are composed of one to three tests (e.g., the Basic Skills Assessment is composed of three tests, most Content Assessments are composed of two tests, the Middle Grades Assessments are composed of a single test). "Number Tested" for "All Tests Within Assessment" is the number of program completers who took all the tests within the assessment and passed all the tests within the assessment.
Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE)
ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE

Program Completers For: 2009-2010
Institution: 419 Georgia State University

Site Code: 4191 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST

Test: 024 Science Test I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Selected-Response Questions</th>
<th>Number of Constructed-Response Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Earth Science</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Life Science</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea(e)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Section</th>
<th>Selected Response</th>
<th>Constructed Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
<th>Scaled Score(d)</th>
<th>Mean Response 1</th>
<th>Mean Response 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3.3 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT Bachelor's</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3.2 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>3.0 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mode of Delivery(g)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Delivery</th>
<th>Test Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
<th>Scaled Score(d)</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3.4 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>3.0 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide (h)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>3.0 3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Percent Correct(i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide(h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea 1: Earth Science</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>Understand current scientific views of the universe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0002</td>
<td>Understand the characteristics and distribution of water and its role in earth processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0003</td>
<td>Understand characteristics of the atmosphere and climate and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0004</td>
<td>Understand characteristics of the earth and processes that have shaped its surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0005</td>
<td>Understand the earth's natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 2: Life Science</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0006</td>
<td>Understand the diversity of living organisms and their classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007</td>
<td>Understand the structure and function of living systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008</td>
<td>Understand the principles and processes of the inheritance of biological traits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009</td>
<td>Understand the dependence of organisms on one another and understand the flow of energy and matter in ecosystems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Code: 4191 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST
Test: 024 Science Test I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Percent Correct(i)</th>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Statewide(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0010 Understand the theory of evolution and the role of natural selection.

Notes:
(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test(s) at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.
(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.
(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."
(d) "Mean Scaled Score" is the average of the total test scores for the program completers included in "Number Tested." Total test scores for the GACE are reported on a scale of 100 to 300 with the passing score equal to a scaled score of 220.
(e) "Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea" is the average of the program completers' performance index for that subarea and question type (selected-response or constructed-response), reported on a scale of 1-4 (see Reporting Elements above).
(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.
(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.
(h) "Statewide" indicates data for program completers from all Georgia teacher education programs.
(i) "Average Percent Correct" for subareas and objectives indicates the average percent of selected-response questions answered correctly within the subarea or objective by all program completers included in "Number Tested." This average percent is based only on questions that contribute to candidate scores. Results are provided for the institution and statewide.
ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE

Program Completers For: 2009-2010
Institution: 419 Georgia State University

Site Code: 4191 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST

Test: 025 Science Test II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Selected-Response Questions</th>
<th>Number of Constructed-Response Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Physical Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Characteristics of Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea(e) ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Delivery(g)</th>
<th>Average Percent Correct(i)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Institution  Statewide(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>19 95 97% 237 2.9 3.5 1.9 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0 0 - - - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>2 2 100% 246 3.5 3.5 2.0 1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS CONFIDENTIAL AND MUST NOT BE DISCLOSED TO UNAUTHORIZED PERSONS. APPROPRIATE SAFEGUARDS MUST BE IMPLEMENTED BY ALL PERSONNEL TO PROTECT AGAINST IMPROPER DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION. THE ACCOMPANYING NOTES ARE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THIS DOCUMENT.
Notes:

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test(s) at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(d) "Mean Scaled Score" is the average of the total test scores for the program completers included in "Number Tested." Total test scores for the GACE are reported on a scale of 100 to 300 with the passing score equal to a scaled score of 220.

(e) "Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea" is the average of the program completers' performance index for that subarea and question type (selected-response or constructed-response), reported on a scale of 1-4 (see Reporting Elements above).

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(h) "Statewide" indicates data for program completers from all Georgia teacher education programs.

(i) "Average Percent Correct" for subareas and objectives indicates the average percent of selected-response questions answered correctly within the subarea or objective by all program completers included in "Number Tested." This average percent is based only on questions that contribute to candidate scores. Results are provided for the institution and statewide.
ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE

Program Completers For: 2009-2010
Institution: 419 Georgia State University

Site Code: 4191 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

ANNUAL RESULTS BY ASSESSMENT

Science (Tests 024,025)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test 024: Science I</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test 025: Science II</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Tests Within Assessment(h)</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(j) The GACE assessments are composed of one to three tests (e.g., the Basic Skills Assessment is composed of three tests, most Content Assessments are composed of two tests, the Middle Grades Assessments are composed of a single test). "Number Tested" for "All Tests Within Assessment" is the number of program completers who took all the tests within the assessment and passed all the tests within the assessment.
Test: 119 English to Speakers of Other Languages Test I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Selected-Response Questions</th>
<th>Number of Constructed-Response Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Language and Language Acquisition</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ESOL Cultural &amp; Prof. Environments</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
<th>Mean Score(d)</th>
<th>Selected-Response 1</th>
<th>Constructed-Response 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Percent Correct:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>1: LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION</th>
<th>2: ESOL CULTURAL &amp; PROF. ENVIRONMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0001 Understand the nature of language and language varieties and ways to apply knowledge of these concepts in the classroom.

0002 Understand the phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and discourse of the English language as related to the development of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and viewing for social and academic purposes.

0003 Understand first- and second-language acquisition.

0004 Understand cognitive, affective, sociocultural, and other variables that affect second-language learning and how to apply this knowledge to facilitate the process of learning English as a new language.

0005 Understand major concepts, principal theories, and research related to the nature of culture, sociocultural systems, and the role of culture in language development and learning.
### Test: 119 English to Speakers of Other Languages Test I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide(h)</th>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0006 Understand characteristic features of cultures, the effect of ELL students' cultural identities on language development and learning, and teaching strategies that are sensitive to the needs of ELL students from diverse cultural groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0007 Understand the historical and research foundations of ESOL programs and current educational trends, issues, policies, and professional practices in ESOL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0008 Understand how to serve as a resource liaison and advocate for ELL students and how to build effective partnerships with families and the community to support student learning and achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test(s) at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(d) "Mean Scaled Score" is the average of the total test scores for the program completers included in "Number Tested." Total test scores for the GACE are reported on a scale of 100 to 300 with the passing score equal to a scaled score of 220.

(e) "Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea" is the average of the program completers' performance index for that subarea and question type (selected-response or constructed-response), reported on a scale of 1-4 (see Reporting Elements above).

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(h) "Statewide" indicates data for program completers from all Georgia teacher education programs.

(i) "Average Percent Correct" for subareas and objectives indicates the average percent of selected-response questions answered correctly within the subarea or objective by all program completers included in "Number Tested." This average percent is based only on questions that contribute to candidate scores. Results are provided for the institution and statewide.
Test: 120 English to Speakers of Other Languages Test II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Selected-Response Questions</th>
<th>Number of Constructed-Response Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ESOL Plan., Implementation, &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ESOL Instruction</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea(e) ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passed(c)</th>
<th>Scaled Score(d)</th>
<th>Response 1</th>
<th>Response 2</th>
<th>Selected Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mode of Delivery(g)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passed(c)</th>
<th>Scaled Score(d)</th>
<th>Response 1</th>
<th>Response 2</th>
<th>Selected Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statewide (h)

| Institution      | 28               | 27               | 96%              | 254             | 3.3        | 3.4        | 3.1              |

Average Percent Correct(i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide(h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBAREA 1: ESOL PLAN., IMPLEMENTATION, &amp; ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009 Understand standards-based ESOL curriculum planning and implementation.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010 Understand how to locate, develop, adapt, and use resources effectively in ESOL instruction, including technological resources.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011 Understand current concepts, trends, issues, policies, and practices related to assessing ELL students, including different types of assessments used in ESOL programs and their purposes, uses, and limitations.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012 Understand how to select and use multiple assessment strategies, techniques, and instruments, including analyzing and interpreting assessment results to inform, evaluate, and modify instruction for ELL students.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBAREA 2: ESOL INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013 Understand current trends, issues, and research-based practices related to promoting ELL students' oral language development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST

#### Test: 120 English to Speakers of Other Languages Test II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Percent Correct(i)</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide(h)</th>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0014</td>
<td>Understand foundations of literacy development in ESOL, including current trends, issues, policies, and research-based practices related to ESOL instruction in literacy development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0015</td>
<td>Understand approaches, methods, and strategies for promoting ELL students' literacy development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0016</td>
<td>Understand current trends, issues, and research-based practices related to promoting ELL students' content-area knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test(s) at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(d) "Mean Scaled Score" is the average of the total test scores for the program completers included in "Number Tested." Total test scores for the GACE are reported on a scale of 100 to 300 with the passing score equal to a scaled score of 220.

(e) "Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea” is the average of the program completers' performance index for that subarea and question type (selected-response or constructed-response), reported on a scale of 1-4 (see Reporting Elements above).

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(h) "Statewide" indicates data for program completers from all Georgia teacher education programs.

(i) "Average Percent Correct" for subareas and objectives indicates the average percent of selected-response questions answered correctly within the subarea or objective by all program completers included in "Number Tested." This average percent is based only on questions that contribute to candidate scores. Results are provided for the institution and statewide.
### English to Speakers of Other Languages (Tests 119,120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test 119 ESOL I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test 120 ESOL II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Tests Within Assessment(h)</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(j) The GACE assessments are composed of one to three tests (e.g., the Basic Skills Assessment is composed of three tests, most Content Assessments are composed of two tests, the Middle Grades Assessments are composed of a single test). "Number Tested" for "All Tests Within Assessment" is the number of program completers who took all the tests within the assessment and passed all the tests within the assessment.
# Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE)

## ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE

**Program Completers For: 2009-2010**

**Institution:** 419 Georgia State University

**Site Code:** 419 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

## ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST

**Test: 011 Middle Grades Language Arts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Selected-Response Questions</th>
<th>Number of Constructed-Response Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Reading Literature &amp; Informational Texts</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Reading Across the Curriculum</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Writing Process, Purposes, &amp; Conventions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Listening, Speaking, and Viewing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea(e)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
<th>Number Scaled(d)</th>
<th>Number Response(1 2 3 4)</th>
<th>Mean Scaled(d)</th>
<th>Mean Response(1 2 3 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2.9 3.4 3.2 3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mode of Delivery(g)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Delivery</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
<th>Number Scaled(d)</th>
<th>Number Response(1 2 3 4)</th>
<th>Mean Scaled(d)</th>
<th>Mean Response(1 2 3 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2.9 3.3 3.3 3.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statewide (h)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Tested</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
<th>Number Scaled(d)</th>
<th>Number Response(1 2 3 4)</th>
<th>Mean Scaled(d)</th>
<th>Mean Response(1 2 3 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>345</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>2.9 3.2 3.2 3.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Percent Correct(i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide(h)</th>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>SUBAREA 1: READING LITERATURE &amp; INFORMATIONAL TEXTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0001 Understand the characteristics of various literary genres and forms of informational texts and their cultural and historical aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0002 Understand the structures and elements of literary works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0003 Understand the structures and elements of informational texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0004 Understand word identification strategies and methods for promoting vocabulary development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0005 Understand reading strategies used to construct meaning, aid comprehension, and increase fluency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>SUBAREA 2: READING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0006 Understand strategies for promoting students' independent reading in multiple subject areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0007 Understand reading for information in multiple subject areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS CONFIDENTIAL AND MUST NOT BE DISCLOSED TO UNAUTHORIZED PERSONS. APPROPRIATE SAFEGUARDS MUST BE IMPLEMENTED BY ALL PERSONNEL TO PROTECT AGAINST IMPROPER DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION. THE ACCOMPANYING NOTES ARE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THIS DOCUMENT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Percent Correct(i)</th>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Statewide(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test(s) at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(d) "Mean Scaled Score" is the average of the total test scores for the program completers included in "Number Tested." Total test scores for the GACE are reported on a scale of 100 to 300 with the passing score equal to a scaled score of 220.

(e) "Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea" is the average of the program completers' performance index for that subarea and question type (selected-response or constructed-response), reported on a scale of 1-4 (see Reporting Elements above).

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(h) "Statewide" indicates data for program completers from all Georgia teacher education programs.

(i) "Average Percent Correct" for subareas and objectives indicates the average percent of selected-response questions answered correctly within the subarea or objective by all program completers included in "Number Tested." This average percent is based only on questions that contribute to candidate scores. Results are provided for the institution and statewide.
**Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE)**  
**ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE**  
Program Completers For: 2009-2010  
Institution: 419 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

**Site Code:** 4191 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

**ANNUAL RESULTS BY ASSESSMENT**  
**Middle Grades Language Arts (Test 011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test 011 M LangArts</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Tests Within Assessment(h)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(j) The GACE assessments are composed of one to three tests (e.g., the Basic Skills Assessment is composed of three tests, most Content Assessments are composed of two tests, the Middle Grades Assessments are composed of a single test). "Number Tested" for "All Tests Within Assessment" is the number of program completers who took all the tests within the assessment and passed all the tests within the assessment.
Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE)

ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE

Program Completers For: 2009-2010
Institution: 419 Georgia State University

Site Code: 4191 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST

Test: 013 Middle Grades Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Selected-Response Questions</th>
<th>Number of Constructed-Response Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Numbers and Operations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Measurement and Geometry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Patterns, Algebra, and Functions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Data Analysis and Probability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mathematical Processes and Perspectives</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Average Performance Index by --- Test Section and Subarea(e) ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide(h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS CONFIDENTIAL AND MUST NOT BE DISCLOSED TO UNAUTHORIZED PERSONS. APPROPRIATE SAFEGUARDS MUST BE IMPLEMENTED BY ALL PERSONNEL TO PROTECT AGAINST IMPROPER DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION. THE ACCOMPANYING NOTES ARE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THIS DOCUMENT.
### ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST

**Test: 013 Middle Grades Mathematics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Percent Correct(i)</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide(h)</th>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0009</td>
<td>Understand linear functions and their applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBAREA 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND PROBABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0010</td>
<td>Understand the process of collecting, organizing, describing, analyzing, and interpreting data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0011</td>
<td>Understand the theory and applications of probability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBAREA 5: MATHEMATICAL PROCESSES AND PERSPECTIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0012</td>
<td>Understand how to use a variety of representations to communicate mathematical ideas and concepts and connections among them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0013</td>
<td>Understand mathematical reasoning, proof, and problem-solving strategies in mathematics and other contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test(s) at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(d) "Mean Scaled Score" is the average of the total test scores for the program completers included in "Number Tested." Total test scores for the GACE are reported on a scale of 100 to 300 with the passing score equal to a scaled score of 220.

(e) "Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea" is the average of the program completers' performance index for that subarea and question type (selected-response or constructed-response), reported on a scale of 1-4 (see Reporting Elements above).

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(h) "Statewide" indicates data for program completers from all Georgia teacher education programs.

(i) "Average Percent Correct" for subareas and objectives indicates the average percent of selected-response questions answered correctly within the subarea or objective by all program completers included in "Number Tested." This average percent is based only on questions that contribute to candidate scores. Results are provided for the institution and statewide.
Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE)
ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE
Program Completers For: 2009-2010
Institution: 419 Georgia State University

Site Code: 4191 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

ANNUAL RESULTS BY ASSESSMENT
Middle Grades Mathematics (Test 013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test 013 M Math</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Tests Within Assessment(h)</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Code(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Delivery(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.
(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.
(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."
(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.
(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.
(j) The GACE assessments are composed of one to three tests (e.g., the Basic Skills Assessment is composed of three tests, most Content Assessments are composed of two tests, the Middle Grades Assessments are composed of a single test). "Number Tested" for "All Tests Within Assessment" is the number of program completers who took all the tests within the assessment and passed all the tests within the assessment.
**Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE)**

**ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE**

Program Completers For: 2009-2010
Institution: 419 Georgia State University

**Site Code:** 4191 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

**ANNUAL RESULTS BY TEST**

**Test: 014 Middle Grades Science**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Selected-Response Questions</th>
<th>Number of Constructed-Response Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Earth Science</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Life Science</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Physical Science</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Characteristics of Science</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree Code(f)</th>
<th>MAT</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Mode of Delivery(g)</th>
<th>Average Percent Correct(i)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide (h)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Institution 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Passed(b)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Statewide 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Corrected</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Tested(a)</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Passed(b)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Scaled</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Response Score(d)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Response 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructed Response 3 4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>SUBAREA 1: EARTH SCIENCE</th>
<th>SUBAREA 2: LIFE SCIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0001 Understand current scientific views of the universe.</td>
<td>0002 Understand the characteristics and distribution of water and its role in the earth's processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0002 Understand the characteristics and distribution of water and its role in the earth's processes.</td>
<td>0006 Understand the diversity of living organisms and their classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0003 Understand characteristics of the atmosphere and of climate and weather.</td>
<td>0007 Understand the structure and function of living systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0004 Understand characteristics of the earth and processes that have shaped its surface.</td>
<td>0008 Understand the principles and processes of the inheritance of biological traits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0005 Understand the types and uses of the earth's natural resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>SUBAREA 2: LIFE SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0006 Understand the diversity of living organisms and their classification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0007 Understand the structure and function of living systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0008 Understand the principles and processes of the inheritance of biological traits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS CONFIDENTIAL AND MUST NOT BE DISCLOSED TO UNAUTHORIZED PERSONS. APPROPRIATE SAFEGUARDS MUST BE IMPLEMENTED BY ALL PERSONNEL TO PROTECT AGAINST IMPROPER DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION. THE ACCOMPANYING NOTES ARE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THIS DOCUMENT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Percent Correct(i)</th>
<th>SUBAREA AND OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Statewide(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test(s) at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.

(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.

(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."

(d) "Mean Scaled Score" is the average of the total test scores for the program completers included in "Number Tested." Total test scores for the GACE are reported on a scale of 100 to 300 with the passing score equal to a scaled score of 220.

(e) "Average Performance Index by Test Section and Subarea" is the average of the program completers' performance index for that subarea and question type (selected-response or constructed-response), reported on a scale of 1-4 (see Reporting Elements above).

(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.

(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

(h) "Statewide" indicates data for program completers from all Georgia teacher education programs.

(i) "Average Percent Correct" for subareas and objectives indicates the average percent of selected-response questions answered correctly within the subarea or objective by all program completers included in "Number Tested." This average percent is based only on questions that contribute to candidate scores. Results are provided for the institution and statewide.
Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE)
ANNUAL PROGRAM PROVIDER SUMMARY REPORT BY SITE

Program Completers For: 2009-2010
Institution: 419 Georgia State University

Site Code: 4191 Georgia State University - Atlanta Campus

ANNUAL RESULTS BY ASSESSMENT
Middle Grades Science (Test 014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Number</th>
<th>Number Tested(a)</th>
<th>Number Passed(b)</th>
<th>Percent Passing(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>014 M Sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Code(f)</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>MAT</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Mode of Delivery(g)</th>
<th>All Tests Within Assessment(h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(a) "Number Tested" is the number of program completers who took the test at any time since the implementation of the GACE on November 18, 2006 through August 31, 2010. For content area tests, this includes only program completers with a certification field appropriate for the test.
(b) "Number Passed" is the number of program completers included in "Number Tested" who passed the test.
(c) "Percent Passing" is "Number Passed" divided by "Number Tested."
(f) "Degree Code" indicates the type of degree or certificate received by the program completers.
(g) "Mode of Delivery" indicates the type of program completed and is defined as follows: Traditional is a program in which 50% or fewer courses are defined as hybrid or online. Hybrid is a program in which greater than 50% but less than 100% of courses are defined as online. Online is a program in which all courses are defined as online.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS CONFIDENTIAL AND MUST NOT BE DISCLOSED TO UNAUTHORIZED PERSONS. APPROPRIATE SAFEGUARDS MUST BE IMPLEMENTED BY ALL PERSONNEL TO PROTECT AGAINST IMPROPER DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION. THE ACCOMPANYING NOTES ARE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THIS DOCUMENT.
**E: Student Quality**

**App. E1: Student Output Quality- Job Placement**


Ph.D. in Instructional Technology (IT) and Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning (TLG)

Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology

*Dr. Dana L. Fox, Chair*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>Advisor</th>
<th>Position/Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Brown</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td>Dr. Christine Thomas</td>
<td>Teacher, Secondary Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paulding Co. High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paulding Co., GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayoung Choi</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy Education</td>
<td>Dr. Gertrude Tinker-Sachs</td>
<td>Director, Language for Business and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(and Adjunct Faculty Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Edwards</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td>Dr. Christine Thomas</td>
<td>Assistant Professor Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennesaw, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Fredricks</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy Education</td>
<td>Dr. Gertrude Tinker-Sachs</td>
<td>Assistant Professor MA Program in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TEFL/Applied Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>American University in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Cairo, Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Kinard</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Dr. Geeta Verma</td>
<td>Teacher, AP Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gwinnett School of Mathematics, Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duluth, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guolin Lai</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Brendan</td>
<td>Non Tenure-track Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Position/Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omer Ari</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy Education</td>
<td>Dr. Gertrude Tinker-Sachs</td>
<td>Clinical Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language and Literacy Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appalachian State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boone, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alda Blakeney</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy Education</td>
<td>Dr. Amy Seely Flint</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary and Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Placement of Ph.D. Graduates for 2009-2010
(Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)
Ph.D. in Instructional Technology (IT) and Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning (TLG)
Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology
Dr. Dana L. Fox, Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>PhD Mentor(s)</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Calder</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy Education</td>
<td>Dr. Dana L. Fox</td>
<td>English Teacher and Department Chair&lt;br&gt;Columbia High School&lt;br&gt;DeKalb County Schools&lt;br&gt;Tucker, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise P. Eskew Sparks</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>Dr. David Myers&lt;br&gt;Dr. Dana L. Fox</td>
<td>Director of Choral Activities&lt;br&gt;Agnes Scott College&lt;br&gt;Decatur, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Fisher</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy Education</td>
<td>Dr. Joyce Many</td>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor&lt;br&gt;Early Childhood Education&lt;br&gt;Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarida Hoy</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Dr. Geeta Verma</td>
<td>Biology and Forensic Science Teacher&lt;br&gt;Dalton High School&lt;br&gt;Dalton Public Schools&lt;br&gt;Dalton, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Jett</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td>Dr. David Stinson</td>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor&lt;br&gt;Middle Level Education&lt;br&gt;Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pecore</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Martin-Hansen</td>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor&lt;br&gt;Science Education&lt;br&gt;Temple University&lt;br&gt;Philadelphia, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Rashford</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Martin-Hansen</td>
<td>Alpharetta High School&lt;br&gt;Ninth-grade Biology and Gifted Education&lt;br&gt;2008 Siemens Science Teacher Award&lt;br&gt;2010 Hayden-Waltz Dissertation Award, GSU COE&lt;br&gt;Fulton County Schools&lt;br&gt;Alpharetta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Shildneck</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td>Dr. David Stinson</td>
<td>Chair, Mathematics Department&lt;br&gt;Carlton J. Kell High School&lt;br&gt;Cobb County Schools&lt;br&gt;Marietta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Snead</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>Dr. David Myers&lt;br&gt;Dr. Dana L. Fox</td>
<td>Assistant Professor&lt;br&gt;Music Education&lt;br&gt;University of Minnesota&lt;br&gt;Minneapolis, MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Position/Placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony B. Stinson</td>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Christine Thomas</td>
<td>Assistant Professor Department of Mathematics Clayton State University Morrow, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnie Tsang-Kosma</td>
<td>Instructional Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Mary Shoffner</td>
<td>Senior Associate Registrar Georgia State University Atlanta, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Price Webb</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Geeta Verma</td>
<td>Science Teacher Creekview High School Cherokee County Schools Canton, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly White-Fredette</td>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. David Stinson</td>
<td>School Improvement Specialist Mathematics Education Griffin Regional Educational Service Agency Griffin, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margo Williams</td>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Peggy Albers</td>
<td>English Language Learner Instruction Coach DeKalb County Schools Atlanta, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anissa Vega</td>
<td>Instructional Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Laurie Brantley-Dias</td>
<td>Assistant Professor Educational Technology Kennesaw State University Kennesaw, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher H. DeCastro</td>
<td>Mathematics Teacher</td>
<td>Dr. Christine Thomas</td>
<td>Duluth High School, Duluth, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Frederick</td>
<td>Language and Literacy Education</td>
<td>Dr. Peggy Albers</td>
<td>Early Intervention Specialist, Rockdale County Schools, Conyers, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrnelle Gregory-Bryan</td>
<td>Language and Literacy Education</td>
<td>Dr. Gertrude Tinker Sachs</td>
<td>Spanish Teacher, DeKalb County Schools, Stone Mountain, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David N. Hirschorn</td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>Dr. Patrick Freer</td>
<td>Director of Choral Music, Durham Middle School, Cobb County Schools, Acworth, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Burns Hurst</td>
<td>Language and Literacy Education</td>
<td>Dr. Mary Ariail</td>
<td>Reading Specialist, Atlanta Speech School, Atlanta, GA Part-time Instructor, Early Childhood Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn C. Jones</td>
<td>Social Studies Education</td>
<td>Dr. Chara Bohan</td>
<td>Shawn Jones, Social Studies Teacher, Eagle’s Landing High School, Henry County Schools, McDonough, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katharine Kurumada</td>
<td>Language and Literacy Education</td>
<td>Dr. Amy Seely Flint</td>
<td>Clinical Instructor; ESOL Coordinator, Early Childhood Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Virginia McDowell</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Dr. Geeta Verma</td>
<td>K-5 Science Endorsement, METRO RESA Science Teacher (6-8) and Department Chair, Fairplay Middle School, Douglas County Schools, Douglasville, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Allyn Parker</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Dr. Geeta Verma</td>
<td>Science Teacher and Team Leader, Renfroe Middle School, Decatur City Schools, Decatur, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
App. E2: Admission Requirements by Program

Admissions
All applicants must submit the following items and meet stated college minimum criteria:
1. Two transcripts from each college or university, domestic or overseas, from which they received a degree, or where they were enrolled in a degree program. This may include courses taken in non-degree status, in transient status, or in post-baccalaureate status and is regardless of whether or not the courses led to a degree or are listed on another institution’s transcript.
2. Applicants must hold an undergraduate degree from a regionally accredited college or university with a major in or with coursework that meets prerequisites for the planned graduate field of study.
   a. Applicants must have earned a grade point average of no less than 2.50 calculated on all undergraduate work attempted in which letter grades were awarded. Individual programs may have a higher standard.
   b. Applicants for the Specialist in Education (Ed.S.) programs must have a grade point average of no less than 3.25 on all graduate coursework for which letter grades were awarded.
   c. Applicants for the Doctorate of Philosophy (Ph.D.) programs must have a grade point average of no less than 3.30 on all graduate coursework for which letter grades were awarded.
3. Copies of scores on the General Test of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE). Test scores must be from an examination taken within the last five years prior to the term of admission of the program. In addition to these copies, the applicant must have records of the scores directed specifically to Georgia State University from their testing agencies. Some departments also require a
minimum score on the Graduate Record Examination. Some programs accept the Miller Analogies Test in lieu of the GRE.

4. Any supplemental application materials required by the major department. Programs may have additional application requirements.

**English Education (M.A.T.)**

**Program Admission**

All applicants must meet the College of Education's requirements for admission to graduate study. Additional admission requirements specific to this program include:

1. An undergraduate or graduate degree in English or the equivalent from a regionally accredited college or university (Coursework must have included at least 24 semester hours of upper-division or equivalent acceptable credit in English content, including a minimum of three semester hours in each of the following areas: American literature, British literature, written composition, and history or structure of the English language.)

2. Three letters of recommendation as follows: (a) one academic or professional letter; (b) one letter from someone who can evaluate the applicant’s personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of potential to work successfully with adolescents, and (c) one letter from a current work supervisor (if applicable).

3. Documentation of previous work experience.

4. Interviews conducted by faculty and school-based personnel.

**Mathematics Education (M.A.T.)**

**Program Admission**

All applicants must meet the College of Education's requirements for admission to graduate study. Additional admission requirements specific to this program include:

1. An undergraduate or graduate degree in mathematics or the equivalent from a regionally accredited college or university (Coursework must have included at least 24 semester hours of upper-division or equivalent acceptable credit in mathematics content, including a minimum of three semester hours in each of four of the following areas: modern or abstract algebra [similar to Math 4441], linear algebra [similar to Math 4435], college geometry [similar to Math 4301], mathematical statistics [similar to Math 4751], and advanced calculus [similar to Math 4661]. How recently these courses have been completed will be a consideration.

2. A minimum overall grade-point average of 2.75 for the four courses is used to meet the previous requirement.

3. Three letters of recommendation as follows: (a) one academic or professional letter; (b) one letter from someone who can evaluate the applicant’s personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of potential to work successfully with adolescent; and (c) one letter from a current work supervisor (if applicable).

4. Documentation of previous work experience.

5. Interviews conducted by faculty and school-based personnel.

**4230.15 Middle Level Education (M.A.T.)**

**Program Admission**

All applicants must meet the College of Education's requirements for admission to graduate study. Additional requirements specific to this program include:

1. An undergraduate or graduate degree or the equivalent from a regionally accredited college or university.

2. The academic preparation of applicants must include the coursework listed below. Students may be admitted to the program and allowed to complete their academic preparation concurrently. Academic preparation must be completed prior to recommendation for certification.
Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities (EXC 4020 or its equivalent)

- **Language Arts and Social Studies Education Concentration** 12 hours of English courses with at least 6 hours of upper division coursework.
  - 12 hours of social studies courses with at least 6 hours of upper division coursework.
  - Students must demonstrate academic proficiency in the following areas: (a) literature and folklore, (b) composition, (c) languages and (d) children's and adolescent's literature.
  - Students must demonstrate academic proficiency in the following areas: (a) Georgia History, (b) geography, (c) World History/studies, (d) U.S. History/studies.

- **Mathematics and Science Education Concentration** 12 hours of mathematics courses with at least 6 hours of upper division coursework.
  - 12 hours of science courses with at least 6 hours of upper division coursework.
  - Students must demonstrate academic proficiency in the following areas: (a) geometry, (b) algebra, (c) number theory, and (d) probability/statistics.
  - Students must demonstrate academic proficiency in the following areas: (a) biology, (b) physical science, and (c) earth/space sciences.

3. Three letters of recommendation as follows: (a) one academic or professional letter, (b) one letter from someone who can evaluate the applicants' personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of the potential to work successfully with pre-adolescents and adolescents, and (c) one letter from a current work supervisor (if applicable).

4. Documentation of previous work experience.

5. Interviews conducted by faculty and school-based personnel.

6. The department may specify additional requirements.

**Reading, Language, and Literacy Education (M.A.T.) Program Admission**

All applicants must meet the College of Education's requirements for admission to graduate study. Additional requirements specific to this program include:

1. An undergraduate or graduate degree or the equivalent from a regionally accredited college or university.

2. The academic preparation of applicants should include the coursework listed below. Students may be admitted to the program and allowed to complete their academic preparation concurrently. Academic preparation must be completed prior to recommendation for certification.

   - Characteristics and Instructional Strategies for Students with Disabilities (EXC 4020 or its equivalent)
   - Students must meet a language requirement that is intended to ensure that all graduates have had the experience of studying a second or foreign language. This requirement can be met in one of the following ways:
     - a. Successful completion of one academic year of a university-level foreign language sequence (three quarters or two semesters of the same language), or
     - b. Successful completion of two quarters or one semester of a non-Western language, or
     - c. One year living/studying abroad as an adult, or
     - d. The acquisition of English as a second language for non-native English speakers.

3. Two letters of recommendation as follows: (a) an academic or professional letter, (b) a letter from someone who can evaluate the applicant's personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of the potential to work successfully with students at the K-12 levels, or (c) a letter from a current work supervisor (if applicable).
4. Documentation of previous work experience.
5. Interviews conducted by faculty and school-based personnel.
6. The department may specify additional requirements.

Social Studies Education (M.A.T.)

Program Admission

All applicants must meet the College of Education’s requirements for admission to graduate study. Admission to the program occurs once each year. Additional admission requirements specific to this program include:

- An undergraduate or graduate degree in history or in one or more of the social sciences from a regionally accredited college or university. A minimum of a major (24 upper-division semester hours) in history or a social science must be part of prior coursework.
- Three letters of recommendation as follows: (a) one academic or professional letter, (b) one letter from someone who can evaluate the applicant’s personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of potential to work successfully with adolescents, and (c) one letter from a current work supervisor (if applicable)
- Documentation of previous work experience
- Interviews conducted by faculty and school-based personnel

Collaborative Program

Georgia Institute of Technology-Georgia State University B.S./M.A.T. Option

Undergraduate students in a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) program at the Georgia Institute of Technology can apply to Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) program at Georgia State University in the Department of Middle-Secondary and Instructional Technology if they meet the following requirements.

- Students must participate in pre-advising sessions with faculty in their academic department and the Director of Pre-Teaching at Georgia Tech.
- Students must have completed at least 30 hours of academic credit at Georgia Tech.
- Students must have earned a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.5.
- Students may apply to the option at any time after completing 30 hours but prior to completing 90 hours of undergraduate coursework.
- Applicants are applying for early acceptance into a M.A.T. program and therefore must submit the following documentation in addition to meeting the GPA requirement.
  - Complete the B.S./M.A.T. application form. This will be kept on file in both the student’s academic major department and in the office of the Director of Pre-Teaching at Georgia Tech.
  - 2-3 letters of recommendation: (a) one academic or professional letter; (b) one letter from someone who can evaluate the applicant’s personal qualifications, experience, and background in light of potential to work successfully with adolescents; (c) one letter from a current work supervisor, if applicable.
  - Documentation of previous work experience (resume or curriculum vitae).
  - Personal statement of goals and/or reasons for teaching.
  - Successful interview with the faculty in the Department of Middle-Secondary and Instructional Technology.

- Formal acceptance into the M.A.T. portion of the program will be contingent upon the following:
  - Maintaining a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher at Georgia Tech;
  - Completion of an undergraduate degree in a field appropriate for the MAT program;
  - Submission of passing scores on the GACE Basic Skills Assessment or demonstrate an exemption upon application to the program. The current options for satisfying the Basic Skills Assessment,
including the exemptions, are outlined at www.gapsc.com/documentation/basicskillsinfo.asp. Under "Basic Skills Testing," go to "Options to Satisfy the Basic Skills Requirement".

- Submission of acceptable GRE scores;
- Filing an application to the M.A.T. program by the appropriate deadline.

**Reading, Language, and Literacy Education (M.Ed.)**

**Program Admission**
Entry into the program for the major in reading, language, and literacy education requires a bachelor's-level certification in any area of teaching or a service certificate in speech-language pathology.

**Instructional Design and Technology (M.S.)**

**Program Admission**
The applicant must aspire to or currently hold a position related to the application of instructional technology.

**Minimum Requirements for All Specialist Degrees**
1. Only courses taken after admission to the Specialist in Education degree program may be used to fulfill program requirements for the Ed.S. degree.
2. Students must earn a cumulative grade point average of 3.00 calculated on all graduate coursework attempted while admitted to the Ed.S. program. The formal coursework requirement is satisfied through successful completion of each course in the program of study with a grade of "C" or higher. Coursework in which a grade below "C" is earned may not be applied to the specialist programs.
3. Some departments require a grade of "B" or higher in specific courses and program areas. Students are responsible for contacting their departments regarding specific academic requirements that exceed college-wide minimums.
4. Students must complete a minimum of 27 semester hours of program coursework at Georgia State University.
5. Students seeking specialist-level teacher certification must have completed three years of appropriate school experience prior to completion of the Specialist in Education degree.
6. No coursework may be more than six calendar years old at the time of graduation.

**Nondegree Admissions and Programs**

**Nondegree Admissions**
**Admission Requirements**
This graduate level admission category provides enrollment opportunities for students who wish to:
- renew a teaching certificate,
- add a teaching field or area of endorsement to a certificate,
- take courses for enrichment,
- obtain initial certification in special education

Applicants must have an undergraduate degree from a regionally accredited college or university with a grade point average of no less than 2.50. No more than nine semester hours of credit earned in this category may be subsequently applied toward meeting the requirements of a master's degree in the College of Education. No work earned while the students are admitted in nondegree status may be applied to programs of study leading to the Specialist in Education degree. Nondegree students are subject to the same academic regulations as degree seeking students.
1605 Entry into Teacher Education
Admission to Georgia State University and to the College of Arts and Sciences or the College of Education (as indicated above) is prerequisite to entry into teacher education. The minimum criteria for entry into teacher education are listed below.

- Students must have successfully completed Area A (Essential Skills) of the undergraduate core curriculum with a grade of "C" or higher for each course.
- Students must demonstrate competence in oral communication. Screening takes place in all education courses. At any time during their courses of study, students may be referred to the Georgia State Speech-Language–Hearing Clinic. There, screening assesses the basic communication skills adults are expected to exhibit during communication in professional settings: hearing, articulation, fluency, appropriate grammar, comprehension of spoken language, and the ability to use appropriate voice quality. Completion of referral, evaluation, and the remedial process is necessary for continuation in the program.
- Students must have demonstrated competence in mathematics and science by successfully completing Area D (Science, Mathematics, and Technology) of the undergraduate core curriculum.
- Students must have a minimum grade point average of 2.50 based on all undergraduate coursework attempted. For students pursuing degrees in some majors, the minimum grade point average requirement is 2.75. Students are encouraged to contact their academic advisors for information regarding the grade point average requirement for their specific majors.
- Students must complete a separate application and pay an application fee. Students must also show proof of Tort liability insurance and criminal background check. See section 4000 College of Education in this catalog or visit the College of Education Office of Academic Assistance web site, education.gsu.edu/oaa/, for more information.
- Students must have successfully completed EDUC 2110 Investigating Critical & Contemporary Issues in Education with a grade of "C" or higher.
- Students must present passing scores on the GACE Basic Skills Assessment or demonstrate an exemption upon application to an initial educator preparation program. The current options for satisfying the Basic Skills Assessment, including the exemptions, are outlined at www.gapsc.com/documentation/basicskillsinfo.asp. Under "Basic Skills Testing," go to "Options to Satisfy the Basic Skills Requirement".

PhD Programs
  GRE
  3.30
  2 recs
  goals statement, resume, & writing sample; interview
Instructional Technology
  GRE
  3.30
  2 recs
  goals statement, resume, & writing sample

F: Faculty
App. F1: Definition of graduate faculty and criteria for selection
Georgia State University
College of Education
Policy on Graduate Faculty Membership
These guidelines describe the professional activities, criteria, and procedures for the appointment
of Graduate Faculty in the Georgia State University College of Education.

Professional Activities

A faculty member must hold Graduate Faculty membership to perform the following activities:

1. Teaching 9000-level courses, 8000-level courses as designated by departments, and 7990 courses (direction of master’s theses or research projects).

2. Serving as chair of dissertation advisory committees.

(Graduate Faculty members may chair dissertation committees of no more than 6 active students at one time. An “active” doctoral student is defined by each department. To assist departments, the Office of Academic Assistance and Graduate Admissions will provide the department chair each term a list of faculty members and doctoral students with approved dissertation committees on file assigned to each faculty member.)

3. Serving as a member or reader on dissertation advisory committees.

(A student’s dissertation advisory committee may include one member who is not a member of the Graduate Faculty in order to accommodate researchers and other professionals who may bring special expertise to the committee.)

4. Directing master’s theses or research projects.

Criteria for Membership

A member of the Graduate Faculty must meet the following six criteria:

(Situations may occur when an exception to these criteria may be desirable. Request for such an exception shall be sent to the chair of the College of Education Academic Affairs Committee by the graduate faculty committee of the department on behalf of the individual requesting the exception.)

1. Hold the appropriate terminal degree in his or her field.
2. Hold the rank of assistant professor or higher.

3. Hold tenure or a tenure-track position.

4. Be in at least his or her second year at Georgia State University.

5. Be an active and productive scholar during the previous five years as demonstrated by at least five scholarly activities, at least three must be in category A.
   A. publications in refereed or peer-reviewed chapters, journals, books, monographs, or funded research grants
   B. scholarly presentations
   C. editorship
   D. non-refereed publications
   E. current publication through other avenues of dissemination which has professionally acknowledged standards (e.g. development of items such as assessment instruments, software, or training modules which are adopted or endorsed by a professional organization or education agency or juried shows)

5. Be an effective teacher at the graduate level. Evidence of graduate teaching effectiveness must include a report of student evaluations and chairperson teaching evaluations since the last review. Evidence may also include teaching awards, successful instructional innovation grants, student accomplishments, guidance of graduate students’ research projects, peer reviews, innovations in course design or delivery, publications in the area of pedagogy, or other quantitative evidence as determined by the department.

Appointment Process

A request for appointment to the Graduate Faculty is initiated by the faculty member. Recommendations for appointment to the Graduate Faculty will be made by a designated committee from the department. The departmental committee’s recommendation will be sent to the College of Education Academic Affairs Committee.
for review and consideration. College recommendations will be sent to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for final approval of appointments and reappointments to the Graduate Faculty.

Appointments to the Graduate Faculty shall be renewable for terms of five years. In most cases, the timing of the review for regular Graduate Faculty membership should coincide with pretenure, tenure, and posttenure reviews. For each faculty member who requests appointment to the Graduate Faculty, the department committee will send the following information to the College of Education Academic Affairs Committee: the faculty member’s current vita, evidence of his or her graduate teaching effectiveness, and the recommendation of the department committee.

Provisional Graduate Faculty Membership

A faculty member who has completed a terminal degree within the previous five years may request non-renewable provisional Graduate Faculty membership for a period not to exceed five years. Provisional members may perform all the duties of Graduate Faculty members except chairing dissertation advisory committees. At any point during the provisional period, the faculty member may request review for regular appointment to the Graduate Faculty.

Approved by College of Education Academic Affairs Committee: April 28, 1998
Adopted by the College of Education Faculty: May 22, 1998
Amended by the College of Education Academic Affairs Committee:
March 25, 1999; April 13, 2004

**App. F2: List of graduate faculty**

*Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peggy Albers, Ph.D.</th>
<th>Dana Fox, Ph.D.</th>
<th>Gertrude Tinker Sachs, Ph.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ariail, Ph.D.</td>
<td>(COAS)</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chara Bohan, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan Calandra, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iman Chahine, Ph.D. (prov)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Davenport, Ph.D.</td>
<td>(COAS)</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Deming, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadir Demir, Ph.D. (prov)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie B. Dias, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Feinberg, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Seely Flint, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Freer, Ed.D.</td>
<td>(COAS)</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier Junor Clarke, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanjira Kinuthia, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyoun Lim, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Many, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Martin-Hansen, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewa McGrail, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody Milbrandt, Ph.D.</td>
<td>(COAS)</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Sullivan, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Thomas, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geeta Verma, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles X. Wang, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngjoo Yi, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


15 status expires 2015. 16 status expires 2016.

**App. F3: Current CVs of full-time faculty**

**Albers**

**CURRICULUM VITA**

**PERSONAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Margaret (Peggy) M. Albers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship:</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>495 Sherman Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decatur, GA 30033 USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>(H) 404-636-6897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(W) 404-413-8387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) 404-402-6119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td>(W) 404-413-8063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:malbers2@gsu.edu">malbers2@gsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:pma8@comcast.net">pma8@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHRONOLOGY OF EDUCATION**
Ph.D. in Language Education, Indiana University, 1996.

Dissertation: Art as Literacy: The Dynamic Interplay of Pedagogy and Gendered Meaning Making in Sixth Grade Art Classes.  
Dissertation Director: Jerome C. Harste, Professor, Language Education

1996 Maris M. and Mary Higgins Proffitt Outstanding Dissertation Award for Meritorious Achievement, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN


B.S. in English and Speech and Drama. Dakota State University, 1978.

MAJOR FIELDS/RESEARCH INTERESTS

English language arts and literacy education; teacher preparation and professional development in middle and secondary English; visual discourse analysis; arts-integration in English and literacy education; critical literacy; children’s literature; new literacies; gender and literacy; interpretive inquiry; video and still photo documentation of studio potters’ processes, techniques, and beliefs.

CHRONOLOGY OF EMPLOYMENT

8/03 – Present  PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH EDUCATION-LANGUAGE AND LITERACY EDUCATION (with Tenure). Department of Middle and Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. Graduate and undergraduate teaching, research, and service; courses and seminars taught in Semiotics and Multiliteracies, Children’s and Young Adult Literature, Principles of English Instruction, Introduction to Secondary Teaching, Theory and Pedagogy in the Teaching of English, Theory and Pedagogy of Literature Instruction, Literacy in the Content Areas, Theory and Pedagogy of Literacy Instruction, Critique of Educational Research, Nonfiction in Language and Literacy and Social Studies, Research Seminar (Dissertation Prospectus), Practicum I, Practicum II-III. Developed web seminar series in literacy for doctoral research.

Summer 2010  FACULTY INSTRUCTOR, Mt. St. Vincent University, Nova Scotia (Toronto, ON campus). Graduate teaching; courses taught Topics in Literacy: Arts and Literacy; Topics in Literacy: New Literacies, Literacy, and Social Justice. Invited by Jerome C. Harste and Vivian Vasquez, program faculty.

Summer 2008  FACULTY INSTRUCTOR, Mt. St. Vincent University, Nova Scotia (Toronto, ON campus). Graduate teaching; courses taught Topics in Literacy: Arts and Literacy; Topics in Literacy: New Literacies, Literacy, and Social Justice. Invited by Jerome C. Harste and Vivian Vasquez, program faculty.

8/05-5/06  LANGUAGE AND LITERACY UNIT COORDINATOR. Department of Middle and Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. Set, conduct, write up L&L unit meetings; oversee and collect L&L documents for NCATE; oversee online assessment survey for all master’s students (STARS); schedule L&L classes [summer, fall, spring, summer] and secure faculty to teach classes; create database of all master’s, Ed.S., and Ph.D. students; oversee all applications to L&L programs; organize, publicize, and conduct two Professional Standards Week (a week devoted to advising students, supporting their portfolio work, interviewing Ph.D. applicants, collecting and organizing program update sheets from all master’s and doctoral students, presenting advisement sessions).

1/97 – 5/03  ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH EDUCATION - LANGUAGE AND LITERACY EDUCATION, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. Graduate and undergraduate teaching, research, and service; courses and seminars taught include Principles of English Instruction, Theory and Pedagogy in the Teaching of English, Children’s and Young Adult Literature, Theory and Pedagogy in the Teaching of English, Theory and Pedagogy of Literature Instruction, Language, Literacy, and the Arts, Literacy in the Content Areas, Theory and Pedagogy of Literacy Instruction, Oral and Written Communication for Middle Childhood Education, The Politics of Literacy, Literacy for a Diverse Society, Advanced Research Seminar (Writing for Publication), Doctoral Seminars (two, individual focus on Henry Giroux, John Dewey), Practicum I, Practicum II-III.

Summer 2003  FACULTY INSTRUCTOR, Mt. St. Vincent University, Nova Scotia (Toronto, ON campus). Graduate teaching; courses taught Topics in Literacy: Arts and Literacy; Topics in Literacy: New Literacies, Literacy, and Social Justice. Invited by Jerome C. Harste and Vivian Vasquez, program faculty.

8/97-8/03  COORDINATOR, TEEMS English Education M.Ed. Degree Program. Department of Middle and Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. Oversee, organize and supervise practicum placements, teaching courses in program, organize seminars, adviser.

Summer 2003  READING INITIATIVE TEACHER EDUCATOR. National Council of Teachers of English, Bloomington, IN; courses taught in reading during a two-week reading seminar to teachers of all age levels

9/02 – 5/03  LITERACY CONSULTANT. Francine Delaney New School for Children, Asheville, NC; consultant to the school; developed, organized, and taught seminars to elementary teachers (K-8); worked with individual teachers to develop arts-based strategies to develop literacy across content areas.
1998/1999  LITERACY CONSULTANT. Northwestern Middle School, Alpharetta, GA; consultant to the school; developed, organized, and taught seminars to teachers on content area literacy across grade levels; worked with individual teachers in their classrooms to develop literacy strategies.

8/93 – 12/96  ASSOCIATE INSTRUCTOR. Department of Language Education, College of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN; undergraduate teaching, research, and service; courses and seminars taught include Methods and Materials for Reading for Secondary Teachers, Methods of Teaching English/Speech/Drama, Early Field Experiences, Methods of Teaching Secondary Reading; coordinated two field-based on-site Reading and English education courses at Tri-North Middle School.

1993-1995  PRESERVICE TEACHER SUPERVISOR. Department of Language Education, College of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN; Designed, coordinated, and implemented curriculum for preservice teachers working in the reading methods course taught at Tri-North Middle School, Bloomington, IN. Oversaw and supervised preservice teachers’ use of reading strategies in English, math, science, and social studies content middle school classes, and presented seminars for cooperating teachers.

Summers 94/95 RESEARCHER AND SECONDARY INSTRUCTORS’ ASSISTANT. Learning Edge, Fresno Pacific University, Fresno, CA; worked as primary researcher in a two-week intensive course in literacy for secondary students: collected data, took photographs and fieldnotes, analyzed data; assisted secondary instructors with reading and writing instruction.

8/92 – 5/93  TEACHING INTERNSHIP. Department of Language Education, College of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN; guest lecturer; assisted English education professor in the classroom and helped to develop curriculum materials.

8/90 – 5/92  ENGLISH TEACHER. English Department, Yankton Middle School, Yankton, South Dakota; taught 7th and 8th grade English, coached oral interpretation; served on school committees, and as seventh grade advisor.

8/89 – 6/90  ENGLISH AND DRAMA TEACHER. English Department, Seaside High School, Seaside, Oregon; taught sophomore, junior and senior English, speech and drama; drama director: directed two theater shows; Drama Club advisor; served on several school committees, and served as junior class advisor; served as prom advisor; judged local speech events for both the middle school and other city events.

8/88 – 6/90  ENGLISH, DRAMA, AND SPEECH TEACHER. English Department, Huron High School, Huron, South Dakota; taught freshman speech, sophomore composition, sophomore literature, American literature, and drama; drama director: directed 6 theater shows; served as oral interpretation and individual forensic events coach and judge; Junior class advisor; organized fundraisers to financially support one poetry workshops conducted by a South Dakota poet, and oversaw and organized their week-long poetry sessions in English classes; oversaw and organized students’ poetry sent in for publication in state fine arts magazine.
8/87 – 6/88 ENGLISH TEACHER. English Department, Chippenham Technical College, Chippenham, England; taught English language and composition for students in preparation to take Comprehensive Secondary Exam (CSE) and Ordinary (“O”) levels.

7/84 – 6/87 ENGLISH, DRAMA, AND SPEECH TEACHER. Huron High School, Huron, South Dakota; taught freshman speech, sophomore composition, sophomore literature, American literature, reading, and drama; drama director: directed 9 theater shows; served as oral interpretation and individual forensic events coach and judge; Junior class advisor; organized fundraisers to financially support two poetry workshops conducted by South Dakota poets, and oversaw and organized their week-long poetry sessions in English classes; oversaw and organized students’ poetry sent in for publication in state fine arts magazine; organized and oversaw fundraisers to take drama club students on field trips to Minneapolis to see professional theater; served on various school-wide committees.

8/83 – 6/84 ENGLISH AND DRAMA TEACHER. English Teacher. Fulbright Teacher Exchange Program. John of Gaunt Comprehensive School, Trowbridge, England; taught first, third and fourth form English language and literature, and first, second and fourth form drama; helped prepare students for the Comprehensive Secondary Exams (CSE) in drama and English language and literature; served as Drama Club advisor and assistant to the director of the theater show; assisted the organizer of the school’s drama festival; organized and took drama students to professional theater shows in Bath, England; assistant organizer of a one week cycling field trip to Normandy, France for fourth form students.

8/78 – 8/83 ENGLISH, DRAMA, AND SPEECH TEACHER. Huron High School, Huron, South Dakota; taught freshman speech, sophomore composition, sophomore literature, American literature, reading, and drama; drama director: directed 15 theater shows; served as oral interpretation and individual forensic events coach and judge; Junior class advisor; organized fundraisers to financially support two poetry workshops conducted by South Dakota poets, and oversaw and organized their week-long poetry sessions in English classes; oversaw and organized students’ poetry sent in for publication in state fine arts magazine; organized and oversaw fundraisers to take drama club students on field trips to Minneapolis to see professional theater; served as served on various school-wide committees; served as vice-president of our teacher’s union.

1980 DRAMA CAMP INSTRUCTOR. South Dakota Arts Council, Watertown, South Dakota; taught drama classes for a week to high school students interested in drama; directed a one-act play and supervised recreational activities.

HONORS, AWARDS, AND DISTINCTIONS

2012 Appointed Co-Editor of Connections, Georgia Council of Teachers of English, with Katie Greene, one of my doctoral student

2011 Recipient of the Outstanding Faculty Teaching Award, Professor. College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

2011 Recipient of the Georgia Council of Teachers of English Professor of the Year Award, Georgia Council of Teachers of English
2011  Invitation to present International Workshop for HAN-Nijmegen, Holland, May 2011; Recipient of the 2010-2011 EU-US Atlantis Excellence in Mobility: Faculty Mobility program (Cross-listed under “Consultations”)

2011  Nominated for Alumni Distinguished Professor, Georgia State University

2011  International Grant Reviewer. Invited to review arts-based grant proposals for Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, an organization whose mandate is to support and develop excellence in research activities within the social sciences and humanities

2011  Elected to serve as Co-Chair of the Commission on Arts and Literacy (COAL) (two-year position, elected by members). COAL is national commission committed to the support of teachers and researchers interested in the integration of the arts, new literacies, and multimodality into English language arts instruction and research.

2010  Nominated for the Georgia Council of Teachers of English Professor of the Year, Georgia Council of Teachers of English

2010  Invited chapter in edited book. Based upon my work with Diane Lapp, I was invited to write a chapter, “If you think they should be critically literate-show them how,” in their upcoming book entitled Teaching With Rigor: Supporting Multiple Ways of Learning. Guildford Press. (Invited, Cross-listed under Chapters in Scholarly Books and Monographs).


2010  Invited Featured Article. Invited by the editors of the Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy to write a featured commentary focused on my work with visual discourse analysis and adolescent literacy. This honor is bestowed on “prominent scholars in the field of adolescent literacy” (from letter of invitation by Tom Bean and Helen Harper).

2010  Invited virtual presentation (Webinar). Multimedia and critical literacy in the classroom. Webinar, National Council of Teachers of English, with Jerome C. Harste and Vivian Vasquez, April 22, 2010 (Cross-listed under Consultations)

2009  Invited Virtual Presentation (Webinar). Creating strong writers through the arts. Webinar, National Council of Teachers of English, January 22, 2009 (Cross-listed under Consultations)

2009  Outstanding Faculty Research Award, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA

2009  Invited participant and presenter. Indiana University Multimodal Text Analysis Conference. Hand-selected researchers were invited to lead discussions on the analysis of visual texts for this small, working conference.

2009  Invited keynote and presentation on arts-based teaching and learning for Upstate New York Bilingual SETRC; Alfred University, Alfred, NY

2009  Grants Selection Committee, IRA. Invited to serve on Studies and Research: Grants Subcommittee of the International Reading Association. Assist the subcommittee in reviewing research grant proposals including the Elva Knight Research Grant, the Helen M. Robinson Grant, Nila Banton Smith Research Dissemination Grant, and the Reading/Literacy Research Fellowship competitions.


2009  Invited to serve on the Editorial Review Board for the Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy (for ninth term). Published eight times a year by the International Reading Association, JAAL is a peer-reviewed publication created to provide a scholarly research and practice-based forum for teachers, researchers, and others committed to improving classroom instruction for literacy learners ages twelve and older.


2008  Invited to serve as an online faculty mentor for the Conference on English Education. CEE faculty member serves for the 2008-2009 academic year and supports a new faculty member by providing thoughtful responses to questions, suggesting useful resources, and sharing how you’ve responded to the range of challenges of the English education profession presents.


2008  Invited Field Reviewer, NCTE, Pathways for 21st Century Literacies, a professional development experience for English/literacy teachers.

2008  Invited to create video documentary short on Jerome C. Harste, Past President, NRC. Part of the Past Presidents of NRC Project, Pat Edwards, Michigan State University.
2007  Distinguished Program in Teacher Education, Georgia Association of Teacher Educators. Award and cash prize presented to the TEEMS English Education MAT Degree Program Faculty (Drs. Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, Ewa McGrail, and Michelle Zoss), October 11, 2007.


2007  Ten-year service award. College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

2007  Invited to serve as a member of the Editorial Review Board for the Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy (for fifth time). Published eight times a year by the International Reading Association, JAAL is a peer-reviewed publication created to provide a scholarly research and practice-based forum for teachers, researchers, and others committed to improving classroom instruction for literacy learners ages twelve and older.

2007  Invited to serve as a guest reviewer for English Education, the official journal of the Conference on English Education of the National Council of Teachers of English. EE is a peer-reviewed publication created to provide a scholarly research and practice-based forum for teachers, researchers, and others committed to improving classroom instruction for English language arts for learners across all ages.

2007  Invited to participate in the Conference English Education Summit, an honor to serve on this national committee is bestowed to those in English education who signify and demonstrate scholarship and research in this field. Only 50 are selected to participate.


2006  Invited keynote address and workshop. The arts, literacy and instruction. Ohio Public Schools, Columbus, OH.

2006  Invited to serve as a guest reviewer for English Education, the official journal of the Conference on English Education of the National Council of Teachers of English. EE is a peer-reviewed publication created to provide a scholarly research and practice-based forum for teachers, researchers, and others committed to improving classroom instruction for English language arts for learners across all ages.

2006  Invited to participate in the Conference English Education Summit, an honor to serve on this national committee is bestowed to those in English education who signify and demonstrate scholarship and research in this field. Only 50 are selected to participate.

2006  Invited to serve as a member of the Editorial Review Board for the Voices from the Middle. Published four times a year by the National Council of Teachers of English, VFM is a
peer-reviewed publication created to provide a scholarly research and practice-based forum for teachers, researchers, and others committed to improving classroom instruction for literacy learners ages ten to fourteen.

2005 Invited keynote address, For love of the mud: (Re)marks of a potter. Research and Teaching in These Critical Times: Harste-Burke Retirement Conference, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN. (Cross-listed under Scholarly Presentations).

2005 Invited to serve as emcee for Jerome C. Harste and Carolyn Burke Community Reception, a retirement celebration. Wilke Auditorium, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN. (Cross-listed under Service, Inter/National)

2005 Invited keynote address, The arts on my mind, presented at the Seven Oaks Division Professional Development Conference, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. (Cross-listed under Scholarly Presentations and Invited Scholarly Presentations).

2005 Invited to serve as Co-Chair of the Commission on Arts and Literacy (COAL) (two-year position, elected by members). COAL is national commission committed to the support of teachers and researchers interested in the integration of the arts, new literacies, and multimodality into English language arts instruction and research.

2005 Invited to serve as a member of the Editorial Review Board for ReadWriteThink. This website, established in 2002, is in partnership with the International Reading Association and National Council of Teachers of English, and the Verizon Foundation, and is committed to working together to provide teachers and students with free Internet access to the best practices and resources in literacy and English language arts instruction.

2005 Invited to participate on the National Council of Teachers of English Opinion Panel. This Opinion Panel offers voice on issues particular to literacy and the English language arts.

2005 Invited to participate in the Conference English Education Summit, an honor to serve on this national committee is bestowed to those in English education who signify and demonstrate scholarship and research in this field. Only 50 are selected to participate.

2004 Elected to serve on the Elementary Section Nominating Committee (elected position by the NCTE membership). The Nominating Committee prepares a slate of candidates for vacancies that occur annually on the Elementary Section Steering Committee and selects candidates for the succeeding year’s Elementary Section Nominating Committee.

2004 Invited keynote address, You can’t Sing the Same Song Twice: Multimodal Curriculum, Hawaii Council of Teachers of English Conference, Honolulu, HI. Co-presenter with Kathryn Egawa. (Cross-listed under Scholarly Presentations and Invited Scholarly Presentations).

2004 Invited keynote address and workshop, Social semiotics, Fresno Pacific University, Fresno, CA. (Cross-listed under Scholarly Presentations and Invited Scholarly Presentations).

2004 Invited Featured Speaker, NCTE: Building professional relationships. Florida Council of Teachers of English Conference, Miami, FL. (Cross-listed under Scholarly Presentations and Invited Scholarly Presentations).

2004 Invited to participate as a Reading Initiative Teacher-Leader. The Reading Initiative is a professional development program sponsored and developed by the National Council of Teachers of English.

2003 Invited to participate as a Cosponsored Speaker for the National Council of Teachers of English. This program provides expertise to local NCTE organizations in the fields of literacy, English language arts, and teacher education.

2003 Invited to serve on the Critical Perspectives in Literacy Committee. This International Reading Association committee served to address issues on social justice and literacy.

2001 Selected by the Executive Board of Whole Language Umbrella to serve as Co-Editor of Talking Points. With Allen Koshewa, we were selected to serve a three-year term as co-editor of Talking Point Talking Points (2001-2003), the premiere journal for this international literacy organization.

2001 Invited keynote address, Literacy, the arts, and higher order thinking. DeKalb County Inservice for Reading Specialists (K-12). Briar Vista Elementary School, Atlanta, GA. (Cross-listed under Invited Scholarly Presentations and Scholarly Presentations).

1999 Invited keynote address, The point of language. Clayton County Literacy Conference, Jonesboro, GA. (Cross-listed under Scholarly Presentations and Invited Scholarly Presentations).

1998 Invited to serve on the Talking Points Editorial Board, the premiere journal, published bi-annually, of the Whole Language Umbrella, three-year term.

1998 Invited to serve as the Whole Language Umbrella (WLU) Representative to Center for the Expansion of Learning and Thinking (CELT). CELT is a nonprofit educational corporation, international in scope, whose members believe in the principles of education for democracy with a focus on natural language learning and inquiry.

1997 Elected to serve on the Executive Committee of Whole Language Umbrella (WLU) (three-year elected term by membership). WLU is an NCTE Conference made up of whole language support groups and individual professionals interested in developing and implementing whole language in educational institutions.

1997 Maris M. and Mary Higgins Proffitt Outstanding Dissertation Award for Meritorious Achievement (Award for Dissertation Study), School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN. (Cross-listed under Personal)
1997 Invited to serve on the Editorial Board for Language Arts, a professional journal published by NCTE for elementary and middle school teachers and teacher educators. LA is a peer-reviewed publication that provides a forum for discussions on all aspects of language arts learning and teaching, primarily as they relate to children in pre-kindergarten through the eighth grade.

1995 Outstanding Associate Instructor, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN (Cross-listed under Teaching)

1995 Leo and Jean Fay Language Education Scholarship, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN. This award is presented to outstanding doctoral students with a $1000 prize.

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Lifetime Summary

Scholarly Books, Monographs, Themed Issues--13
  Literacy Books----3
  Themed Issues---2
  Monographs--1
  EFL Books---7
Scholarly Books and Monographs (in progress) ---2
Book Reviews--1
Chapters in Scholarly Books and Monographs—12
Chapters in Scholarly Books and Monographs (under review)--1
Section Editor of Literacy Book ---- 3
Significant Citations and Distinctions---4
Articles For Refereed Journals and Yearbooks -----47
Articles For Refereed Journals and Yearbooks (under review)---- 4
Articles For Refereed Journals and Yearbooks (in progress)---- 4
Editorships of National/International Journal----2
Editorship of Themed Issue of National Journal----2
Curriculum Materials-----2
Creative Projects----59
  Artwork Published in Art Book—1
  Artwork Featured on Cover and Inside Journal--1
  Cover Design—1
Doctoral Literacy Web Seminars—9
Video Documentaries—5
  Podcast---1
  Logo--1
  Pottery Shows—30
  Photography---1
  Published Poetry—3
  Featured articles in international adolescent journal--5
  Photo credits--1
Scholarly Presentations —140
  International Keynote Presentations--------4
  National Keynote Presentations-------------7
  Local Keynote Presentations-----------------2
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Scholarly Books, Monographs, and Themed Issues


Practitioner Books: EFL (English as a Foreign Language) Books


Scholarly Books and Monographs Under Review or In Progress


Chapters in Scholarly Books and Monographs


Chapters in Scholarly Books and Monographs (Under Review)


Section Editor in Book


Significant Citations and Distinctions: Abstracts of Research Published
Abstracts of Research

Reviews of Albers’s Books


Articles in Refereed Journals and Yearbooks
International/National Journals
Albers, P., Harste, J.C., & Vasquez, V. (in press). Making trouble and interrupting certainty: Teachers’ critical and visual responses to children’s literature. Submitted to the 60th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference (pp.). Oak Creek, WI: NRC.


Albers, P. (2004). Dancing platters (or why throw on a bat when you can use the wheelhead?). Clay Times, 10(6), 46-49.


State Journals


Articles for Refereed Journals and Yearbooks (Under Review)

Holbrook, T., Albers, P., & Harste, J.C. (under review). Looking to see: Three literacy researchers as artists. Submitted to 60th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference (pp.). Oak Creek, WI: NRC.


Articles For Refereed Journals and Yearbooks (In Progress)


Brown, D. & Albers, P. (in progress). Fifth grade students’ constructions of gender. JECL.


Editorship of Referred Journal


Guest Editor of Themed Issue in Referred Journal


Curriculum Materials


Creative Projects

2009 - Present    Global Conversations in Literacy Research
During the 2009 year, I designed and developed “Doctoral Webinars,” a series of web seminars presented by doctoral students in their final stages of the dissertation. Since the inception of this presentation platform, we have hosted nine doctoral students. We expanded these conversations to literacy researchers of all ranks are scheduling others for the upcoming academic year (2011-2012). These web seminars in literacy are a platform for sharing literacy research work online. National and international literacy scholars are invited to present to a internet audience of scholars and other doctoral students. These webinars have two foci: 1) research in which literacy researchers of all ranks share their research and processes with others interested in literacy; 2) to present the most cutting-edge research across the globe. This work is done with Katie Greene, GSU doctoral student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Presenter</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date of Presentation</th>
<th>Title of Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Vander Zanden</td>
<td>University of Northern Iowa</td>
<td>May 1, 2011</td>
<td>Liberty to do it our way*: Exploring Contested Discourses and Educational Spaces with Fifth Graders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christi Moore</td>
<td>GSU</td>
<td>March 13, 2011</td>
<td>This is What I Want Them to Hear: Pre-service Teachers’ Experiences in a Music-Integrated Literacy Methods Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenny Sanchez</td>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>February 7, 2011</td>
<td>Students as Researchers: Forming a Critical Inquiry Community through an Ethic of Care Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Roberts</td>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>November 7, 2011</td>
<td>Promise and Possibilities of Infusing Parent-Child Read Alouds with Comprehension Strategy Instruction: An Intervention Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candace Kuby  University of Missouri  October 24, 2011  Understanding an Early Childhood Inquiry Curriculum through Crystallizing Autoethnography, Practitioner Research, and a Critical Performative Analysis of Emotion
Scott Ritchie  Kennesaw State University  September 19, 2010  Walking the Talk: How Eight P-12 Educators Came to Teach Critically
Tammy Frederick  Georgia State University  April 15, 2010  Semiosis of Self: Visual Meaning Making in a Spanish for Native Speakers Class
Nicole Manry Pourchier  Georgia State University  April 11, 2010  A Study of Postmodern Picturebooks: Theoretical and Research Considerations
Heather Lynch  Georgia State University  November 15, 2009  Dabbling in Methods: Looking at Data from Multiple Perspectives
Terry Fisher  Georgia State University  October 11, 2009  Looking Back and Looking Ahead: Lessons Learned (and shared) From One Dissertation Journey
Katie Kurumada  Georgia State University  September 20, 2009  Presenting the Prospectus: One Ph.D. Student’s Experiences

2011  Mentoring Conversations in Doctoral Preparation
In the spring of 2011 year, one of my doctoral students (Katie Greene) and I designed and developed mentoring web seminars, Global Conversations in Doctoral Preparation, a series of web seminars presented by doctoral students and faculty interested in the preparation of doctoral students. This series of mentoring web seminars has as its goals the following: 1) to present information on a range of aspects of significance in doctoral program; 2) to provide doctoral students with opportunities to present their expertise and thinking on these aspects; and 3) to encourage community and dialogue between and among doctoral students across the college and beyond GSU.

Name of Presenter  Affiliation  Date of Presentation  Title of Presentation
Svetla Dimova  GSU  April 26, 2011  Presenting and Defending the Prospectus
Katie Greene  GSU  March 15, 2011  Writing Grants for the Classroom

Cover Design with 6 Art Images:
2010  California English. Invited artwork on cover with six images inside California English 15(4), a California Association of Teachers of English refereed journal for language arts teachers.

Video Documentaries


Podcasts

Photography

Logos

Pottery Shows
2011  Decatur Arts Festival, juried show, May 2011
2010  Artists’ Market, Christmas at Callanwolde Fine Arts Center
2010  Intown Hardware Pottery Show and Sale
2010  Decatur Arts Festival, juried show, May 2010
2009  Intown Hardware Pottery Show and Sale
2009  All Saints Episcopal Church, Art Show and Sale (October, 2009)
2009  Virginia Highlands Summer Fest, juried show, June, 2009
2008  Intown Hardware Pottery Show and Sale
2008  All Saints Episcopal Church, Art Show and Sale (November, 2008)
2007/2008  North Druid Hills Gallery of Artists, Atlanta, GA (2 shows).
2008-1997  Intown Hardware Pottery Show, bi-annual show of pottery (10 shows).
2007-1997  Decatur Arts Festival, yearly arts festival featuring the work of visual artists (10 shows; juried).
2006  Alabama Clay Conference, Gallery of Artists, Gasden, AL.

Published Poetry

Featured Writer for International Adolescent Journal

Photo Credit

SCHOLARLY PRESENTATIONS
International Keynote Addresses


National Keynote Addresses

Albers, P. (2006). The arts, literacy and instruction. Invited keynote address and workshop on differentiated instruction and the arts for K-8 arts, music, drama, special needs, and physical education teachers. Ohio Public Schools, Columbus, OH. (Cross-listed under Honors, Awards, and Distinctions).


Local Keynote Addresses
Albers, P. (2001). Literacy, the arts, and higher order thinking. Invited keynote address for DeKalb County Inservice for Reading Specialists (K-12). Briar Vista Elementary School, Atlanta, GA. (Cross-listed under Invited Honors, Awards, and Distinctions).


Scholarly Presentations at Conferences

International/National


Albers, P., Holbrook, T., & Harste, J.C. (Dec., 2010). Looking to see: Three literacy researchers as artists. Presentation at the annual conference of the Literacy Research Association, Ft. Worth, TX.


Albers, P., Frederick, T., & Thompson, C. (2008). “We teach who we are”: A study of two Latino teachers, their reflective practices, and their literacy work with struggling Latino students. National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL.


Cowan, K., Harste, J.C., Frederick, T., & Albers, P. (2007). What difference do the arts make in literacy learning? International Reading Association Annual Conference, Atlanta, GA.


Albers, P. (2006). The arts, literacy and instruction. Keynote address and workshop on differentiated instruction and the arts for K-8 arts, music, drama, special needs, and physical education teachers. Ohio Public Schools, Columbus, OH. (Cross-listed under Scholarly Presentations, and Honors, Awards, and Distinctions).


Albers, P. (2000). Integrating the arts in literacy instruction, Whole Language Umbrella, Nashville, TN.


Local/State Presentations


Invited Scholarly Presentations: Classroom, University, and Community

Albers, P. (Oct., 2010). Writing promotion and tenure narratives. Middle and Secondary Education and Instructional Technology.


Albers, P. (2009). Creating strong writers through the arts, ECE 3602, multimodal teaching and learning, Teresa Hampton, instructor.


Albers, P. (2008). Analysis of visual texts. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Albers, P. (2006). The role of technology in English language arts instruction. Spelman College, Atlanta, GA.


Albers, P. (2006). Reading the code: Theorizing art in children’s picture books. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Albers, P. (2005). Fresno teachers speak about literacy. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Albers, P. (2003). Multiculturalism in caldecott award-winning picture books. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Albers, P. (2003). Promotion and tenure. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Albers, P. (2003). Teaching English in the metro-Atlanta Area. College of Arts and Sciences, GSU, Atlanta, GA.

Albers, P. (2002). Arts and literacy instruction. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Albers, P. (1998). Creating a research agenda. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.
Albers, P. (1998). Doing ethnographic research. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Albers, P. (1997). Gender and writing. Peachtree Urban Writing Project. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


AWARDS AND GRANTS

State and Local Grants and Contracts

GCTE Teacher Mini-Grant (2010). Katherine Greene, Peggy Albers (co-PIs). $500. Grant to secure technology equipment for arts-based research. Funded.


Milbrandt, M., Albers, P., Zoss, M., Holbrook, T., McGrail, E. (2007; equal effort as Co-PIs; $3,000) CENCIA Grant Award for the Proposal: Internet Conversations in Literacy, the Arts, and Digital Media (uiClad) Project. Funded.


Albers, P. (2002). Moving Towards electronic professional portfolios with graduate nontraditional English education teacher candidates. PT3 mini-grant, $2400. Georgia State University, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. Funded.

Albers, P. (2000). Assessing the technology needs of graduate nontraditional English education students pursuing initial teaching certification. PT3 mini-grant, $2400. Georgia State University, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. Funded.


PROFESSIONAL OUTREACH: INTERNATIONAL/NATIONAL

Service: Editorships
2011-2016 Language Arts Co-editor (with Caitlin Dooley, Amy Flint, Teri Holbrook, Laura Mays). Language Arts is sponsored by National Council of Teachers of English. (Five year term, National Search)
2011 Reviewer. 60th National Council of Reading/Literacy Research Association Yearbook (Invited).
2010-2011 Section Co-Editor (with Vivian Vasquez and Jerome C. Harste), The Many Faces of Texts. Handbook on Research for the English Language Arts.
2010 Reviewer. 59th National Council of Reading Yearbook (Invited).
2008-09 Co-Editor (with Jennifer Sanders), Literacies, the arts, and multimodality. Accepted book manuscript, NCTE. Brought together 12 national voices in this publication.
2004-01 Co-Editor (with Allen Koshewa), Talking Points (Three year term, National Search)
2001  Guest editor, Primary Voices, K-6, Themed Issue, Literacy and the Arts, 9(4). Peer-reviewed proposal.

Editorial Board Memberships and Editorial Reviewing
2011  Guest editor, Teaching Practice and Critique, e-journal, special edition, Critical Literacy
2011 Invited reviewer, Conference on English Education Conference.
2011-2010 Invited Member. Editorial Review Board. Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy
2011  Editorial Review Board. 60th Literacy Research Association Yearbook (formerly: National Reading Conference Yearbook)
2010  Editorial Review Board. 59th National Reading Conference Yearbook.
2010  Guest reviewer. Talking Points, National Council of Teachers of English.
2010  Invited Member. Voices from the Middle, National Council of Teachers of English
2009  Book Proposal and Manuscript Reviewer. International Reading Association
2009-2008 Invited Member. Editorial Review Board. Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy
2009-2006 Invited Member. Editorial Review Board. Voices from the Middle, National Council of Teachers of English
2008-2005 Invited Member. Editorial Review Board. ReadWriteThink, NCTE/IRA/Verizon
2005-1999 Invited Member. Editorial Review Board. Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy
2003-2001 Invited Member. Editorial Review Board. Georgia Connections
2003-2000 Manuscript Reviewer. Talking Points
2000  Book Proposal and Manuscript Reviewer. Allen Bacon

Conference Program/Proposal Reviewing
2011  Program Proposal Reviewer. Literacy Research Association (formerly: National Reading Conference)
2010  Program Proposal Reviewer. National Reading Conference
2009  Program Proposal Reviewer. National Reading Conference
2008  Program Proposal Reviewer. National Reading Conference
2007  Program Proposal Reviewer. National Reading Conference
2003  Program Proposal Reviewer. National Reading Conference
2002-1997 Program Proposal Reviewer. Georgia Read Write Now Conference
2000-1997 Program Proposal Reviewer. Whole Language Umbrella
2000  Program Proposal Reviewer. National Reading Conference
1999  Program Proposal Reviewer. National Reading Conference

National/International Leadership in Professional Organizations

2010-2009  Revision of Pathways, NCTE
2009   Outstanding Language Arts Educator Project. Created a video short for Karen Smith, recipient of this award and presented at the CELT annual meeting at NCTE
2008   Field Reviewer, NCTE, Pathways for 21st Century Literacies, a professional development experience for English/literacy teachers.
2008   NRC Past-President Project. Video Interview: NRC Past President, Jerome C. Harste; to be presented at NRC 2008.
2007-2005  Co-chairperson, Commission on Arts and Literacy, NCTE
2006-present  NCTE Consulting Network
2005-present  NCTE Opinion Panel
2005  Designer and Emcee, Community Reception, Harste-Burke Retirement Conference

2004  NCTE Elementary Section, Nominating Committee (national, elected)
2004  Reading Initiative Teacher Leader
2004-2001  Cosponsored Speaker, NCTE
2003-2002  Committee Member. Critical Perspectives in Literacy. International Reading Association
2001-1998  Executive Committee, Whole Language Umbrella
2001-1998  WLU Representative to CELT
2000-1998  WLU Representative to CELT (Center for the Expansion of Learning and Thinking) Program Committee

National/International Participation in Professional Organizations

Active  National Reading Conference
Member:  National Council of Teachers of English
         Whole Language Umbrella
         International Reading Association
         Supporting the Learning and Teaching of English
         Commission on the Arts and Literacy
         Center for the Expansion of Learning and Thinking
         Georgia Council of Teachers of English
         American Educational Research Association
2007-2006  National Council on the Education of the Ceramic Arts
2005-2000  Georgia Council of Teachers of English
1998-1997  Alpha Upsilon Alpha

National/International Outreach: Various Roles

External Reviewer: Promotion and Tenure Dossiers
2010  University of South Carolina
2010  Boise State University, Boise, Idaho
2010  The Penn State University, Harrisburg, PA
2009  Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

Designer and Producer of Global Conversations in Literacy Research Web Seminars
Present-2009  Research web seminars were initiated in the fall of 2009 and feature doctoral students in different stages of their PhD work, and intend to present the cutting-edge and current work of doctoral students across the world; Web seminars are interactive; the presenter responds to questions and comments from those participating. This project has now expanded to include all academic ranks. Website: www.globalconversationsinliteracy.wordpress.com

Designer and Producer of Global Conversations in Doctoral Mentoring Web Seminars
Present-2011  A series of web seminars aimed to support doctoral students in all stages of their program and in a range of aspects that support their residency and search for inter/national faculty positions.

External Examiner for Thesis: International

External Grant Reviewer for Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada: International
2011  Invited to review arts-based grant proposals for Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, an organization whose mandate is to support and develop excellence in research activities within the social sciences and humanities

CONSULTATIONS

2011  Invitation to present International Workshop for HAN-Nijmejen, Holland, May 2011; Recipient of the 2010-2011 EU-US Atlantis Excellence in Mobility: Faculty Mobility program (Cross-listed under Honors, Awards, Distinctions)
2011-2010  NCTE Professional Development Work with Hawaii on state curriculum
2010-2006  NCTE On-site Professional Development Consultant
2010  Chesterfield City Schools, Chesterfield, Va., October 2010

2010 Multimedia and critical literacy in the classroom. Webinar, National Council of Teachers of English, April 22, 2010

2009 Arts-based teaching and learning with ESL and Learning Disabled, Upstate New York Bilingual SETRC; Alfred University, Alfred, NY.

2009 Creating strong writers through the arts. Webinar, National Council of Teachers of English, January 22, 2009

2008 Content Area Literacy. Cincinnati City Schools, Cincinnati, OH

2008 The arts, literacy and instruction. Ohio Public Schools, Columbus, OH.

2004 NCTE Reading Initiative, Summer Institute, Indiana University. Bloomington, IN

2003 NCTE Reading Initiative, Summer Institute, Indiana University. Bloomington, IN

2003-2002 Arts-based literacy workshops: Creating curriculum with the arts in mind. Francine Delaney New School for Children, Asheville, NC

2001 Arts-based literacy workshop, Francine Delaney New School for Children, Asheville, NC

2001-1995 Freelance TEFL Consultant, Consultant for writers of English language texts for students studying English as a Foreign Language

1999-1998 Literacy Consultant, Northwestern Middle School, Alpharetta, GA. Work with content area teachers in developing literacy strategies to help middle school students become better readers of content area texts

1995-1994 Researcher and Assistant, Learning Edge, Summer Intensive Reading/Writing Institute for Secondary Urban Students (Cross-listed under Service: Community and State)

PROFESSIONAL OUTREACH: UNIVERSITY

Outreach: Georgia State University

2011-2010 Member, GSU, Senate Subcommittee on Administrator Evaluations
2012-2010 Member, Cultural Diversity Committee
2011-2010 Member, GSU, Senate Subcommittee to study salary compression and equity, Cultural Diversity Committee
2012-2010 Member, Faculty Affairs Committee
2012-2004 Member, GSU, University Senate
2010-2008 Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
2010-2008 Member, GSU, Background Investigation Committee
2010-2009 Planning and Development Committee, University Senate
2010-2009 Drafting Procedures for Administration Evaluations Subcommittee
2008-2009 Member, GSU, Senate Subcommittee on Triennial Administrator Evaluations
2008-2009 Member, GSU, Senate Subcommittee, Tenure Clock Delay
2008-2009 Member, GSU, Senate Subcommittee, AOW Report on Salary Inequity
2008 Member, GSU, Senate Subcommittee, Faculty Evaluations
2011-2004 Member, GSU, Faculty Affairs Committee
2011-2004 Member, GSU, Cultural Diversity Committee
2008-2007 Member, GSU, African American Male Initiative Subcommittee
2008-2007 Member, GSU, Deans’ Evaluation Subcommittee
2007-2006 Member, GSU, Domestic Partnership Benefits Subcommittee
2008-2006 Member, GSU, Tenure-clock Delay Subcommittee
2006-2005 Member, GSU, Faculty Information Management System Subcommittee
2004-2003 Member, GSU, Search Committee, Art Education

Outreach: College of Education, Georgia State University

2011 Search Committee Member, Urban Literacy Clinic
2011-2010 Member, Ad Hoc Committee to study salary compression and equity
2011-2009 Member, Ad Hoc Committee to Examine Doctoral Education
2011-2010 Supported faculty writing P&T narratives and CVs
2008-2001 Member, Content Knowledge Committee, Professional Education Faculty
2007-2005 Chair, Content Knowledge Committee, Professional Education Faculty
2004-1998 Member, Student Affairs Committee
2004-1997 Member. Standards in Teacher Education Performance
2001-1998 Board Member. Peachtree Urban Writing Project, College of Education
2000-1999 University Fellow, Atlanta Urban Compact Coalition, literacy consultant work with teachers in urban schools, under the direction of Lisa Delpit

Outreach: Department: Middle and Secondary Education and Instructional Technology

Present -2008 Ph.D. Coordinator; Faculty Sponsor for Doctoral Web Seminars; Ph.D. Coordinator, wrote FAQs, created database of Ph.D. students, prepared PAW session; prepare all materials for applications, Handbook; created Ph.D. listserv
2010-2011 Mentor to New Language and Literacy Faculty
2011 Announcer at Honors Day for MSIT award recipients
2010 Faculty mentoring conversations: Writing narratives for the P&T document.
2010-2009 Search Committee, Literacy Education, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education
2009 Supported College faculty in writing responses to tenure decisions
2010-2008 Annual Review Committee
2008 CLUES Conference, Secured Keynote Speaker
2008 Chair, Search Committee, English Education, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education
2008 Chair, Peer Review Committee, Annual Review of Faculty, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education
2008-2007 uiCLAD Committee, urban internet Conversations in Literacy, the Arts, and Digital Technologies
2008-2007 Member, Awards Committee, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education
2008-2007 Facilitator, Book Writing Club, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education
2008-2003 Ed.S. English Education, point person, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education
2008-2003 Promotion and Tenure Committee, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education
2008-2006 Member, Diversity Committee, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education
2007-2006 Member, Peer Review Committee, Annual Review of Faculty, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education
2007-2006  Search Committee, English education, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education
2006-2005  Unit coordinator, Language and Literacy Education
2006      Diversity Committee, program co-coordinator of Retreat, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education
2006      Secretary, MSIT Department
2006-2003  Social Committee, MSIT Department
2005      Advisory Council, MSIT Department
2004-2002  Presenter, Praxis II Workshop, English Education, Language and Literacy
2003-1999  Member, Secondary Education Committee, MSIT Department
2003-1999  Co-director, Georgia Read Write Now Conference
2002      Chair, Search Committee, Language and Literacy
1999-1998  Member, Partnership Schools, MSIT Department
1998-1997  Search Committee, Social Studies Education, MSIT Department
1998      Honors Day Committee

Outreach: Indiana University School of Education

1996-1994  Literacy Forum, Student Coordinator, worked alongside Dr. Robert Arnove
1996-1995  Member, Teacher Education Steering Committee
1996-1995  Facilitator and Instructor, Drama Seminar for Theater Majors in English education
1996-1994  Facilitator and Instructor, Table Talks, Discussion forums for undergraduate preservice teachers on educational issues
1996-1993  Facilitator and Instructor, Seminars on Multiple Sign Systems in the Content Areas, for undergraduate preservice content area teachers
1995      Facilitator and Instructor, Urban Area Preservice Teachers Seminar
1995      Facilitator and Instructor, Seminar in Reading/Writing Strategies, for secondary content area teachers
1995      Reading/writing Strategies for Secondary Students, inservice workshop for content area teachers at Tri-North Middle School, Monroe Country School Corporation, Bloomington, IN.
1993      Facilitator, Writing Circle, undergraduate writing group to share and critique works, both creative and academic, in progress.

PROFESSIONAL OUTREACH: COMMUNITY AND STATE

2011-2010  Writing support (resumes, cover letters) for instructors at the Decatur-DeKalb YMCA.
2011-2010  Mentor to student at Clark-Atlanta University on Writing Dissertation Prospecti
2010      Empty Bowl Dinner; contributor for homeless in Atlanta
2009      Writing support (resumes, artists’ statements) for potters applying for graduate school, for juried shows, for unjuried shows
2009      Empty Bowl Dinner, Georgia Association for Women in Law: contributor for homeless in Atlanta and for female students wishing to attend law school but need financial support
2008-2006  Facilitator, Academic Writing Support Group, Spelman College faculty working to publish in academic journals, Atlanta, GA
2008-2006 Empty Bowl Dinner, Publicity and contributor, fundraiser for the homeless in Atlanta, GA supported by local and national potters (Tom Zwerlein, contact person)
2009-2002 Videographer, videotaping inter/nationally known potters’ processes, and create 30-minute documentaries about their work and throwing processes
2008-2002 Member, Callanwolde Clay Guild, assist co-chairs with community art shows
2008-2000 Writing consultant to potters, support local potters to develop artists’ statements, vitae, and portfolios
2008-1997 Photographer/Record keeper, Callanwolde Fine Arts Center, Ceramics program, photograph pottery shows, pottery workshops, and write up techniques and processes of local, state, and inter/nationally known potters
2007 Pottery workshop, Park Springs Retirement Homes, Stone Mountain, GA (Lisa Kiely, director)
2006 Technology and the English language arts, workshop presentation for undergraduate education majors, Spelman College, Atlanta, GA (Gwen Williams, instructor)
2006 Windows Movie Maker workshop, Edwards Middle School, Conyers, GA
2005 Invited to participate in Georgia Assessment for the Certification of Educators revision of assessment tool, Professional Standards Commission
2005 Art, mask-making and literacy, workshop for third grade class, Toney Elementary School, Decatur, GA (Elyse Davis, teacher)
2005 Literacy through the arts, mask-making/writing workshop for sixth grade English learners, Edwards Middle School, Conyers, GA (Tammy Frederick, teacher)
2005 Clay as Language, PowerPoint Presentation and clay workshop, Park Springs Retirement Center, Stone Mountain, GA (Lisa Kiely, director)
2004 Multimodal literacy, presentation in ninth grade reading class, Reedley High School, Reedley, CA (Oscar Hernandez, teacher)
2004 Arts-based literacy workshop, presentation in ninth grade reading class, Reedley High School, Reedley, CA (Yadira Gonzalez)
2002 Arts-based literacy workshop in clay, Slater Elementary School, Atlanta, GA (Amy Gonglefski teacher)
2002-2001 Series of literacy workshops in visual media, Inman Middle School, Atlanta, GA (Clori Rose, teacher)
2002-2000 Co-chair, Callanwolde Clay Guild, organized pottery shows for this group
2002-2000 Editor, Callanwolde Clay Guild Newsletter, newsletter that highlighted local and state ceramic events
2001-1995 Facilitator/presenter, literature studies, Arab High School, Arab, AL, (Darriel Ledbetter, teacher)
2000 Series of literacy workshops in visual media, St. John the Evangelist Catholic School, (Jennifer Dail, teacher)
2000 Literacy workshops with teachers and students, Paul D. West Middle School, East Point, GA
2000 Multimodal literacy workshop with second grade students, Parklane Elementary School, East Point, GA (Wendy Abramowitz, teacher)
1998 Literacy, inquiry and the arts workshops with fourth grade students, Slaton Elementary School, (Jodi Moscowitz, teacher)
1997  Initiating Critical Conversations: Connecting Students' Lived Experiences Through Literature, invited presentation and workshop focused on literature studies, English Department, Arab High School, Arab, AL
1995-1994  Researcher and Assistant, Learning Edge, Summer Intensive Reading/Writing Institute for Secondary Urban Students (Cross-listed under Consultations)

TEACHING

Awards (Cross-listed under Awards, Honors, and Distinctions):

2011  Recipient of the Georgia Council of Teachers of English Professor of the Year Award, Georgia Council of Teachers of English

2008-2007  Distinguished Program in Teacher Education, Georgia Association of Teacher Educators. Award and cash prize presented to the TEEMS English Education MAT Degree Program Faculty (Drs. Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, Ewa McGrail, and Michelle Zoss), October 11, 2007. (Cross-listed under Honors, Awards, and Distinctions)

1995  Outstanding Associate Instructor, School of Education, Indiana University (1995) (Cross-listed under Honors, Awards, and Distinctions)

Graduate Courses Taught

Summer, 2011  EDCI 8810 Directed Rdgs  Georgia State University
Three students

Summer, 2011  EDRD 8310 Theoretical Models  Georgia State University
and Processes of Language

Summer, 2011  EDLA 7150 Children’s and Young Adult Literature  Georgia State University

Summer, 2011  GLIS 6758 Topics in Literacy  Mt. St. Vincent University
Literacy through the Arts  Nova Scotia, Canada (Toronto Campus, with Jerome C. Harste, Vivian Vasquez

Spring, 2011  EDRD 6600 Intro to Materials and Methods of Teaching Reading  Georgia State University

Fall, 2010  EDCI 9850 Proposal Writing, Research Seminar  Georgia State University

Fall, 2010  EDRD 6600 Intro to Materials and Methods of Teaching Reading  Georgia State University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2010</td>
<td>GLIS 6758</td>
<td>Topics in Literacy</td>
<td>Mt. St. Vincent University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy through the arts</td>
<td>Nova Scotia, Canada (Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campus, with Jerome C. Harste,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vivian Vasquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2010</td>
<td>EDCI 8990</td>
<td>Seminar in Tchg and Learning</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2010</td>
<td>EDRD 8310</td>
<td>Theoretical Models and Processes of Language</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2010</td>
<td>EDCI 8810</td>
<td>Directed Readings</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2010</td>
<td>EDRD 8550</td>
<td>Visual Methodologies</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2010</td>
<td>EDCI 9900L</td>
<td>Critique of Educational Research</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2009</td>
<td>EDRD 6600</td>
<td>Intro to Materials and Methods of Teaching Reading</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2009</td>
<td>RGNT 0198</td>
<td>Regent’s Reading</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2009</td>
<td>EDLA 7150</td>
<td>Children’s and Young Adult Literature</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2009</td>
<td>EDRD 8310</td>
<td>Theoretical Models and Processes of Language</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2009</td>
<td>EDCI 9900L</td>
<td>Critique of Educational Research</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2009</td>
<td>EDCI 8810</td>
<td>Directed Readings</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Multimodality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2009</td>
<td>EDCI 7670/7680</td>
<td>Practicum II &amp; III</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2008</td>
<td>EDLA 6550</td>
<td>Principles of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2008</td>
<td>GLIS 6758</td>
<td>Topics in Literacy</td>
<td>Mt. St. Vincent University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Literacy, Podcasting, &amp; Role of Digital Media</td>
<td>Nova Scotia, Canada (Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campus, with Jerome C. Harste,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vivian Vasquez, Colin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maymester, 2008</td>
<td>RGNT Regent’s Reading</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2008</td>
<td>EDCI 9900L</td>
<td>Critique of Educational Research Directed Readings (Semiotics)</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2007</td>
<td>EDLA 6550</td>
<td>Principles of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7660</td>
<td>Practicum I</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maymester, 2007</td>
<td>EDRD 8550</td>
<td>Trends &amp; Issues in Literacy Education (Nonfiction In Language Arts and Social Studies)</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RGNT Regent’s Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 7150</td>
<td>Children’s and Young Adult Literature</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2007</td>
<td>EDLA 7150</td>
<td>Children’s and Young Adult Literature</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7670/7680</td>
<td>Practicum II &amp; III</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2006</td>
<td>EDLA 7440</td>
<td>Theory and Pedagogy of Literature Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD 7600</td>
<td>Theory and Pedagogy of Literacy Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2006</td>
<td>EDLA 6550</td>
<td>Principles of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD 7600</td>
<td>Theory and Pedagogy of Literacy Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2006</td>
<td>EDCI 7670/7680</td>
<td>Practicum II &amp; III</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2005</td>
<td>EDLA 7440</td>
<td>Theory and Pedagogy of Literature Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 9850</td>
<td>Proposal Writing, Doctoral Seminar</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2005</td>
<td>EDLA 6550</td>
<td>Principles of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD 7600</td>
<td>Theory and Pedagogy of Literacy Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2005</td>
<td>EDRD 8550</td>
<td>Trends and Issues in Literacy Education (Semiotics &amp; Multiliteracies)</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7670/7680</td>
<td>Practicum II &amp; III</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2005</td>
<td>EDLA 6550</td>
<td>Principles of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Course Details</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2004</td>
<td>EDRA 6550 Principles of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD 7600 Theory and Pedagogy of Literacy Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2004</td>
<td>EDCI 7670/7680 Practicum II &amp; III</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 7150 Middle and Secondary Literature</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2003</td>
<td>EDCI 7660 Practicum I</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 6550 Principles of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2003</td>
<td>EDLA 6550 Principles of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2003</td>
<td>GLIS 6758 Topics in Literacy Arts &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>Mt. St. Vincent University Nova Scotia, Canada (Toronto Arts &amp; Literacy Campus, with Jerome C. Harste)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2003</td>
<td>EDCI 7670/7680 Practicum II &amp; III</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2002</td>
<td>EDCI 7660 Practicum I</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 6550 Principles of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2002</td>
<td>EDLA 6550 Principles of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD 8280 Literacy in a Diverse Society</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2002</td>
<td>EDLA 7550 Theory and Pedagogy of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2002</td>
<td>EDCI 7670/7680 Practicum II &amp; III</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Course Codes and Details</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2001</td>
<td>EDLA 7550 Theory and Pedagogy of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7660 Practicum I</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2001</td>
<td>EDLA 6550 Principles of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 7150 Middle and Secondary Literature</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2001</td>
<td>EDRD 7600 Theory and Pedagogy of Literacy Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7670/7680 Practicum II &amp; III</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2000</td>
<td>EDRD 8550 Trends and Issues In Literacy (The Politics of Literacy)</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 7550 Theory and Pedagogy of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7660 Practicum I</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2000</td>
<td>EDRD 8550 Trends and Issues in Literacy (Language, Literacy and the Arts)</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 6550 Principles of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2000</td>
<td>EDLA 7150 Middle and Secondary Literature</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7670/7680 Practicum II &amp; III</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD 9980 Advanced Research Seminar</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1999</td>
<td>EDLA 7550 Theory and Pedagogy of English Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD 9980 Doctoral Seminar In Literacy (Henry Giroux)</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 7660 Practicum I</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 1999</td>
<td>EDRD 9980 Doctoral Seminar In Literacy (John Dewey)</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD 8550 Trends and Issues in Literacy (Language, Literacy and the Arts)</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDLA 7150 Middle and Secondary Literature</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 1999</td>
<td>EDRD 7600 Theory and Pedagogy</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the Teaching of Reading
EDRD 7630 Literacy in the Content Areas
Georgia State University
EDCI 7670/7680 Practicum II & III
Georgia State University

Fall, 1998
EDRD 8280 Literacy in a Diverse Georgia State University Society

Summer, 1998
EDLA 749 Advanced Literature for Middle Child Education
EDCI 655 Methods in Teaching English
Georgia State University

Spring, 1998
EDRD 734 Literacy in the Content Areas
EDCI 748 Advanced Language Arts
Georgia State University

Winter, 1998
EDLA 744 Adolescent Literature Georgia State University
EDLA 946 Research Internship (Ind. Study)
Georgia State University

Fall, 1997
EDLA 754 Teaching English in Secondary Schools
EDCI 866 Practicum I
Georgia State University

Summer, 1997
EDCI 660 Introduction to Secondary Teaching
EDLA 655 Methods in Teaching English
Georgia State University

Spring, 1997
EDRD 862 Issues and Trends in Reading Education
Georgia State University

Winter, 1997
EDLA 746 Oral and Written Communication For Middle Childhood Education
Georgia State University

Undergraduate Courses Taught

Fall, 1999
EDLA 4550 Principles of English Instruction
EDCI 4595 Introduction to Secondary Education
Georgia State University

Fall, 1998
EDCI 4595 Introduction to Secondary Education
EDLA 4550 Principles of English Instruction
Georgia State University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Course Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1996</td>
<td>M452/450 Methods of TeachingIndiana University English/Speech/Drama/Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M401 Early Field Experiences Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 1996</td>
<td>M452/450 Methods of TeachingIndiana University English/Speech/Drama/Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M401 Early Field Experiences Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1995</td>
<td>M464 Methods of TeachingIndiana University Secondary Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M401 Early Field Experiences Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M452/450 Methods of TeachingIndiana University English/Speech/Drama/Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 1995</td>
<td>M464 Methods of TeachingIndiana University Secondary Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M401 Early Field Experiences Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1994</td>
<td>M464 Methods of TeachingIndiana University Secondary Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M401 Early Field Experiences Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 1994</td>
<td>M464 Methods of TeachingIndiana University Secondary Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M401 Early Field Experiences Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1993</td>
<td>M464 Methods of TeachingIndiana University Secondary Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M401 Early Field Experiences Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 1993</td>
<td>M401 Early Field Experiences Indiana University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate Practicum Supervision

This supervision entails working with TEEMS (Teacher Education Environments in English, ESOL, Math, MCE, Science and Social Studies) members as they begin their work in middle schools and high schools. TEEMS English Education is a Master’s of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) degree in English education in which students enter with an undergraduate degree in English and receive a master’s degree and an initial teaching certification, often within a calendar year. Students
participate in two major practicums within metro Atlanta, one in the summer with middle school students, and a two-semester year-long practicum in a high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th># of Pre-service Teachers</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2009 University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2008 University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2007 University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2007 University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2006 University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2005 University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2004 University</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2003 University</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2002 University</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2001 University</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2001 University</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2000 University</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2000 University</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1999 University</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 1999 University</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1997 University</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undergraduate Practicum Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th># of Pre-service Teachers</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1998 University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Practicum Supervision

Conceived by Tri-North Middle School in Bloomington, IN, Indiana University’s Language Education department chair and myself, this practicum evolved from a need by both the middle school and the university to help middle school students become better readers and writers,
and for preservice teachers to receive substantive teaching experience. Together, we developed a practicum which fit their needs and which fulfilled the goals of the secondary reading course. I designed and orchestrated this practicum from its start in the Fall of 1995. My duties involved supervising preservice content area teachers in classrooms and acting as a liaison between preservice teachers and the middle school teachers with whom they worked. I continually maintained communication between the teachers and myself, resolving difficulties which arose and supporting preservice teachers as they planned their teaching lessons in these classrooms. This reciprocal relationship between Indiana University and Tri-North Middle School continues to be in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th># of Pre-service Teachers</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1995</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 1995</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1994</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 1994</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1993</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses Taught at Other Institutions (Cross-listed under Courses Taught)

- **Summer, 2011**
  - GLIS 6758
  - Topics in Literacy
  - Critical Literacy and Arts
  - Mt. St. Vincent University
  - Nova Scotia, Canada (Toronto Campus, with Jerome C. Harste, Vivian Vasquez)

- **Summer, 2010**
  - GLIS 6758
  - Topics in Literacy
  - Critical Literacy and the arts
  - Mt. St. Vincent University
  - Nova Scotia, Canada (Toronto Campus, with Jerome C. Harste, Vivian Vasquez)

- **Summer, 2008**
  - GLIS 6758
  - Topics in Literacy
  - Critical Literacy, Podcasting, & Role of Digital Media
  - Mt. St. Vincent University
  - Nova Scotia, Canada (Toronto Campus, with Jerome C. Harste, Vivian Vasquez, Colin Lankshear, Michelle Knobel)

- **Summer, 2003**
  - GLIS 6758
  - Topics in Literacy
  - Mt. St. Vincent University
  - Nova Scotia, Canada (Toronto Campus, with Jerome C. Harste)

Courses Developed at Georgia State

- EDRD 8550 Trends and Issues in Literacy Education, Visual Methodologies
- EDRD 9980 Doctoral Seminar In Literacy (John Dewey)
- EDRD 8280 Literacy in a Diverse Society
- EDRD 8550 Trends and Issues in Literacy (Nonfiction for SS/LL)
- EDRD 8550 Trends and Issues In Literacy (The Politics of Literacy)
Student Advisement

Doctoral Dissertation Advisement at a Glance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Program of Study Chair</th>
<th>Doctoral Program of Study Committee Member</th>
<th>Doctoral Dissertation Committee Chair</th>
<th>Doctoral Dissertation Committee Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completed Dissertations: Chair (7)

Bruhn, Tara (2005). “I am an island to myself:” How one veteran language arts teacher’s beliefs, experience, and philosophy translate into classroom practice. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Cowan, Kay (2001). The visual-verbal connections of literacy: An examination of the composing processes of the fifth- and sixth-grade student. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. Outstanding Dissertation Award, College of Education, Language and Literacy, Georgia State University (Cross-listed under Evidence of Student Achievement)

Fair, Randy (2001). “Yes, I should, but no I wouldn’t”: Teachers’ attitudes towards introducing lesbian/gay issues in the literature classroom. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Frederick, Tammy (2010). Semiosis of self: Meaning making in a high school Spanish for native speakers class. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Race, Cassie (2004). The Struggling reader in a high school basic reading and writing class: Perceptions of literacy, technology, and schooling. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Williams, Margo (2009). On the border of a new culture: Perceptions, expectations, and attitudes of newcomer middle school students. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Completed Dissertations: Committee Member (12)
Brown, Nancy (2002). The role of the media specialist in elementary schools with a majority limited English proficient Latino enrollment. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Corga, Yesim (2008). Crossing borders from a critical stance: Case studies on German and American female minority teachers’ perspective on multicultural education

Crain, Anne (2003). The role of the reading specialist: Perspectives of content area teachers and reading specialists. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Danley, Charrita (2003). Playing both sides of the field: African American high school students’ struggle for success on the linguistic turfs of home and school. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Howard, Frances (1999). Bearded mothers and breasted fathers, paradox or vision?: The influence of gender and epistemology on the pedagogy of two beginning teachers. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Fisher, Terry. (2009). Aspects of a teacher educator’s lived experiences that have shaped them towards a commitment to social justice and political change. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Hallisey-Case, Carol (2003). Field testing an integrated art education curriculum: Do students make the connections? Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Kinnard, Melissa (2009). Orchestrating student discourse opportunities and listening for conceptual change in high school science classrooms. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Rotter, Arlene (2003). Limited English proficient students’ perspectives and dispositions regarding experiences in high school. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Shams, Marcia (2001). Literacies through life profiles: Chronicles of two expelled high school males. Unpublished dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Doctoral Dissertation Committee, Chair, in Progress (7)

Heather Lynch (prospectus). The literacy practices of one video gamer (working title).

Dru Tomlin (prospectus), Body as text in administrative contexts (working title).

Mary Huysman (prospectus), Content area teachers and their roles as literacy teachers (working title).

Marie Bruner (prospectus), Teachers work with Facebook (working title).

Jennifer Ureno (prospectus). Multimodal teaching and learning in a kindergarten ESL class (working title).

Crystal Robinson (prospectus). Hip hop literacies: How hip hop culture can enhance student literacy (working title).

Sandra Sessoms (prospectus). African American males’ literacy practices: Empowerment through the use of teacher study groups (working title)

Doctoral Dissertation Committee, Committee Member, in Progress (5)
Alisha White (prospectus), Artistic frames: Experience and meaning of arts integration (working title)
Svetlova Dimova (prospectus), Foreign language instruction at the secondary level: Aiming to develop lifelong learning habits through content area learning (working title)
Rita Baker (prospectus; art education), The effects of the art curriculum on black male identity (working title)
Nicole Manry Pourchier (prospectus), Coming to know: Literacy, visual arts, and postmodern picturebooks. (working title)
Jamie Spinks (prospectus). Reading, writing, and viewing in a third grade classroom (working title).

Doctoral Program Committees: Chair (18)

Katherine Greene, in progress
Margul Woolfolk, in progress
Katherine Greene, in progress
Ryan Boylan, in progress
Leslie Bell, in progress
Robert Clemente, in progress
Monique O’Shea, in progress
Janelle Gardner, in progress
Dru Tomlin, completed
Heather Lynch, completed
Margo Williams, completed
Tara Bruhn, completed
Kay Cowan, completed
Randy Fair, completed
Cassie Race, completed
Sandra Sessoms, completed
Michael Shirley, completed
Mary Thompson, completed

Doctoral Program Committees: Member (16)

Megan Nason, in progress
David Brown, in progress
David Langley (music education), in progress
Rita Baker (art education), in progress
Lauren Phillips (art ed), in progress
Sarah Mantegna, in progress
Kimberly Guinn, in progress
Alisha White, completed
Nicole Manry Pourchier, completed
Omer Ari, completed
Lisa Eickholdt, completed
Tammy Frederick, completed
Frances Howard, completed
Shannon O’Day, completed
Arlene Rotter, completed
Marcia Shams, completed

Ed.S. and Masters Committees
Over the years, I have chaired and advised over 300 students in both the Ed.S. and masters English education and reading programs

Products Developed for Teaching (list):


Supervision/Advisement: Internships, Directed Readings, and Audited Classes

Summary Table: Directed Readings, Teaching/Research Internships/Audited Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI 8810</th>
<th>EDCI 9660 (Tchg)</th>
<th>EDCI 9660 (Research)</th>
<th>Audited Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students Auditing Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Total #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Mantegna</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Visual Methodologies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dru Tomlin</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Critique of Ed Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervision/Instruction Directed Readings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Semester of EDRD 8810</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Total #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamania Wynter</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Critical Literacy</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Davis</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Schema Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dru Tomlin</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Visual analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shae O’Neill</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shae O’Neill</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Ureno</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Visual Analyses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Fisher</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Teacher Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Frederick</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Visual Analyses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervision/Instruction Teaching Internships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Semester of Tchg Internships</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Total #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katie Greene</td>
<td>Maymester</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>EDLA 7150</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence of Student Achievement
Evidence of student achievement is found in the awards that they have received, national, state, and/or local committees on which they serve, manuscripts they have published, and presentations at inter/national, state, and local conferences they have made.

Awards and Honors (Sample listing)

2011 Katherine Greene, along with Peggy Albers, was selected to co-chair, Connections, Georgia Council of Teachers of English, bi-annual professional journal.
2010 Katherine Greene: Elected by colleagues for Milton High School Local School Advisory Committee (LSAC). Works with administrators, parents, and community leaders to benefit Milton and the larger school community. (Local)
2010 Katherine Greene, GCTE Teacher of the Year. (State)
2010 Katherine Greene, Elected to Secondary Steering Committee, National Council of Teachers of English. Elected by the constituents for a two-year term. (National)
2010 Nicole Manry Pourchier and Tammy Frederick, invited to serve on 59th NRC Yearbook editorial team, a premiere research journal of proceedings from the NRC annual conference. (National)
2010 Heather Lynch, and Nicole Manry Pourchier, invited to serve as proposal reviewers for NRC. (National)
2009 Shekema Holmes, elected position, Secondary Nominating Committee, National Council of Teachers of English. (National)
2009 Tammy Fredrick, Outstanding Doctoral Student, Language and Literacy. (MSIT Department)
2009  Emily Decker, Outstanding Masters of Arts in English Education Award. (MSIT Department).
2009  Kyra Caldwell, GCTE Future Teacher of Color Award. (State)
2009  Melissa Kinnard, Outstanding Doctoral Student Award, (MSIT Department).
2008  Shekema Holmes, NCTE Early Career Educator of Color Leadership Award. (National)
2008  Tammy Frederick, Outstanding Doctoral Student in Research Award, Language and Literacy. (MSIT Department)
2007  Christina Pennell, Georgia Council of Teachers of English Student Teacher of the Year. (State)
2007  Christina Daniel, Teacher of the Year, Riverdale High School, Riverdale, . (County)
2007  Michelle Yother, Georgia Power New Teacher Assistance Grant. (State)
2007  Edward Ellis, Language and Literacy, Outstanding M.Ed. Student. (Initial Preparation, MSIT Department)
2006  Teresa Fisher, COE Fellowship, three year full-scholarship for doctoral studies. (College)
2006  Jennifer Ureno, COE Fellowship, three year full-scholarship for doctoral studies. (College)
2006  Marvin Pue, Teacher of the Year, Creekside High School, Fulton Co. Schools. (County)
2006  TEEMS English Education Students’ ETS Recognition of Excellence for outstanding scores on the Praxis II English Language, Literature, and Composition Content Knowledge Exam: Lisa Arnold (199/200), Christine Brand (197/200), Ivy Carroll (194/200), Moira Gillott (194/200), Courtney Preston (perfect: 200/200), Cara Rankart (198/200), Allison Redd (perfect: 200/200), Lori Webster (194/200)
2005  Charles Penn, middle school and system-wide Teacher of the Year, Atlanta Public Schools. (County)
2005  Allison Redd, Language and Literacy, Outstanding M.Ed. Student. (MSIT Department)
2005  TEEMS English Education Students’ ETS Recognition of Excellence for outstanding scores on the Praxis II English Language, Literature, and Composition Content Knowledge Exam: Erin E. Daily (197/200), Joseph Hunt (198/200), Bethany Hedges (198/200), Lisa Powell (perfect: 200/200)
2004  Christina Daniel, NCTE Early Career Educator of Color Leadership Award. (National)
2004  Denise Buckelew, Language and Literacy, College of Education Graduate Student Scholarship. (MSIT Department)
2003  Mel Mann, Georgia Council of Teachers of English Conference Award for Future Teachers of Color. (State)
2002  Kay Cowan, Outstanding Dissertation, College of Education, GSU. (College)
2002  Christina Daniel, Georgia Council of Teachers of English Conference Award for Future Teachers of Color. (State)

Selected Publications


Selected Conference Presentations


Cowan, K., Harste, J.C., Frederick, T., & Albers, P. (2008). What difference do the arts make in literacy learning? International Reading Association Conference, Atlanta, GA. (former and current doctoral students)


Cowan, K., Harste, J.C., Frederick, T., & Albers, P. (2008). What difference do the arts make in literacy learning? International Reading Association Conference, Atlanta, GA. (former and current doctoral students)

Albers, P., Frederick, T., & Thompson, C. (2008). National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL. “We teach who we are”: A study of two Latino teachers, their reflective practices, and their literacy work with struggling Latino students. (current doctoral students)


Antine, E. A. (2003). Reading aloud with short fiction to enhance inference skills. Georgia Read Write Now Conference, Atlanta, GA. (former masters student, initial preparation)

Clark, E. (2002). Integrating the arts into a secondary curriculum. Georgia Read Write Now Conference, Atlanta, GA. (former masters student)

Mearon, J. (2002). Integrating the arts into high school English instruction. Georgia Read Write Now Conference, Atlanta, GA. (former masters student)
CURRICULUM VITA

MARY ARIAIL
Associate Professor
Associate Chair, Department of Middle-Secondary Education & Instructional Technology

Education
Ph.D. Language Education University of Georgia
M.Ed. Middle School Education University of Georgia
B.S. Housing and Interior Environment Colorado State University
B.S. Home Economics Education University of Georgia

Teaching Experience (Academic)
Associate Professor Georgia State University Spring 2007 - Present
Atlanta, GA
Assistant Professor Georgia State University Fall 2003 – Spring 2007
Atlanta, GA
Assistant Professor Texas Woman’s University Fall 2000 – summer 2003
Denton, TX
Adjunct Professor University of Texas Fall 1998 – spring 2000
Austin, TX
Lecturer University of Georgia Spring 1996 – spring 1997
Athens, GA
Public School Teacher Rockdale County Schools Spring 1990 – spring 1995
Conyers, GA
Music Teacher Valley View Elementary Fall 1986 – spring 1987
Valley View, TX

Administrative Experience (Academic)
Associate Chair Fall 2008 to Present
Department of Middle-Secondary Education & Instructional Technology
Georgia State University

Coordinator Middle Childhood Education TEEMS for Spring 2007 to
Present
Language Arts and Social Studies
Georgia State University

University Coordinator for Professional Development School Spring 2007 -
Present
Peachtree Charter Middle School
Dunwoody, GA
Coordinator Undergraduate Program  
2006  
Middle Childhood Education program  
Georgia State University

Business and Professional Experience
Owner & Designer, Gainesville Home Interiors  
February 1983 – September 1989  
Gainesville, TX

Owner & Designer, Ocala Interiors  
October 1981 – January 1983  
Ocala, FL

Interior Designer, Koontz Furniture Store  
January 1980 – October 1981  
Ocala, FL

INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Publications: Refereed Journal Articles and Book Chapters  
(Please note name change from Broughton, M.A. to Ariail, M. I have published works under both names.)


Publications: Encyclopedia Entries/Monographs/Reports


Professional Presentations (Refereed)


Broughton, M.A., & Albright, L.K. (November 2003). What does research have to say about reading aloud in middle school? Paper presentation, National Middle School Association, Atlanta, GA.


Professional Presentations (Not Refereed)


E. Editorial/Reviewer Projects

- Editorial Board Member/Reviewer  
  - English Education (2003 – present)  
  - English Journal (2003 – present)  
  - Yearbook of the National Reading Conference (2001-present)

- Proposal Reviewer (2004): Conference proposals submitted to the Literature SIG and the Middle Level Education SIG of the American Educational Research Association annual meeting

- Grant Reviewer (2005 and 2006). Invited external reviewer for two grant proposals from Dr. Dorothy Leal of Ohio University for support of a project entitled “Identifying Benchmark Data for 1st-12th grade Students’ Word Writing Abilities for Complexity, Accuracy and Fluency.”

Courses Taught (Georgia State University)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Level(s)</th>
<th># Times Taught</th>
<th>Average Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGTR 0198 –</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regents’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLA 3200 –</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Adolescents’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLA 4400 –</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEEMS LA/SS</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDRD 7600 –</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Study of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLA 7440 –</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Teaching of Literature</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Courses Taught (Texas Woman’s University)

Course Level #
Times Taught
EDRB 3413: Reading/Language Arts: Practice to Theory I B.S.E. 2
EDRB 4483: Reading/Language Arts: Practice to Theory II B.S.E. 5
READ 4383: Phonological and Orthographic Principles in Reading B.S.E. 1
ERDB 4413: Integrated Language Arts for Grades 4 – 8. B.S.E. 2
ERDB 5423: Reading/Language Arts: Practice to Theory M.Ed. 2
ERDB 6583: Research in Reading Ph.D. 1

Professional and Honor Organizations and Activities

A. Membership
- ALAN (Assembly on Literature for Adolescents) (2005–present)
- Children’s Literature Assembly (2005 – present)
- Denton Rotary Club member 2000 - 2003; Chair of 2002 “Storybook Christmas” book drive
- Founding Member: International Society for Language Studies
- International Reading Association (1999 – 2005)
- Literacy Clinic, Georgia State University (2006-2007)
- National Council of Teachers of English (1996 – present)
- National Middle School Association (2000 – present)
- National Reading Conference (1996 – present)
- Texas Council of Teachers of English Language Arts (2002-2003)
- Kappa Delta Pi Honor Society (Corresponding secretary, 1996-97)
- Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society
- Alpha Upsilon Alpha (Treasurer, 1996-97)
- Outstanding Young Women of America (1985)

B. Offices/Committees/Presentations
- Executive Board, Georgia Council of Teachers of English (2009)
- Field Council Representative, National Reading Conference (2005-present)
• Chair, Literature Special Interest Group (SIG), American Educational Research Association (2002-2004)
• Secretary/Treasurer, Literature Special Interest Group (SIG), American Educational Research Association (2000-2001)
• Executive Board member of the Texas Council of Teachers of English/Language Arts (2002-2003); Vice-President-elect for Affiliates, Texas Council of Teachers of English/Language Arts. This position included a one-year apprenticeship with the Vice-president of Affiliates. (2003)

Grants, Awards, and Honors
• Member, Kappa Delta Pi, International Honor Society in Education
• External grant from TQE Professional Development Schools Deliver Success Grant for Peachtree Charter Middle School Writing Project, $2,000. 2007-2008. Funds from the grant were used to provide materials and instruction for after-school writing class at the middle school.
• Internal grant from College of Education Proposal Review Committee of Georgia State University - $3000. (November 2003). Co-recipient with Rudy Sirochman of the Department of Middle-Secondary & Instructional Technology at GSU. Funds from the grant were used for GRA support of a mixed-methods study at Cross Keys High School in DeKalb County, GA in 2003-2004.
• Travel Assistance Fund of Texas Woman’s University - $600 (October 2001) Recipient of funds to support presentation of research on “Engaging Middle School Students through Picture-Book Read-Alouds” at the National Council of Teachers of English annual convention in Baltimore, MD.
• Travel Assistance Fund of Texas Woman’s University - $600 (October 2000). Recipient of funds to support presentation of research on a longitudinal project on early adolescent girls’ construction of the self in a language arts classroom. The session, presented jointly with Dr. Colleen Fairbanks of the University of Texas, was entitled, “Stances and Dances: How Girls Negotiate Constructions of the Self in the Language Arts
• Outstanding Teaching Award, College of Professional Education, Texas Woman’s University (2003)
• “Senior Favorite” Teaching Award, Texas Woman’s University (2003)

Service

Service to the Profession
Service Location or Organization Date
GCTE Executive Board — SLATE Representative Georgia Council of Teachers of English Sept. 2009-present
Participant, Reading First Higher Education Symposium University of Georgia July 27-28 2006
Participant, Summit Conference on English Education Leadership and Policy Georgia State University May 20-22 2005
Vice-president-elect, Affiliates (2002) and vice-president, Membership of TCTELA; developed publicity flyer for state conference for TCTELA Texas Council of Teachers of English Language Arts (TCTELA) 2002-2003
Chair, Georgia Read Write Now Conference  GSU  
College of Education  Jan. 2005  
Jan. 2006  
Chair, AERA Literature SIG (two years)  American Educational Research Assoc.  2001- 2003  
Secretary/Treasurer, AERA Literature SIG  American Educational Research Assoc.  2000-2001  

Service to the University  

Service  Location or Organization  Date  
Member, Leadership Consortium Board  NET-Q Teacher Enhancement Grant  2011  
Member, Search Committee to hire NET-Q faculty  NET-Q Teacher Enhancement Grant  2011  
Member, Search Committee to hire Middle Level Tenure-Track Faculty  GSU Dept. of MSIT  2011  
Chair, Search Committee to hire Middle Level Clinical Faculty  GSU Dept. of MSIT  2009  
Member, PEF Assessment Committee,  
Chair, PEF Assessment Committee (2009-2011)  College of Edu/Arts & Sciences Professional Education Faculty  2008-present  
Organized and directed LiveText Day of Training for Professional Education Faculty  GSU Professional Education Faculty  November 12, 2009  
Mentor for junior faculty member, Caroline Sullivan  GSU Dept. of MSIT  2007-present  
Co-Coordinator, Middle Childhood Education TEEMS program  GSU Dept. of MSIT  2006-present  
Member, Student Affairs Committee  
Chair, Student Affairs Committee (2006-2008)  GSU College of Ed.  2005-2008  
Member, Dean’s Advisory Committee  GSU College of Ed.  2006-2008  
Member Curriculum Committee, PEF  GSU University  2006-2007  
LiveText Coordinator/Administrator  GSU – MSIT University  2007-2008  
Member, department social committee  
Chair, farewell party for Carolyn McGhee (May 2006)  GSU Dept. of MSIT  2004-2006  
Assisted with College of Education Honors Day  GSU Rialto Theater  April 7  2006  
Recording Secretary, Dept. of MSIT  GSU Dept. of MSIT  2005-2006  
Mentor for junior faculty; shared research agenda for new faculty members  GSU Dept. of MSIT  2005  
Faculty Guide, GSU graduation ceremonies  GSU Fall 2004  
Member, MSIT By-laws Revision Committee with Andrew Smith and Guichon Zong  GSU Dept. of MSIT  2004  
Member, Professional Award Selection Committee  TWU
College of Education 2003  
Member, 10 search committees to hire new faculty  TWU

College of Education and College of Arts & Sciences 2001-2003  
Co-Chair, Honors Day celebration  TWU

Dept. of Reading 2002-2003  
Committee member, application for FIPSE grant for new master’s program in middle school education  TWU

College of Education 2002  
Departmental representative to SECC (State Employee Charitable Campaign)  TWU

Dept. of Reading 2002  
Library liaison  TWU

Dept. of Reading 2001-2003  
Member, Faculty Evaluation and Development Committee  TWU

University 2000-2003  
Member, Curriculum Certification Committee (developed criteria for new teaching certificates. Also chaired subcommittee  TWU

2000-2001  
Chair, subcommittee (of CCC above) for Grades 4-8 certification  TWU

COE & CAS 2000-2001  
University representative for Fire Safety and Emergency Evacuation  TWU

Dept. of Reading 2000-2001

Service to the Community

Service Location or Organization Date
Secretary, Condominium Association Board of Directors Towne Square Condominium Association, Decatur, GA March 2011 to date
Lead role in “The Butler Did It” Decatur First United Methodist Church, Decatur, GA Sept. 27-29, 2007
Commencement Keynote Speaker Laurus Technical Institute Decatur, GA Apr. 20, 2007
Chair, book campaign for new elementary school in Honduras Honduras Outreach International 2006-2007
Volunteer, Children’s area
Decatur Book Festival Atlanta Journal-Constitution Atlanta, GA September 2006 and 2007
Chair, “Storybook Christmas“ campaign Denton Rotary Club Denton, TX 2002

Author/Illustrator Page(s) in Encyclopedia Author/Illustrator Page(s) in Encyclopedia
Abolafia, Yossi 2 Innocenti, Roberto 406
Adler, C.S. 6 Jacobs, Joseph 415
Adler, David  6-8  Jones, Elizabeth Orton  423
Alcock, Vivien  17  Kastner, Jill  428
Angell, Judie  35-36  Keith, Harold  431
Archambault, John  39-40  Kleven, Elisa  446
Arnold, Caroline  41  Kogan, Deborah (Ray)  447
Artzybasheff, Boris  42  Krasilovsky, Phyllis  449
Atwater, Richard  47  Lampman, Evelyn Sibley  457
Aylesworth, Jim  58 (with Janelle Mathis)  Lattimore, Eleanor F.  465
Bagnold, Enid  60  Leedy, Loreen  471
Behn, Harry  72  Lexau, Joan M.  480
Bellairs, John  72-73  Little, Jean  490-491
Benary-Isbert, Margot  76  Lopshire, Robert Martin  498
Bial, Raymond  79-80  MacDonald, Suse  506-507
Bishop, Claire Hutchet  86  Marshall, James  517-518
Blos, Joan Windsor  89  McMillan, Bruce  538-539
Bober, Natalie  93  Mora, Pat  557
Bontemps, Arna Wendell  97  Morrison, Lillian  558
Boylston, Helen Dore  108-109  Munro, Roxie  567
Bridwell, Norman  111-112  Munsch, Robert Martin  567-568
Bulla, Clyde Robert  128  Neville, Emily Cheney  585-586
Delton, Judy  229  O’Neal, Elizabeth (Libby)
Dowden, Anne Ophelia  246  Osborne, Mary Pope  605-606
DuJardin, Rosamond  253  Patent, Dorothy Hinshaw  610-611
Faber, Doris  270  Pilkey, Dav  629-630
Fatio, Louise  278  Quackenbush, Robert M.  652
Finger, Charles  283  Raffi (Raffi Cavoukian)  653-654
Flack, Marjorie  287  Ransome, Arthur M.  655-656
Fleming, Denise  290  Raschka, Chris  656-657 (with Rebecca Platzner)
Forbes, Esther  293  Reid, Barbara  662-663
Freeman, Don  299-300  Ryder, Joanne  681-682
Garden, Nancy  306  Scott, Ann Herbert  701
George, Jean Craighead  310-312  Sharp, Margery  714
Glenn, Mel  320-321  Skurzyski, Gloria (Jean)  725
Gramatky, Hardie  329  Smith, Lane  729-731
Hague, Michael  341-342  Snyder, Zilpha Keatley  734
Hamilton, Virginia  345-347  Southall, Ivan  738
Henstra, Friso  359  Spinelli, Jerry  741-742
Hill, Eric  367-368  Steele, Mary Q.  746
Hoban, Lillian  371  Stowe, Harriet Beecher  760 (with Michael O’Laughlin)
Holman, Felice  378  Terban, Marvin  775
Hopkins, Lee Bennett  381-382
NERMIN BAYAZIT
Georgia State University
Department of Middle-Secondary and Instructional Technology
30 Pryor Street Suite 609
Atlanta, GA 30302-3980
404-413-8406
nbayazit@gsu.edu

EDUCATION
Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 08/2004-08/2009 School of Teacher Education- PhD in Mathematics Education
Dissertation: Prospective Mathematics Teachers’ Use of Mathematical Definitions in Doing Proof
Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey 09/2002-08/2004
Secondary Science and Mathematics Education-MS in Mathematics Education
Thesis: The Effect of Journal Writing on First Year Engineering Students’ Achievement on Integral
Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey 09/2000-08/2002
Department of Mathematics-BS in Mathematics
Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey 09/1997-06/2002
Secondary Science and Mathematics Education-BS in Mathematics Education
Anatolian Teachers Training High School, Adana, Turkey 09/1993-06/1997
Emphases on Teachers Training-High School Diploma

TEACHING AND RELATED EXPERIENCE
Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 08/2009-Present
Clinical Assistant Professor at the Department of Middle Secondary and Instructional Technology
Courses Taught:
• EDMT 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction; Fall 2010; 16 students
• EDCI 7660 Practicum I; Fall 2009 (two loads-12 students); Fall 2010 (one load-7 students)
• EDMT 8430 Sociocultural and Sociohistorical Issues of Mathematics Education; Summer 2010; 5 students
• EDCI 7670/7680 Practicum II & III; Spring 2010; 7 students
• EDMT 7360 Integration of Technology in Mathematics Instruction; Spring 2010; 14 students
• EDCI 3250 Introduction to Teaching in Secondary Schools; Fall2009; 9 students

Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 08/2004-08/2009
Graduate Teaching Assistant at School of Teacher Education
Courses Taught:
- MAE5960 - Ethnomathematics
- MAE4657 - Technology in Teaching Mathematics
- MAE4815 - Elements of Algebra (Introduction to proof writing and reading/Abstract Algebra)
- MAE4816 - Elements of Geometry
- MAE4813 - Number Systems (online course)
- MAE4878 - Introduction to Applications of Mathematics for Teachers (Problem Solving)
- MAE4945 - Student Teaching in Mathematics (supervising 5 interns in both Middle School and High School)

Courses Assisted:
- MAE4862 - Using History in the Teaching of Mathematics
- MAE5865 - Using History in the Teaching of Mathematics

Tallahassee Community College, Tallahassee, FL, 08/2006-05/2009
Adjunct Instructor at Department of Mathematics

Courses Taught:
- MAC1105 - College Algebra
- MGF1106 - Mathematics for Liberal Arts I
- MGF1107 - Mathematics for Liberal Arts II
- MAT1033 - Intermediate Algebra (Using MyMathLab)

Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 10/2007-08/2008
Research Assistant at Florida Center for Research in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (FCR-STEM)
- Worked on the administration of the technology survey to middle and secondary mathematics teachers in Florida.
- Interviewed with middle and secondary mathematics teachers
- Assisted in data collection and writing articles and reports
- Helped to develop lesson plans and observed and reported the implementation of the lessons.

Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 08/2005-08/2006
Graduate Assistant at Office of Clinical Experiences
- Assisted the student teachers.
- Created a database of student teacher evaluation forms by using Excel

Atilim University, Ankara, Turkey 08/2002-08/2004
Graduate Teaching Assistant at Department of Mathematics
- Taught Calculus I and II problem solving sessions
- Prepared and graded quizzes, homework and Mathematica applications
- Tutored at Mathematics Help Center.

PUBLICATIONS


WORK IN PROGRESS


PRESENTATIONS


SERVICE
College:
• Worked on the Urban Teacher Leader (UTL) program proposal
• Served on Ad Hoc Committee for Clinical Faculty Promotion Document

Department:
• Program coordinator for M.Ed in Mathematics Education (GOML)
• Served on Annual Faculty Evaluations Committee (Clinical Faculty)
• Served on Faculty Search committee for GOML ESOL program
• Served on Faculty Search committee for NET-Q clinical faculty

Profession:
• Associate Editor for Journal of Urban Mathematics Education (JUME).
• Scientific Committee Member for First North American GeoGebra Conference
• Reviewer for Journal of Urban Mathematics Education (JUME).
• Reviewer for PME-NA 2005, 2009, and 2010
• Reviewer for Journal of Urban Mathematics Education (JUME).
• Reviewer for American Educational Research Association (AERA)

Community:
• Worked as a Coach in Residence for Pebblebrook HS
• Served as judge for Sutton Middle School Science and Math project fair

Other:
• Graduate Student Representative for the 2008 and 2009 mathematics education tenure-track search committee, Florida State University
• Mathematics judge for Regional Science Fair; 2007
• Director of the Math Help Center, Florida State University 2004 and 2005
• Social Committee member, Atilim University, Turkey, 2002 and 2003

GRANTS
• November 2010- Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (Teacher Quality) ($48,000).
• January 2009-School of Teacher Education, Florida State University travel grant ($300)
• July 2008-School of Teacher Education, Florida State University travel grant ($1438)
• September 2006- Congress of Graduate Students, Florida State University travel grant ($100)
• January 2006-Congress of Graduate Students, Florida State University travel grant ($500)
• July 2003-Department of Mathematics, Atilim University travel grant ($300)

MEMBERSHIPS
• American Educational Research Association (AERA)
• Association of Mathematics Teacher Educators (AMTE)
• Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT)
• The North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education (PME-NA)
• International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education (PME)
• Florida Council of Teachers of Mathematics (FCTM)
• Benjamin Banneker Association (BBA)
• Georgia council of Teachers of Mathematics (GCTM)
• Mathematical Association of America (MAA)
• National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)
Bohan  
CHARA HAEUSSLER BOHAN  
Associate Professor-Social Studies Education  
Georgia State University  
Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology  
P.O. Box 3978  
Atlanta, Georgia 30302-3978  
404-413-8402  
cbohan@gsu.edu  

EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE  

Educational Institutions:  
The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas  
Doctor of Philosophy—Curriculum and Instruction: Concentration in History of Education and Social Studies Education 1999  

Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York  
Master of Arts—Social Studies Education 1990  

Cornell University, Ithaca, New York  
Bachelor of Arts—History 1988  
Cum Laude in History and with Distinction in all Subjects  

Certificates: New York State Social Studies Teacher Certification  
Texas Teacher Certification, Social Studies Composite
Professional Employment History:

2009–present  Georgia State University, Associate Professor, College of Education, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Social Studies Education Unit Leader

2006–2009  Georgia State University, Assistant Professor, College of Education, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology

2003–2006  Baylor University, Assistant Professor, School of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction

1999–2002  The University of Texas at Austin, Instructor, Social Studies Methods Course

1996–1999  The University of Texas at Austin, Student Teacher Supervisor and Teaching Assistant


1990–1993  Horace Mann School, Bronx, NY, History Teacher

1990  New York City Public Schools, Brooklyn Technical High School, Student Teacher

1988–1989  New York County District Attorney’s Office, Paralegal

1988  Ithaca Alternative School, Ithaca, NY, Teaching Intern Social Studies Course

Other Experience and Professional Memberships:

2002–  American Association of Teaching and Curriculum, Member and Conference Proposal Reviewer 2006–present, Dissertation Award Committee, 2009, Executive Board, 2009–present


Teaching History Special Interest Group, Chair, 1999–2002

1999– History of Education Society, Member


Delta Chapter Vice–President, 1998–1999

1996– Society for the Study of Curriculum History

1996–2008 Midwest History of Education Society


2007– Southern History of Education Society

Research Publications, Editorial and Reviewer Positions:

2011– Executive Editor, The Social Studies Taylor & Francis Publication

2003– Editorial Board, American Educational History Journal

2001–2006 Editorial Board, Social Studies and the Young Learner, National Council for the Social Studies

2007– Board of Reviewers, Social Studies Research and Practice

2007 Board of Reviewers, Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 2(1)

2003 Manuscript reviewer, Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 18

2004– Manuscript reviewer, Theory and Research in Social Education

2006– Manuscript reviewer, Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue

Honors:

2011 Georgia State University College of Education Faculty Research Award

2010 Georgia State University College of Education Faculty Research Award, Nomination

2003–2005 Summer Sabbatical Award, Baylor University

2000 Distinguished Dissertation Award, Kappa Delta Pi Educational Foundation

1998 O. L. Davis, Jr. Doctoral Scholarship, Kappa Delta Pi Educational Foundation

1998 Presentation Travel Grant, The University of Texas at Austin
1997–1998    David Bruton, Jr. University Fellowship, The University of Texas at Austin
1996    Paul R. Hanna Scholarship, Kappa Delta Pi Educational Foundation
1996–1997    Professional Development Award, The University of Texas at Austin
1990    Professional Development Award, Teachers College, Columbia University
1989    Honorable Mention Mellon Fellowship, Teachers College, Columbia University

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Published Articles:


Chapters in Books:


Books:


Other Publications:


In Progress:


Presentations at Professional Meetings


Craig, C., Uhrmacher, P. B., Bennett, L. & Bohan, C. (2010, October). Writing for publication workshop. American Association for Teaching and Curriculum, St. Louis, MO.


Chisholm, J. & Bohan, C. (2010, October). The challenges of developing biographies about historically significant female educators. American Association for Teaching and Curriculum, St. Louis, MO.

Bohan, C. & Sullivan, C. (2009, November). Program Co-Chair, National Council for the Social Studies, College and University Faculty Assembly, Atlanta, GA.
Bohan, C. (2009, October). The social studies curriculum in Atlanta Public Schools during the Desegregation Era. American Association for Teaching and Curriculum, Crystal City, VA.


Awards and Grants:

2009–2012 U.S. Department of Education, Studying History in Focus Together, SHIFT. Award $1,681,074 DeKalb County School District; GSU subcontract $589,825 (Role: GSU Principal Investigator, and Co-Investigator GSU History Department
Associate Chair, Michelle Brattain, Lead Historian and DeKalb County, Kim Weston, Projector Director).

2006–2009 Professional Development Schools, Georgia State University, PDS2 University Liaison at North Springs High School

2008–2009 Developing an Interdisciplinary Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies Social Justice Curriculum, Graduate Student Research Assistant Support, Fall and Spring $6,000 (with David Stinson)

2008 Professional Development Grant for Graduate Research Assistant Support for Assistance with Teaching American History Grant Application, Educational Research Bureau, College of Education, Spring and Fall, $4,000 (with Caroline Sullivan)

2008 Professional Development Grant for Graduate Research Assistant to Study the Impact of High Stakes Testing on Social Studies Education $2,000 (with Erica DeCuir)

2007–2008 Anchor Action Mini-Grant, Georgia State University, PDS2 Grant, Principal Investigator, $2,019.84


2007–2008 Anchor Action Mini-Grant, Georgia State University, PDS2 Grant, Principal Investigator, $2,019.84

Rejected Grants:

Institute of Education Science: Education Research Grant Programs – Mathematics and Science Education: Developing a Social Justice Mathematics Curriculum for a Ninth-Grade, Integrated Mathematics Course; PI: David Stinson; Co-PI: Dr. Chara Bohan; submitted: $1,334,461.00 September 2009; Rejected Spring 2010.

Improving Teacher Quality State Grant, Georgia Department of Education. Improving the Knowledge of World Geography, World Cultures and Global Affairs for Teachers at the New Schools of Carver Early College High School. Requested $(Gwen Benson, Project Director, Role: Project Facilitator, with Joe Feinberg and Michelle Brattain). Rejected Spring 2009.


TEACHING

Georgia State University

Critique of Educational Research, EDCI 9900; Trends and Issues in Teaching Social Studies: Special Topics, Educational Biography, EDSS 8550; Topics in School Social Studies Curriculum, EDSS 8420; Learning, Curriculum and Instruction in Social Studies, EDSS 8290; Practicum II & III, EDCI 7670/7680; Social Studies Concepts and Issues, EDSS 7570; Theory and Pedagogy of Social Studies Instruction, EDSS 7540; Educational Inquiry, EDCI 8900

Completed Dissertations: Cynthia M. Schafer (2007); Victor Keith McCrory (2008); Kevin R. Wood (2011); Shawn Jones (2011)

Doctoral Advisor Chair: Erica DeCuir, Patricia Randolph, James Chisholm, Heather Stevens

Doctoral Advisor Co-Chair: John Pecore (2009)

American Association of Teaching and Curriculum Dissertation Award for Teaching (2010) John Pecore (Bohan, C. nominator)

Doctoral Advisor: Caroline Jernigan, Lauren Lawyer Bradshaw, Franco Timbol, Tanya Crawford, Jeremy Nix

Education Specialist Advisor: Aubrey Brammar, Anthony Foti, Keith Haber, Wesley Marshall, Z. Ryan Payne, Deyvi Portee, Matthew Staruch


Master’s Thesis Advisory Committee, Geography Department: Matthew Waller (2009)

Baylor University

Social Issues in Education, TED 3380; History of American Educational Thought, TED 2381; Introduction to Elementary Education, TED 2220; Elementary Social Studies Methods, EDC 4208; Special Problems in Education, EDC 5V95; Geography for Educators, GEO 4316

Dissertation Committee: Sheila Gloer, Colleen Eddy

Undergraduate: Honors Students: Marybeth Townsend, Elizabeth Terry

The University of Texas at Austin

Elementary Social Studies Methods, EDC 370E, Student Teaching Seminar, School Social Studies, EDC 5575

Dissertation Committee: Kelley Reidt

Honors Thesis Committee, Kate Walker

SERVICE
Professional Development:

External Review Letter, Tenure and Promotion, Sarah Bair, Dickinson College, Fall 2009

External Review Letter, Tenure and Promotion, Tom Fallace, University of Mary Washington, Summer 2009

External Review Letter, Tenure and Promotion, James Moore, Cleveland State University, Spring 2009

Center for Civic Education, The Supreme Court, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, June 2009


The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) Grant Writing Workshop (Webinar), Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, May 20, 2008

The Grant Institute, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, April 18–20, 2007


R. Freeman Butts Institute, Indianapolis, IN, May 2005

Texas Alliance for Geographic Education, San Antonio, TX, September 2004

TxBess Teacher Training, Austin, Texas, July 2003


American Educational Research Association, Division B Graduate Student Seminar, Participant, April, 1998, San Diego, California

Teaching About the Past/Learning for the Future, U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service Teacher Workshop, Participant, Johnson City, TX, July 1997

Circle Grant, The University of Texas at Austin, Participant, collaboration between High SES and Low SES schools and university to promote technology in classroom, 1994–1995

Rivers Project, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, Participant, learned interdisciplinary curriculum with Rivers as the focus, August, 1994

Cooperative Learning I and II, St. Edward's University, Participant, 1994, Austin, Texas
National Endowment for the Humanities, Summer Study Grant, Thomas Jefferson - Political Thought and Action, Fordham University, award recipient, Summer 1992

Abuse and Maltreatment Training in Identification, Reporting and Intervention for Mandated Professionals, Teachers College, Columbia University, Participant, 1990, NY, NY

UNIVERSITY:

Georgia State University

Social Studies Unit Leader, MSIT, 2008–present
Leadership Committee, MSIT Department, 2008–present
Annual Review Committee, MSIT Department, 2009
Promotion and Tenure Committee, MSIT Department, 2009–2010
Promotion and Tenure Committee, College of Education, 2011–2013
Curriculum Committee of PEF, Fall 2007–Present, Co-chair 2007–2009
Diversity Committee, MSIT, 2006–2008
Professional Development Committee, MSIT, 2006-2007
Social Studies Unit Committee, MSIT, 2006–present
Social Studies Unit, Hiring Committee Chair, 2007, 2008, 2010
EPS Department, Social Foundations Unit, Hiring Committee, 2010
MSIT Faculty Retreat, Stone Mountain, GA, May 2009, 2010
MSIT Faculty Retreat, Chateau Elan, Braselton, GA, May 2008
MSIT Faculty Retreat, Brasstown Valley, Young Harris, GA, May 2007
Faculty Graduation Moderator, Fall 2006
Faculty Graduation Representative, Fall 2008

Baylor University

Quality Enhancement Proposal, Fall 2005, School of Education
Program Review Committee, School of Education, 2004–2005
Curriculum Committee, School of Education, 2004–2005
Supervise Interns in Australia, Student Teaching Abroad Program, 2004
Texas Association for the Improvement of Reading, October 2003
School of Education Faculty Retreat, Laity Lodge, May 2003
School of Education Doctoral Program Core Faculty Retreat, November 2002
New Faculty Seminar, August 2002
Baylor Ethnographic & Qualitative Research Network
Marshall, Baylor University Graduation Ceremony 2003
Faculty Partner Mentor, Collins Dormitory 2003–2004

SERVICE & COMMUNITY:

Istanbul Center, Essay Contest, Judge, 2007–2010, speaker at Annual Art and Essay Contest Award Ceremony, January 29, 2008, Twin Towers, Atlanta, GA; February 19, 2009, North Atlanta High School, Atlanta, GA; March 5, 2010, Ogelthorpe University, Atlanta, GA.

Timber Ridge Elementary School, Marietta, GA, Environmental Club and Parent Volunteer, 2006–present
Dodgen Middle School, Marietta, GA, Environmental Club, Committee Co-chair, 2007–2009
Walton High School, Marietta, GA, Varsity and J.V. Baseball Team Parent Booster Club; Teacher Appreciation Week Contributor, 2010–present
Bellingham Homeowners Association, Executive Board, Secretary, 2007–present
First Presbyterian Church, Waco, Presentation, “Ending Extreme Poverty: The Moral Imperative.”

University United Methodist Church Early Childhood Center, Governing Board, 2001-2002, Cooperative Preschool volunteer, Grant writer
Forest Trail Elementary School, Eanes Independent School District, volunteer
Austin Children’s Hospital Foundation, Council Member, Children’s Christmas Card Fundraiser

Families with Children from China, member

St. John Neumann Roman Catholic Church, Mobile Loaves and Fishes Volunteer
Brantley-Dias
LAURIE BRANTLEY-DIAS

- Curriculum Vitae -

Associate Professor
Georgia State University
Middle/Secondary Education and Instructional Technology
P.O. Box 3978
Atlanta, Georgia 30302-3978
Phone: 404-413-8422
Email: lbdias@gsu.edu
473 Cameron Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30312
404-627-0876

Educational Background

Ph.D.
Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA
Major Instructional Technology
Dissertation “Best Practices of Technology Integrating Teachers: Pictures of Practice from Four Elementary Classrooms”
2000

M.S. Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY
Major Library Science
1991

B.A. Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY
Major English 1987

Professional Experience

2007-Present  Associate Professor, Georgia State University, Department of Middle, Secondary and Instructional Technology, Atlanta, GA

2000-2007  Assistant Professor, Georgia State University, Department of Middle, Secondary and Instructional Technology, Atlanta, GA

1999-2000  Instructor, Georgia State University, Department of Middle, Secondary and Instructional Technology, Atlanta, GA

1997-1999  Instructional Technology Specialist, Cobb County Public Schools, Marietta, GA

1997 (Dec.-July) Technology Bond Project Specialist, Cobb County Public Schools, Marietta, GA

1996 (Aug.-Dec.)  Middle School Media Specialist, Cobb County Public Schools, Marietta, GA

1993-1996  Elementary School Media Specialist, Cobb County Public Schools, Marietta, GA

1988-1993  High School English Teacher/Media Specialist, Sumner County Public Schools, Gallatin, TN
1988 (Feb.-June)   Middle School Language Arts Teacher, Sumner County Public Schools, Gallatin, TN

Courses Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Title</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT 2210 Integrating Technology into the Elementary Classroom</td>
<td>Fall 2006-Present (course coordinator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-Summer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 3210 Teaching, Learning and Technology Integration</td>
<td>Present- Fall 2000 (course coordinator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Teachers and Technology—old course name)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-Spring, Summer, Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 7100 Design of Performance and Instructional Systems</td>
<td>2008-Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-Spring, Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IT 7230  Technology Mediated Instruction  2003-Summer
2001-Fall

IT 7360  Technology for Educators  2009-Spring, Summer
2008-Spring
2007-Summer
2006-Summer
2005-Summer
2004-Summer
2002-Summer, Fall
2001-Summer, Fall

IT 8000  Foundations of Instructional Technology  2003-Fall

IT 8090  Internet for Educators  2010-Fall
2009-Fall
2008-Summer
2006-Fall
2005-Fall
2004-Fall
2003-Spring, Fall
2002-Spring

IT 8390  Analysis of Education, Training, and Performance
Support Centers  2008-Summer
2007-Summer
2006-Summer

IT 8420  Topics in Instructional Technology  2011-Spring
2001-Summer
Evidence of Student Achievement

Rigole, N. (2011). Obtained a tenure track assistant professor positions at Macon State College and will also serve as the Director of Instructional Technology for the college.


Publications-Journal Articles  (*=refereed)


Publications-Chapters in Books


Manuscripts in Progress


Lokey-Vega, A. & Brantley-Dias, L. (in process). Examining curriculum alignment: Connecting the goals of schooling to state standards. To be submitted to the Educational Technology Research and Development
Research Projects On-Going and In-Progress

Georgia Institute of Technology & Brantley-Dias, L. Direct to Discovery: Video conferencing with GA Tech clean-room (nano-technology) and Barrow County science teachers.

Brantley-Dias, L. Developing pedagogical technology integration content knowledge (PTICK) in beginning teachers.


Brantley-Dias, L. & Calandra B. Designing and validating an instructional design model for urban teacher candidates: IDNT.

Presentations


the Association for Educational Communications and Technology National Conference, Atlanta, GA. National.


Invited Seminars and Presentation

Brantley-Dias, L. (2007, November). Beyond Google: Searching the Internet. A two-day workshop of senior English students at North Springs High School, Atlanta, GA.
Brantley-Dias, L. (2007, November). Creating Interactive PowerPoint for Public Service Announcements. A two-day workshop of senior sophomore students at North Springs High School, Atlanta, GA.

Brantley-Dias, L. (2005, December). Email Etiquette. A presentation for St. Martin’s Episcopal School, Atlanta, GA.

Brantley-Dias, L. & Shoffner, M.B. (2005, October). Technology integration in teacher education. A presentation for the Partners in Learning from the Ministry of Education, P.R. China at Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Dias, L.B. (2003, April). Defining the Field: I.T. and Technology Integration. A presentation/discussion for Dr. Andrew Smith’s IT 8000, Foundations of Instructional Technology at Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Dias, L.B., Hines, M.A. & Brown, N. (2003, March). Transition from public school to academia. A virtual discussion for Dr. Dana Fox’s MSIT Departmental Seminar in Teaching and Learning at Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Dias, L.B. (2001, October). Superhero vs. superhighway: Media specialists helping teachers integrate internet technologies. An inservice workshop for the Technology for Teachers Conference at Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Dias, L.B. (2000, October). Classroom applications using wireless laptops. A presentation/discussion for the Technology for Teachers Faculty EXPO at Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.
Dias, L.B. (2000, October). The dissertation process. A presentation/discussion for Dr. Francis Atkinson’s MSIT Departmental Seminar in Topics in Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Dias, L.B. (2000, October). How media specialists can support their teachers’ use of technology. An inservice workshop for the Technology for Teachers Conference at Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Dias, L.B. (2000, February). From prospectus to dissertation. A roundtable discussion for Dr. Joyce Many’s MSIT Departmental Seminar in Teaching and Learning at Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Dias, L.B. (2000, February). Teaching with Time Liner. A district in-service workshop developed for secondary social studies teachers from Cobb County Public Schools, Marietta, GA.

Dias, L.B. (1999, September). Comprehensive exams and the prospectus. Invited roundtable discussion for Dr. Shirley Tastad’s MSIT Departmental Seminar in Teaching and Learning, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Sponsored Activities

External Awards


Unfunded External Proposals


(2008, November). The international professional development school for the systemic reform of Jordanian Education. USAID. $45,000,000. (Role: Consultant)

(2008, August). Direct-to-Discovery. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Office of Education K-12 Competitive Grants. $2,100,000. (Role: Educational Consultant, Contributing Author)


Internal Awards
Calandra, B., Weeks, M., Brantley-Dias, L. & Puvirajah, A. (2009, March). Creating educational simulations for STEM teachers’ professional development. Georgia State University, STEM Faculty Fellowship Grants. $12,310. (Role: Co-PI and Contributing Author)


Unfunded Internal Proposals


Media Products


Professional Service:
International/National/State/ Local Level

Guest Co-Editor, Tech Trends   National     2009

Grant Reviewer, Teacher Quality Grant
   State    2009, 2010


Past President, Teacher Education Division, Association for Educational Technology and Communications
   National     2008-2009

President, Teacher Education Division, Association for Educational Technology and Communications
   National     2007-2008

Invited proposal reviewer, National Educational Computing Conference
   National     2006, November

President-elect, Teacher Education Division, Association for Educational Technology and Communications
   National     2006-2007

Guest Reviewer, Teaching and Teacher Education
   International     2006

Reviewer, Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-based Learning
   National     2004-present

Session Facilitator, Association for Educational Technology and Communications Conference
   National     2004-present

Member, Instructional Technology, SIG, American Education Research Association
Member, Association for Educational Technology and Communications

Member at Large, Teacher Education Division, Association for Educational Technology and Communications

I.T. Consultant, Hoya Science Camp, Harrison High School, Cobb County, Georgia

Mentor, Take our Daughters to Work: Girl Force, Sponsored by GSU
Proposal Reviewer, American Education Research Association Conference
National 2001-present

Guest Reader, Tull Water's Media Center Open House
Local 2001, Fall

Member, Teaching and Teacher Education, Division K, American Education Research Association
National 2000-present

Proposal reviewer, Association for Educational Technology and Communications Conference
National 2000-present

Proposal Reviewer, National Educational Computing Conference
National 1999, Fall

Grant Reviewer, Technology Innovation Challenge Grant Program
National 1998, Summer

University/College/Department Level

Member, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Committee Department 2011, spring

Member, Science Education Tenure Track Faculty Search Committee

Member, Promotion and Tenure Committee
Department

College
2011, spring
2008-2010

Unit Leader, MSIT for Instructional Technology Department 2009-2010

Chair, Academic Affairs Committee College 2008-2009

Member, Promotion and Tenure Committee Department 2008, Fall

Member, Strategic Planning Committee College 2008

Member, Library Media Clinical Faculty Search Department 2008

Member, MSIT Department Chair Search Department 2008

Member, Academic Affairs Committee College 2007-fall 2009

Member, MSIT Research and Graduate Program Committee

              Department  2004-2006

Member, MSIT GRA Instructional Technology Specialist search committee

Department

2004
Member, Professional Education Counsel

College 2004-2006

Member, Area F Committee for Dean

Member, Graduate Admissions Appeals and Exceptions Committee

College

College 2004

2003-2006

Member, Teaching and Learning Technology, Senate Subcommittee

University 2002-2004

Member, Instructional Technology Tenure Track Faculty Search Committee for MSIT

Department 2002-2003

Reviewer, College of Education Study Abroad Scholarship

College 2002

Coordinator, IT2210 and IT3210 Courses

Department 2001-present

Representative, MSIT Library Liaison to Pullen Library

Department 2001-2002

Member, COE Standards-based Teacher Education Project (STEP) Committee

College 2001-2002

Member, Library Media Education Tenure Track Faculty Search Committee for MSIT

Department 2001-2002

Member, Middle Childhood Education Curriculum Committee
Department 2000-2002

Member, Social Studies Education Tenure Track Faculty Search Committee for MSIT
Department 2000-2001

Projects

Center for Disease Control (CDC) (2007-2008).
Consultant. Instructional Designer. Designed and assisted in project development for BioSense database training.

Consultant. Major contributing author of a document used to secure funds for media center.

Instructional Technology Support. Teacher Quality/ Higher Education Grant. Designed and facilitated online modules and promoted participant community interactions.

BMW (2003).
Technical Writer and Instructional Designer. Designed and rewrote content for an Internet-based interactive online course entitled: BMW Privacy Policy Orientation.

Instructional Designer. Contributing designer for a one-day training course on front-end analysis.

Grant Reviewer. FY03 Title II Educational Technology Competitive Grants. Reviewed and evaluated grant recipients assessment plans.

Awards
Excellence in Instructional Technology Teaching Award (2004)
Current Professional and Academic Association Memberships
American Education Research Association (AERA)
Association for Educational Technology and Communications (AECT)

European Teachers Education Network (ETEN)

Georgia Association for Instructional Technology (GAIT)

International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)
NANCY J. BROWN
Curriculum Vitae

Library Media Technology
Department of Middle/Secondary Education and Instructional Technology
634 College of Education
Georgia State University
MSIT P. O. Box 3978
Atlanta, GA 30302-3978
Office: 404.651.0206; FAX: 404.651.2546
nbrown11@gsu.edu

CHRONOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Ph.D. in Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, 2002.

Dissertation: The Role of the Media Specialist in Elementary Schools with a Majority Limited English Proficient Latino Enrollment.

Dissertation Director: Mary Ann Hindes
1998 Doctoral Award for Excellence in Scholarship, Outstanding Service to the Department and the Educational Community and Demonstrated Professional Excellence, Georgia State University.

Ed.S. in Library Media Technology, Georgia State University, 1998.


B.A.Ed. in English, Arizona State University, 1968.

MAJOR FIELDS/RESEARCH INTERESTS

Library studies; information science as applied to school library media; media specialist preparation and professional development; literature for children and young adults; Latino educational involvement; Asian educational involvement; diversity issues in school library media centers

CHRONOLOGY OF EMPLOYMENT

1/02-present  CLINICAL INSTRUCTOR OF LIBRARY MEDIA TECHNOLOGY, Department of Middle/Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. Graduate teaching, advising, committee involvement, and research. Supervision of Library Media Technology interns in field experiences. Masters level courses and seminars taught include the following: Selection of Print and Nonprint Materials, Selection of Reference Sources, Survey of Literature for Young People, Children’s Literature, Administration of Library Media Centers, Internship in Library Media Technology, Computers in Library Media Management; ED.S. level courses include Administration and Supervision of Media Services, Scholarly Inquiry, and Special Libraries.
1/98-12/01  GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT, Department of Middle/Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. Graduate teaching; courses and seminars taught included the following: Selection of Print and Nonprint Materials, Selection of Reference Sources, Survey of Literature for Young People, Administration of Library Media Centers, and Computers in Library Media Management.

8/99-12/01  MEDIA SPECIALIST, Martin Elementary School, Flowery Branch, GA. Organized and automated initial school media center. Served as a teacher, information specialist, instructional partner, and program administrator in the school media center. Engaged in purchasing and cataloging materials, selecting items for professional collection, orientation for students and faculty, and staff development.

9/92-6/99  MEDIA SPECIALIST, Tadmore Elementary School, Gainesville, GA. Automated school media center. Served as a teacher, information specialist, instructional partner, and program administrator in the school media center. Teacher of the Year - 1995. Successfully coordinated efforts to raise $10,000.00 from parents and community members to buy new library books.

9/91-6/92  MEDIA SPECIALIST, Colquitt County High School, Moultrie, Ga. Served as a teacher, information specialist, instructional partner and program administrator in the school media center. Assisted in video production, purchasing, staff development. Mentored senior students involved in writing research papers.

6/82-6/89  YOUNG ADULT LIBRARIAN, Moultrie-Colquitt County Public Library, Moultrie, GA. Automated young adult collection. Coordinated purchasing and programming for students in grades 6-12. 1984 – Presentation in Dallas, TX and Outstanding Program Award from the Young Adult Services Department of the American Library Association for an innovative outreach program to local middle school.

8/78-6/82  SCHOOL LIBRARIAN, Pineland School, Moultrie, GA. Organized initial school library. Engaged in purchasing and cataloging materials, selecting items for professional collection, orientation for students and faculty, and staff development.
SCHOOL LIBRARIAN, Montrose Elementary and Pimento Elementary schools, Terre Haute, IN. Served as a teacher, information specialist, instructional partner and program administrator in two different schools, one urban and one rural.

SCHOOL LIBRARIAN, Spiceland Elementary and Tri Cities Elementary schools, Spiceland, IN. Served as a teacher, information specialist, instructional partner and program administrator in two different elementary schools, both rural.


SECONDARY ENGLISH TEACHER, Cortez High School, Glendale, AZ. Taught English to secondary students in grades 9-12.

GRADUATE COURSES TAUGHT

ELMT 7130 – Selection and Use of Reference Sources. The course focuses on the study and evaluation of basic reference sources including networked information resources. Students examine the role of the school library media specialist in the information process.

ELMT 7200 – Computers in Library Media Management. The course focuses on the study and application of computer technology to library media center management and services.

ELMT 7250 – Survey of Literature for Young People. The course provides a survey of literature suitable for school media centers, including exploration of literature reflecting diversity. Materials include literature appropriate for grades PreK – 12.

ELMT 7250 – Survey of Literature for Children. The course was realigned in 2006 to offer a study of literature appropriate for grades PreK – 5.
ELMT 7410 – Administration of Library Media Programs – The course focuses on principles of management necessary for successful administration of a library media program.

ELMT 7660 – Internship in Library Media Technology. The course provides students with field based experiences in school library media settings.

ELMT 8150 – Administration and Supervision of Media Services. The course explores supervision and leadership techniques pertinent to the administration of system-wide media programs and services.

ELMT 8350 – Special Libraries. The course examines the philosophy and unique characteristics of information centers and the role of special librarians.

EDCI 8990 – Scholarly Inquiry. The course focuses on the design, implementation, and documentation of the scholarly inquiry requirement for the Education Specialist degree.

SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS


SCHOLARLY PRESENTATIONS


1/03 Brown, N. J. (2003, January). The role of the media specialist
in elementary schools with a majority limited English proficient Latino enrollment. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Library and Information Science Education, Philadelphia, PA.


PRACTITIONER PUBLICATIONS


EXTERNAL FUNDING

1/04 Georgia State University College of Education travel grant to The People’s Republic of China. $2000.00

SERVICE: CITIZENSHIP

Intramural Service: College Service
2005  Brown, N. J. (2005, May). So, you like kids, you like books, you like technology... Your career as a library media specialist. Information presented at the Georgia State University Career Counseling Center, Atlanta, GA.


Intramural Service: College Committees

2004-present  College of Education Ad Hoc Committee on International Education

2004 – 2005  Faculty liaison with Dean’s Office. Coordinated professional development for visiting Chinese Scholar-in-Residence

2003- 2004  Great Cities Universities – Urban Education Corporation

Intramural Service: Departmental Committees

2005 – present  MSIT Intern Placement Advisement Committee

2002 – present  MSIT faculty liaison with Pullen Library

2003 - 2004  Member, Search Committee for Assistant Professor, Library Media Technology

2002 - 2003  Member, Search Committee for Assistant Professor, Library Media Technology


SERVICE: OUTREACH

National/International Outreach: Participation in Professional Organizations

Active Member: American Library Association
  American Association of School Librarians
  International Association of School Librarians
  Phi Delta Kappa

State Outreach: Participation in Professional Organizations

Active Member: Georgia Library Media Association
  Georgia Association for Instructional Technology

State Outreach: Participation in Professional Development


State Outreach: Legislative Involvement

1/07 Library Legislative Day, State Capitol, Atlanta, GA
1/06 Library Legislative Day, State Capitol, Atlanta, GA
1/05 Library Legislative Day, State Capitol, Atlanta, GA
Local/State Outreach: Presentations

12/05  Brown, N. J. (2005, December).  Public relations and public perceptions: Professional success in the media center.  Information presented at the meeting of the Gwinnett County Association of Media Center Clerks, Lawrenceville, GA.

8/05  Brown, N. J. (2005, August). Educational opportunities in Library Media Technology at Georgia State University.  Information presented at the meeting of the DeKalb County Media Specialists’ Association, Lithonia, GA.

8/04  Brown, N. J. (2004, August). Library Media Technology at Georgia State – Check it out! Information presented at the meeting of the DeKalb County Media Specialists’ Association, Lithonia, GA.

State Outreach: Participation in Educational Activities

3/06  Moderator for The Helen Ruffin Reading Bowl.  DeKalb County district competition.  Miller Grove High School, Lithonia, GA.

Local/State Outreach: Consultancies

2005 – present  Planning and Design Committee, Tech High School, Atlanta Public Schools
2003 - present  Collection Development Consultant, Centennial Place Elementary School,
Atlanta Public Schools

2003 - 2004  Cataloging and Collection Development Consultant, Parkside Elementary School,
Atlanta, GA

2003 - 2004  Collection Development Consultant, Pickens County High School, Jasper, GA

2001 - 2004  Collection Development Consultant, Cumming Elementary School, Cumming, GA

Current as of 5/23/07
Burns
Current and Complete Vita
Janet Zaleski Burns, Ph.D.

Home Address

4336 Village Oaks Lane
Atlanta, GA 30338
770.451.2750
404.660.1588
drjburns@bellsouth.net

Office Address

Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology
P. O. Box 3978
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA  30302-33978
404.413.8417
Jburns@gsu.edu

Education

Ph.D.  Georgia State University, 1995
Human Resource Development - cognates in Psychology and Vocational Education
Dissertation: Prediction of Leader Member Exchange Quality by Jungian Personality Type

M.S. Georgia State University, 1989
Human Resource Development

B. S. University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1976
Home Economics Journalism - minors in Consumer Economics; Foods and Nutrition

Experience

2008 – 2010 Georgia State University
Director of Field Experiences
Department of Middle/Secondary Education & Instructional Technology (MSIT)

2002- present Georgia State University
Clinical Associate Professor, Department of MSIT
Program Coordinator, Career and Technical Education

1997-2001 Georgia State University
Clinical Assistant Professor
Department of MSIT

2000-1996 Georgia State University, Temporary Clinical Instructor
Department of MSIT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Position / Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>Georgia State University, Part Time Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Vocational and Career Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1991</td>
<td>Equifax Services, Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-1991 &amp;</td>
<td>United Airlines, Instructor-In-flight Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-1982</td>
<td>Training Advisor In-flight Services, Flight Attendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>Grady Memorial Hospital, Food Service Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>Jewel Food Stores, Home Economist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Affiliations**

**ACADEMY for Career and Technical Teacher Education**
- President Elect 2011-2012

**American Education Research Association (AERA)**
- Secretary/Treasurer Special Interest Group: Career and Technical Education

**American Psychological Association (APA)**
- Special Interest Groups: Educational Psychology; Consulting Psychology
Association of Career and Technical Education (ACTE)

Association of Career and Technical Education Research (ACTER)

Georgia Association for Career and Technical Education (GACTE)

National Association of Industrial and Technical Teacher Educators (NAITTE)

National Officer, Research Chair 2002-2004

   Journal Editor 2005-2007

   National Officer, Trustee 2006-2009

Phi Upsilon Omicron (honor society for Home Economics)

Trade and Industrial Educators of Georgia (TIEGA)

   Board of Directors 2005-2006, Post-Secondary Director

   Board of Directors 2006-2008, Teacher Educator Director

   Board of Directors 2010, 2011 Invited Position

National Professional Service

2011   President Elect, The ACADEMY for Career and Technical Teacher Education

2011   Discussant American Education Research Association (AERA), annual conference, New Orleans, LA
2011 Secretary/Treasurer AERA Sig; Career and Technical Education

2010 Past Editor Review panel member for the 31st annual outstanding manuscript award recipients for the Journal of Industrial Teacher Education (JITE)

2010 Manuscript reviewer for national conference papers, Association for Career and Technical Education Research (ACTER)

2009 Past Editor Review panel member for outstanding manuscript award for 2008, Journal of Industrial Teacher Education (JITE)

2009 Review panel member for national conference papers, American Education Research Association Sig: Career and Technical Education

2006 – 2009 National Officer; Trustee, National Association of Industrial and Technical Teacher Educators-responsible for election of national officers 2007; coordinate national awards 2008


2007- 2008 Editorial Board, Manuscript reviewer, Journal of Industrial Teacher Education

2006 Oklahoma State University; served as outside reviewer for School of Teaching & Curriculum Leadership promotion and tenure candidate
2005 – 2007  Editor, Journal of Industrial Teacher Education (JITE)

2002 – 2004  Associate Editor, Journal of Industrial Teacher Education

2001 – 2004  National Officer, NAITTE, Research Chair

2001 - 2002  Assistant Editor, Journal of Industrial Teacher Education

2001  National Science Foundation (NSF), Reviewer and Review Panel member for proposals submitted to the NSF Advanced Technological Education (ATE) program


2001  Conference Symposium Chair, Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) Research Conference

2001  Manuscript Reviewer, AHRD Research Conference

2000  Manuscript Reviewer, AHRD Research Conference

2000  Manuscript Reviewer, Journal of Industrial Teacher Education

1999 - 2002 Academy of Human Resource Development, Appointed Member

Integrity and Ethics Committee (AHRD)

Regional, State, Local Service

2011 Georgia SkillsUSA State Championship Lead judge and event coordinator for three events

2011 Advisory Committee secretary, School of Health Sciences & Research, Therrell High School, Atlanta Public Schools

2011 Board of Directors, Trade and Industrial Educators of Georgia (TIEGA)

2010 State of Georgia, Career and Technical Education Advisory Commission Meeting, Rep. Howard Maxwell, Chairman - provided testimony regarding the importance of teacher education

2010 Board of Examiners Team member for developmental review of two programs for the Georgia Professional Standards Commission

2010 Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, Member of Regional Education Policy Committee

2010 Georgia SkillsUSA State Championship judge and event coordinator

2010 Georgia Career Student Association (GCSA) state level competition judge for special needs students
2010  Board of Directors, Trade and Industrial Educators of Georgia (TIEGA)

2009  Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, Member of Regional Education Policy Committee

2009  Georgia Department of Education, CTAE Leadership Academy, invited presenter

2009  Georgia SkillsUSA State Championship judge

2009  Georgia Department of Education, workshop presenter for new Healthcare Science Teacher Educators

2008  Career Technical Instruction (CTI) support services for special populations, Competition Judge, State Leadership Conference, Jekyll Island, GA

2007  Georgia Working Poor Families Project Advisory Committee member, Georgia Budget and Policy Institute

2006-2007  Computer Science Education Endorsement Task Force, Georgia Professional Standards Commission, Chairperson

2006-2007  Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, Member of Regional Education Policy Committee; Member of Career Preparation Subcommittee

2006  National Assembly of Delegates, Georgia Delegate, Association of Career and Technical Education, Annual Conference, Atlanta, GA.
2006   Vocational Opportunities Chapters of America (VOCA), Competition Judge, State Leadership Conference, Jekyll Island, GA

2005   SREB High Schools That Work, Evaluation Team Member, Grady High School, Atlanta Public Schools

2001   State Planning Committee. Coordinate and implement program standards for Trade and Industrial and Health Occupations secondary teachers. Georgia Department of Education, Georgia State University, University of Georgia, Valdosta State University

2001   Georgia Department of Education Secondary Vocational Administrators Workshop, presenter, "Teacher Certification Issues"

2000 - Atlanta Public Schools Vocational Advisory Committee Member, Grady High 2001 School, (Health Career Academy, Health Occupations)

2000   Georgia Department of Education, Reviewer of program certification proposals for secondary Health Occupations programs.

1999   Georgia Department of Education, Grant Proposal Evaluator for Health Occupations education secondary grants

1998   SREB High Schools That Work, Evaluation Team Member, Therrell (APS)

1997   Roosevelt Rehabilitation Institute, Warm Springs, GA, Consultant for team building and strategic planning to the Vocational Development and Retail Occupations Services Departments

1996   Selection Committee Member for Vice Principal, Atlanta Public Schools
1996   Georgia Department of Education, Workshop Committee Member, "Updating Health Occupations Education"

1996   Office of the State Superintendent of Schools, Georgia Department of Education, Review Committee for Career Academy Proposals

1996 -  Douglas County Board of Education Vocational Advisory
2001   Committee Member, (Cosmetology Programs, Trade & Industrial)

1996 -  Board of Directors, Volunteer Training Director, Working Wardrobe (Non-profit organization providing attire to economically disadvantaged women for job interviews)
1999   Co-authored awarded grant for $10,000 from Days Inn Corp.

1996 -  Habitat for Humanity, participant in 3 home building project at
1998   urban Atlanta sites through Bell South and St. James UMC

University Service

2005-   Faculty Senator
2008

2005-   Subcommittee Member: Information Systems and Technology Committee,
2008   Budget Committee,
   Planning and Development Committee,
   Student Discipline Committee
2004- ASUR evaluation committee member for Dean of Students

2005

1999 Consultant, Office of the Vice Chancellor for External Affairs, Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, topic; relationship of post-secondary technical schools to four-year institutions

1999 Committee Chair and College of Education Liaison - Created Joint B. S. Program with Andrew Young School of Policy Studies for Career Technology Teachers; program housed in Andrew Young School of Policy Studies; students enter the College of Education

College Service

2011 Ad Hoc committee for Promotion Guidelines for Clinical Faculty

2010 Field Experience & Clinical Practice Standing Committee

2010 Ad Hoc committee for Promotion Guidelines for Clinical Faculty

2010 PDS Field Placement Directory, ed. 2 – compiled MSIT section

2009 Chair, Professional Education Faculty (PEF)

2009 Ad Hoc committee for College Conceptual Framework
2009  Ad Hoc committee for minor in Urban Education

2009  Ad Hoc committee for Field Placement Policies

2007  Standards and Accreditation Committee

2001- Academic Affairs Committee; Secretary 2002; Secretary 2003

2003

1999 -  P-16 Co-Reform Initiative, Secondary Partner School Collaboration (Grady High
2000  School) Consultant for Career Academy; Fall Semester 1999, Spring 2000

2000  Secondary Partner School Collaboration; Planned and provided one day Team Building
Workshop to Grady High School teachers

1996  GSU College of Education Draft Reviewer, Standards for National Board Certification
(Vocational Education), National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

Department Service

2011  Developed presentation, “Effective University Teaching through the Lens of
Adult Learning Theory” for Faculty Mentoring Conversations, March 8, 2011

2010  Search Committee member for Clinical Assistant Professor of Science Education

2010  Search Committee member for Administrative Coordinator in MSIT
2010  Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Clinical Faculty

2009 -  Ad Hoc Committee Chair to Evaluate Clinical Faculty

2008-  Department Secretary
2009

2008-  Department Leadership Team Member (MSIT)
2010

1996 -  Program Coordinator of the Technology/Career Education teacher education certification program  2011

2008  Search committee for Department Chair/Associate Chair

2000 -  Department Advisory Committee Member (MSIT)
2006

2006   NCATE Committee Chair; co-wrote NCATE document for Technology/Career Education Teacher Certification Program

1998   Developed new course for department, EDCI 3250-Introduction to Secondary Education

1997   Committee Chair, wrote Semester conversion program for Technology, Career-prep Initial Certification Program and all supporting documents including catalog descriptions and program advisement sheets
1997  Secondary Committee for Semester Conversion

1996  Designed Initial Teacher Certification Program for Trade & Industrial and Health Occupations Teachers

1996  Developed all courses for Initial Teacher Certification Program for Trade & Industrial and Health Occupations Teachers at GSU

1996 -  Board of Directors, Volunteer Training Director, Working Wardrobe (Non-profit organization providing attire to economically disadvantaged women for job interviews)
1999  Co-authored awarded grant for $10,000 from Days Inn Corp.

1996 -  Habitat for Humanity, participant in 3 home building project at
1998  urban Atlanta sites through Bell South and St. James UMC

Funded Grants

$ unknown - PI

$55,000 - PI

New Teacher Institute for Trade & Industrial and Healthcare Science Technology Teachers – School Site Field Follow-up

$55,000 - PI

2008-2009  Georgia State University – Tech Fee Grant (Hayden & Burns)


New Teacher Institute for Trade & Industrial and Healthcare Science Technology Teachers – School Site Field Follow-up

$75,000 - PI


New Teacher Institute for Trade & Industrial and Healthcare Science Technology Teachers – School Site Field Follow-up

$90,000 - PI


New Teacher Institute for Trade & Industrial and Healthcare Science Technology Teachers – School Site Field Follow-up

$75,000 - PI


New Teacher Institute for Trade & Industrial and Healthcare Science Technology Teachers – School Site Field Follow-up

$70,000- PI

New Teacher Institute for Trade & Industrial and Healthcare Science Technology Teachers – School Site Field Follow-up
$67,000 - PI

$67,000 - PI

2001 -2002 Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium - New Teacher Institute for Trade & Industrial and Health Occupations Teachers
Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium - School Site Field Follow-up $60,000 - PI

2000 -2001 Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium - New Teacher Institute for Trade & Industrial and Health Occupations Teachers
Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium - School Site Field Follow-up $60,000 - PI

1999 - 2000 Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium - New Teacher Institute for Trade & Industrial and Health Occupations Teachers
Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium - School Site Field Follow-up $50,000 - PI

1998 - 1999 Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium - New Teacher Institute for Trade & Industrial and Health Occupations Teachers
Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium - School Site Field Follow-up $50,000

1997 - 1998 Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium - New Teacher
Institute for Trade & Industrial and Health Occupations Teachers

Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium - School Site Field Follow-up $35,000

1996 - 1997 Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium - New Teacher

Institute for Trade & Industrial and Health Occupations Teachers

Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium - School Site Field Follow-up $30,000

Other Collegiate Assignments

1996- Program Coordinator: Technology and Career Education Initial Teacher Certification Program; supervise Part-Time Instructors, advisor to 30+ students

1997 - Doctoral Committee Member for 10 Ph.D. candidates

2007

Professional Development

2009 Invited and attended Board of Examiners Training for Georgia Professional Standards Commission.

In-Service Presentations/Invited Seminars

2011 Developed and presented 4 webinars for the Georgia Department of Education – Career, Technical and Agricultural Education Division.

2010 Speaker at Fall State Leadership Conference for SkillsUSA Advisors-topic Carl D. Perkins legislation
2010  Speaker at Georgia CTI fall Leadership conference—special needs teachers working with CTE students – topic Highlights of the Perkins legislations as related to special populations

2010  Georgia Department of Education, workshop presenter for new Career and Technical Teacher Educators – topic Classroom/Laboratory Management

2009  Burns, J. Z. Cooperating Teachers Advisory Board. Session at Conference on Literacy, Urban Issues and Social Studies Educations (CLUES), Atlanta, GA

2008  Burns, J. Z. & Hayden, J. M., Practical strategies to improve literacy skills. In-service presentation at Meadowcreek High School, Spring Professional learning conference, Atlanta, GA

2008  Burns, J. Z. & Hayden, J. M., Reading and writing across the curriculum for HSTE teachers. In-service presentation at HSTE winter professional development conference, Newnan, GA


2007  Burns, J. Z. Meeting the challenge of leading the research effort in engineering and technology education. Seminar presentation and panel member at the National Center for Engineering and Technology Education (NCETE), fall meeting, Greensboro, NC

2007    Burns, J. Z. & Hayden, J. M, Instructional Techniques for Helping English Language Learners in Trade and Industrial Courses. In-service presentation at Trade and Industrial Educators of Georgia (TIEGA), winter professional development conference, Newnan, GA

2006    Burns, J. Z. & Hayden, J. M., Reading Across the Curriculum. In-service presentation at Georgia Association for Career and Technical Education (GACTE), summer professional development conference, Atlanta, GA


2004    Burns, J. Z. Writing for the Journal of Industrial Teacher Education: Requirements for Peer Reviewed Journals. Seminar presented at Association for Career and Technical Education, Las Vegas, NV

2003    Burns, J. Z. Process and Product - Assessment Strategies for Business, Marketing and Information Technology Teachers. In-service presentation for Georgia Department of Education Fall professional development conference, Atlanta, GA

2002  Burns, J. Z.  Authentic Assessment-Rubrics for Technology/Career Educators. In-service presentation for Georgia Association for Career and Technical Education, Summer Conference, Atlanta, GA.

2001  Burns, J. Z.  Assessment Strategies for Business, Marketing and Information Technology Teachers. In-service presentation for Georgia Department of Education Fall professional development conference, Atlanta, GA


1999  Burns, J. Z. & Taylor, H.E., Instructional Strategies for Block Scheduling. In-service presentation Muscogee County School System, Columbus, GA

1998  Burns, J.Z., Career Planning Using the MBTI. Workshops for Blue Ridge Area Health Education Center (AHEC) for secondary students, Rome, GA; Dalton, GA

1998  Burns, J. Z., Program Management and Student Behavior. In-service presentation North Metro Technical School, Department of Adult and Technical Education, Acworth, GA


1997  Burns, J. Z., Authentic Assessment for the Secondary Instructor. In-service presentations Fulton County Schools, Atlanta, GA

1996  Burns, J. Z., Teaching Strategies for Block Scheduling; Professional Ethics. In-service presentations Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, GA
Burns, J. Z., Understanding Personality Type and How it Impacts Teaching and Learning Styles. In-service presentation Georgia Department of Education Health Occupations Unit, Augusta, GA

Refereed Publications


Publications in Refereed Journals (other)


Burns, J.Z. (2006). From the Editor, The more things change, the more they remain the same. Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 43(3), 3-5.


Non-Refereed Articles Published in Conference Proceedings


Paper Presentations


Lakes, R., D. & Burns, J. Z. (2008). Workforce development and CTE reform in


Burns, J. Z. (1997). From occupation to profession - the relationship of formal ethical statements to the growth of a profession. Paper presented at Academy of Human Resource Development Integrity through HRD Pre-Conference, Atlanta, GA.

Paper presented at American Education Studies Association, Montreal, Canada.

Book/Chapters Authored


Television Broadcasts


Unpublished Manuscript not Submitted for Publication


Educational Products

2011 Webinar for Georgia Virtual Schools (GADOE), Events of Instruction- Including Small Group Learning
2011  Webinar for Georgia Virtual Schools (GADOE), Planning and Implementing Project Based Learning

2011  Webinar for Georgia Virtual Schools (GADOE), Using your Laboratory for Effective Learning

2011  Webinar for Georgia Virtual Schools (GADOE), Management Strategies – What is your plan for a strong start?

2010  Practicum I Handbook, Second Edition, Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (two additional sections – college supervisors; provisionally certified teachers.

2010  Practicum II and III Handbook, Second Edition, Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology (two additional sections – college supervisors; provisionally certified teachers.

2010  Video for Mentor Teachers for Practicum I, Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology.

2010  Co-created revised model/new syllabus for EDCI 7660 for all TEEMS programs Practicum I course.

2009  Practicum I Handbook, Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology.

2009  Practicum II and III Handbook, Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology.

2009  Video for Mentor Teachers for Practicum II, Department of MSIT.
2009  ULearn Instructional Model for Practicum I, Ethical Issues for Teachers.

2009  ULearn Instructional Model for Practicum I, Legal Issues for Teachers.

Awards

2009  Commendation letter from the Lieutenant Governor of Georgia for service to GA students.

2008  Recognition letter from The Georgia State University Center for Teaching & Learning.

2005  Recipient of Outstanding Service Award from the National Association of Industrial and Technical Teacher Educators (NAITTE)

Work in Progress


Burns, J. Z.  Investigator in COMPELS grant, data collection phase

Faculty Load

Fall Quarter, 1997

EDBT 369  Teaching Practicum in Vocational and Career  5 hrs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 457</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies in Business and Education</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 466</td>
<td>Applied Practice in Vocational and Career</td>
<td>5-15 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 480</td>
<td>Independent Study in Vocational and Career</td>
<td>5-15 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winter Quarter, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 370</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Vocational and Career</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 425</td>
<td>Principles and Practices of Vocational Education</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring Quarter, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 446</td>
<td>Instructional Development in Business &amp; Education</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 371</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Vocational and Career</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summer Quarter, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 302</td>
<td>Instructional Development in Vocational Education</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 336</td>
<td>Foundations of Management and Safety in Vocational Education</td>
<td>5 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semester Conversion

Fall Semester, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 3250</td>
<td>Introduction to Secondary Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3690</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4570</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4660</td>
<td>Applied Practice in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3-9 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Coordinator

PI on Grant

---

### Spring Semester, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3700</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3710</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Coordinator

PI on Grant

---

### Summer Semester, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3020</td>
<td>Instructional Development in Tech., Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4660</td>
<td>Applied Practice</td>
<td>3-9 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Coordinator

PI on Grant

---

### Fall Semester, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3690</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4570</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4660</td>
<td>Applied Practice</td>
<td>3-9 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1590
EDBT 4800  Independent Study  3-9 hrs.  
  Program Coordinator  
  PI on Grant  

Spring Semester, 2000  
EDCI 3250  Introduction to Teaching in Secondary Schools  3 hrs.  
EDBT 3700  Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep  3 hrs.  
EDBT 3710  Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep  3 hrs.  
  Program Coordinator  
  PI on Grant  

Summer Semester, 2000  
EDBT 3020  Instructional Development in Tech., Career-prep.  3 hrs.  
EDBT 4660  Applied Practice  3-9 hrs.  
  Program Coordinator  
  PI on Grant  

Fall Semester, 2000  
EDBT 3690  Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep  3 hrs.  
EDBT 4570  Instructional Strategies in Technology, Career-prep  3 hrs.  
EDBT 4660  Applied Practice  3-9 hrs.  

1591
Program Coordinator
PI on Grant

Spring Semester, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3700</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3710</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4800</td>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>3-9 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Coordinator
PI on Grant

Summer Semester, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3020</td>
<td>Instructional Development in Tech., Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4660</td>
<td>Applied Practice</td>
<td>3-9 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Coordinator
PI on Grant

Fall Semester, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3690</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4570</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4660</td>
<td>Applied Practice</td>
<td>3-9 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Coordinator
PI on Grant
Spring Semester, 2002

EDBT 3700  Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep  3 hrs.
EDBT 3710  Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep  3 hrs.
EDBT 4800  Independent Study  3-9 hrs.

Program Coordinator
PI on Grant

Summer Semester, 2002

EDBT 3020  Instructional Development in Tech., Career-prep.  3 hrs.
EDBT 4660  Applied Practice  3-9 hrs.

Program Coordinator
PI on Grant

Fall Semester, 2002

EDBT 3690  Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep  3 hrs.
EDBT 4570  Instructional Strategies in Technology, Career-prep  3 hrs.
EDBT 4660  Applied Practice  3-9 hrs.

Program Coordinator
PI on Grant

Spring Semester, 2003
2 sections

EDBT 3700  Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep  3 hrs.

EDBT 3710  Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep  3 hrs.

EDBT 4800  Independent Study  3-9 hrs.

Program Coordinator

PI on Grant

Summer Semester, 2003

EDBT 3020  Instructional Development in Tech., Career-prep.  3 hrs.


EDBT 4660  Applied Practice  3-9 hrs.

Program Coordinator

PI on Grant

Fall Semester, 2003

EDBT 3690  Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep  3 hrs.

EDBT 4570  Instructional Strategies in Technology, Career-prep  3 hrs.
2 sections

EDBT 4660  Applied Practice  3-9 hrs.

Program Coordinator

PI on Grant
### Spring Semester, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3700</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3710</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology, Career-prep</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4800</td>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>3-9 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Program Coordinator
- PI on Grant

### Summer Semester, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3020</td>
<td>Instructional Development in Tech., Career-prep.</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4660</td>
<td>Applied Practice</td>
<td>3-9 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Program Coordinator
- PI on Grant

### Fall Semester, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3690</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4570</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4660</td>
<td>Applied Practice</td>
<td>3-9 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Program Coordinator
- PI on Grant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester, 2005</td>
<td>EDBT 3700</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDBT 3710</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDBT 4660</td>
<td>Applied Practice in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3-9 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PI on Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Semester, 2005</td>
<td>EDBT 3020</td>
<td>Instructional Development in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDBT 4660</td>
<td>Applied Practice</td>
<td>3-9 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PI on Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester, 2005</td>
<td>EDBT 3690</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDBT 4570</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PI on Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester, 2006</td>
<td>EDBT 3700</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDBT 3710  Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education  3 hrs.
EDBT 4250  Principles and Practices in Technology/Career Education
            2 sections
EDBT 4660  Applied Practice in Technology/Career Education  3-9hrs.
            Program Coordinator
            PI on Grant

Summer Semester, 2006
EDBT 3020  Instructional Development in Technology/Career Education  3 hrs.
EDBT 3360  Foundations of Management and Safety in Technology/Career
            Education  3 hrs.
EDBT 4660  Applied Practice  3-9hrs.
            Program Coordinator
            PI on Grant

Fall Semester, 2006
EDBT 3690  Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education  3 hrs.
EDBT 4570  Instructional Strategies in Technology/Career Education
            3 hrs.
            2 sections
            Program Coordinator
            PI on Grant

Spring Semester, 2007
EDBT 3700  Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education  3 hrs.
EDBT 3710  Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education  3 hrs.
EDBT 4250  Principles and Practices in Technology/Career Education
2 sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3020</td>
<td>Instructional Development in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDBT 4660  
Applied Practice in Technology/Career Education  
Program Coordinator  
PI on Grant

Summer Semester, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3690</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4570</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4660</td>
<td>Applied Practice in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3-9hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall Semester, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3700</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 3710</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring Semester, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDBT 4660</td>
<td>Applied Practice in Technology/Career Education</td>
<td>3-9hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Coordinator
PI on Grant

Summer Semester, 2008
EDBT 3020 Instructional Development in Technology/Career Education 3 hrs.
EDBT 4660 Applied Practice 3-9hrs.
Program Coordinator
PI on Grant

Fall Semester, 2008
EDBT 3690 Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education 3 hrs.
EDCI 7660 Practicum I – TEEMS Science 3 hrs.
Director of Field Experiences MSIT
Program Coordinator
PI on Grant

Spring Semester, 2009
EDBT 3700 Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education 3 hrs.
EDCI 7670/7680 Practicum II and III 6 hrs.
Director of Field Experiences MSIT
Program Coordinator
PI on Grant
Summer Semester, 2009

EDBT 3020  Instructional Development in Technology/Career Education  3 hrs.

Program Coordinator
PI on Grant

Fall Semester, 2009

EDBT 4570  Instructional Strategies in Technology/Career Education  3 hrs.
EDCI 7660  Practicum I  3 hrs.
Director of Field Experiences MSIT
Program Coordinator
PI on Grant

Spring Semester, 2010

EDBT 3700  Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education  3 hrs.
EDCI 7670/7680  Practicum II and III  6 hrs.
Director of Field Experiences MSIT
Program Coordinator
PI on Grant
Summer Semester, 2010

EDBT 3020  Instructional Development in Technology/Career Education  3 hrs.

Director of Field Experiences

Program Coordinator

PI on Grant

Fall Semester, 2010

EDBT 4570  Instructional Strategies in Technology/Career Education  3 hrs.
EDCI 7660  Practicum I  3 hrs.
EDBT 3690  Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education  3 hrs.

Director of Field Experiences MSIT

Program Coordinator

PI on Grant

Spring Semester, 2011

EDBT 3700  Teaching Practicum in Technology/Career Education  3 hrs.

Program Coordinator

PI on Grant
Calandra
Brendan Calandra, Ph.D.

Associate Professor

Georgia State University, Atlanta
bcalandra@gsu.edu

Education

Ph.D., Instructional Technology, University of South Florida (USF) 2002

Graduate Certificate, Design and Development of Distance Learning, USF, 2001

MA, Germanistik, University of Florida (UF) 1998

Scholarship Exchange Student, Universität Mannheim, 1996/7

Certificate, Intensive English Language Instruction, USF, 1992

BA, German, Florida State University (FSU) 1991

Employment

2007-present  Associate Professor with tenure, Georgia State University

2002-2007

2002 - present
Assistant Professor, Georgia State University

Consultant
Georgia Pacific, CARE, Georgia Department of Education, Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, Barrow County Schools, BMW, & United Parcel Service

1999 - 2002 University Instructor
Instructional Technology, USF
Department of Library and Information Science, USF
Program Director (Summer study abroad in Prague and Berlin)
International Affairs, USF
Instructional Designer/Technology Project Manager
Florida Center for Instructional Technology, USF

1998-1999
University Instructor / Instructional Designer
Division of Language and Linguistics, USF
The English Language Institute, USF

1995-1998
University Instructor
Dept. of Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures, UF
Scholarship Exchange Student
University of Mannheim, Germany
Language Instructor
SAP, Germany
1992-1995

Language Instructor/Teacher Trainer

Constantine the Philosopher University, Nitra, Slovak Republic

Ministry of Education, Slovak Republic

PHARE Program, European Union

Projects

Dr. Calandra's consulting, research, and development focus on the use of digital media as cognitive and transformative tools. Some selected projects are listed below including the dates he was involved. These projects were informed by theory, research, and professional literature, and when possible involved systematic design, development, and evaluation.

(2005-present) USING DIGITAL VIDEO FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Calandra and colleagues have been doing research and development on a video-enhanced process for professional development. This work has been implemented for teachers' professional development, and it has produced multiple theoretical and data-driven publications. We are currently refining the process and believe that it can assist with honing not only technical knowledge and skills, but also personal and professional transformation.

(2008-present) PROJECT-BASED STEM ACTIVITIES FOR CHILDREN IN ATLANTA SCHOOLS

Our team is funded by the Georgia DHR as part of a recurring grant to develop innovative, technology enhanced, project-based summer and after school activities for middle school students in the Atlanta Metro area through the Atlanta After School All Stars (ASAS).
(2008-present) DESIGNED LEARNING EXPERIENCES IN VIRTUAL WORLDS

Dr Calandra and colleagues have been investigating which types of designs for Virtual Worlds could be well suited for different types of learning. Some examples include: 1) Language learning through virtual pen pals, learning about children's literature through "lived" experiences, and using a virtual practice space for professional development. All of these ventures have been pilot tested.

(April 2010 – present) SAFETY AWARENESS TRAINING FOR GEORGIA PACIFIC FACILITIES

Dr. Calandra is working with a team from Georgia Pacific to design and develop an innovative, interactive safety awareness training program for facility workers.

(2007/2008) CARE INTERNATIONAL SAFETY AND AWARENESS TRAINING

In this funded project, Dr. Calandra and a colleague at Georgia State University designed and developed a series of online, interactive activities to help make CARE staff aware of the dangers they face when working in the field, and to provide them with advice on how to avoid dangerous situations.


As part of a Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers for Technology (PT3) grant, Dr. Calandra designed and created high-level prototypes for an electronic support system for novice teachers entering the urban workforce. This work was done at Georgia State University.

(2003-5) THE GEORGIA DIGITAL HISTORY PROJECT (GDHP)

GDHP is an interpretive/pedagogical collection of historical resources designed for use in inquiry-based learning in high school and university classrooms, and created by faculty and
graduate students at Georgia State University and North Carolina State University. Dr. Calandra consulted, and he and his students helped with development work on this project.

(2003) BMW FINANCIAL SERVICES COMPLIANCE TRAINING

For this project, Dr. Brendan Calandra and two colleagues from Georgia State University designed and developed an online, multimedia training module for BMW Financial Services.


This resource was produced by The Florida Center for Instructional Technology and the University of South Florida to assist Florida's teachers in meeting the Florida State mandate for Holocaust education. It has won numerous awards and been translated into many languages. Brendan Calandra worked as a designer and developer on this site. Dr. Calandra's dissertation dealt with the development and evaluation of design aspects of the site.

(2001) PROJECT ESOL TAPESTRY

The ESOL TAPESTRY website was designed at the University of South Florida to support the process of ESOL integration into a wide range of teacher preparation courses and programs. In creating video modules, we collaborated with leading experts in the teaching ESOL (TESOL) field, asking them to address fellow teacher educators regarding the most crucial information in their areas of specialization. Throughout his doctoral studies, Dr. Calandra was a developer and technology project manager for the initial development phases of the site.

Scholarship
Honors, invited Posts, etc.

(2010) Recipient of Leadership Award from Instructional Technology SIG of AERA

(2010) Peer Reviewer: Computers and Education


(2007-2010) Chair of the Instructional Technology SIG of AERA.

(2009-present) Peer Reviewer: Journal of Teacher Education (JTE)

(2007) Invited speech: Developing Real Teachers in a Virtual World. Presented at the 2007 James F. Ackerman Colloquium on Technology and Citizenship Education at the Ackerman Center for Democratic Citizenship, Purdue University.


(2001) Awarded Best Educational Resource for the Teacher’s guide to the holocaust: An extensive online resource for teachers at the 2001 Annual Meetings of the Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education in Orlando, FL.

Journal Articles


Book Chapters


Selected Refereed Proceedings


Textbooks


Invited presentations


Paper presentations


Other Presentations


Siekmann, S., & Calandra, B. (2002). Accepting the challenge: Communicative activities in beginning online distance language classes. Presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Dallas, TX.


Kemker, K., Calandra, B. (2001). Unleashing the power of quicktime. Presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Atlanta, GA.


Grants

External

(2011, unfunded) Principle Investigator: Georgia State University and Atlanta After-School All Stars Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Outreach Program, Georgia Department of Education. $997,687.

(2011, unfunded) Principle Investigator: Georgia State University and Atlanta After-School All Stars Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Summer Academy, Georgia Department of Education. $681,281.

(2010, funded) Co-Principle Investigator: Activities to Promote Project-based Learning and Inquiry, State of Georgia Department of Human Resources. $697,915.


(2008, unfunded) Consultant: The International Professional Development School for the Systemic Reform of Jordanian Education. USAID. $45,000,000.

(2003-2007 funded) Co-Principle Investigator: The Crossroads: Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology (PT3) at the Intersection of Content, Pedagogy and Technology, Federal grant funded at over $530,000.

(2005/6 funded) University Technology Coordinator: PDS2 Professional Development School Partnerships Deliver Success: Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program for Partnerships (TQE-P), Federal grant funded at $1,893,445.


Internal

(2010, funded) Co-Principal Investigator: Extending Teacher Technology Competence through Mobile Digital Applications. Georgia State University Student Technology Fees Grant. $25,000.

(2009, funded) Co-Principal Investigator: Science and Technology Education through Probeware (STEP). Georgia State University Student Technology Fees Grant. $50,000.

(2009, funded) Principal Investigator: Creating Educational Simulations for STEM Teachers’ Professional Development. Georgia State University STEM fellowship grant. $13,000.


(2009, unfunded) Co-Principal Investigator: A Virtual Research Lab for Undergraduate Students. Georgia State University Student Technology Fees Grant. $50,000.

(2007, funded) Co-Principal Investigator: Using Portable Media for Pre-service Teacher Professional Development, GSU Student Technology Fees Grant funded at $25,321
(2007, funded) Principle Investigator: Media Effects on College Students’ Comprehension of Narrative Passages, GSU Student Technology Fees Grant funded at $6,000

(2006 funded) Co-Principle Investigator: Learning to Teach with Portable Multimedia Laboratories, GSU Student Technology Fees Grant funded at $76,319


(2004 funded) Co-Principle Investigator: Interactive Multimedia Laboratory, GSU Student Technology Fees Grant funded at $60,802

(2003 funded) Principle Investigator: Portable Usability Laboratory, GSU Student Technology Fees Grant funded at $39,059

Teaching

2004-present  Georgia State University

Coordinator for Computer Skills for the Information Age: up to 475 students per semester

Graduate courses taught at GSU

• EDCI 9900: Instructional Technology Doctoral Student Seminar
• IT 8000: Foundations of Instructional Technology
• IT 8360: Design and Development of Multimedia for Education and Training
• IT 8400: Advanced Authoring Technology
• IT 8660: Instructional Technology Internship
• EDCI 8810: Directed Reading: Varied topics dealing with media and learning

Undergraduate courses taught at GSU
• IT 2010: Computer Skills for the Information Age
• IT 3210: Teachers and Technology

1995 – 2002 University of Florida & University of South Florida

Graduate Courses
• EME 6936: Telecommunications in Education
• EME 6936: Interactive Media
• EDF 6284: Problems in Instructional Design

Undergraduate courses
• LIS 3361: Web Page Design and Management
• German 1, 2 & 3 (UF and USF)

Other teaching duties
• Directed 3 study abroad programs to Europe for USF International Affairs
• Designed and led various technology workshops for USF faculty and in-service teachers
• Taught ESL a the English language Institute (USF)

Mannheim, Germany
• Taught business English for various German companies including SAP.
1992 – 1995  Slovak Republic

- Taught English as a Foreign Language and EFL pedagogy courses and workshops for teachers and students through the Slovak Ministry of Education, The University of Constantine the Philosopher, and the PHARE global economic reform program sponsored by the Soros foundation.

Advising

Doctoral advisees (Dr. Calandra serves as major advisor for these students) he also serves as committee member on a number of other doctoral committees)

Name  Guolin Lai
Status  Graduated in December of 2008. He is faculty at the University of Louisiana Business School. His doctoral work is now available through our top research journal, Educational Technology Research and Development.
Topic  Examining the effects of computer-based scaffolds on novice teachers' reflective journal writing.

Name  Dana-Smith Bryant
Status  Graduated in December of 2010. She has a position at Spelman College.
Topic  Technology resolved: An ethnographic approach to instructional design within urban middle school debate.

Name  Ingrid Thompson-Sellers
Status  Will defend her dissertation in fall of 2011. Ingrid and Dr. Calandra have done research and published together. This research in part informed her dissertation topic.
Topic  What drives corporate instructional designers’ decision making?

Name  Yuelu Sun
Status  Is preparing her prospectus. She has taught for Dr. Calandra, worked on a number of funded projects, and presented with him at numerous conferences.
Name    Joseph Horne

Status  Recently started the program. He has taught for Dr. Calandra, has done research and
development on his funded projects, and is currently taking coursework.

Topic   Technology and transformative learning in higher education

Name    Brian Flanagan

Status  Brian is completing his coursework.

Topic   Journey down the Chattahoochee River: An adventure learning project

All of Dr. Calandra’s advisees work with him directly as GTAs teaching graduate and
undergraduate courses, and as GRAs on his funded and/or research projects. Moreover, he
regularly presents, publishes, and teaches with his doctoral advisees

Publications with advisees

Lai, G. & Calandra, B. (2010). Examining the effects of computer-based scaffolds on novice
teachers’ reflective journal writing. Educational Technology Research and Development. 58(4),
421-437.

Lai, G., Calandra, B., & Ma, Y. (2009). Leveraging the potential of design-based research to
improve reflective thinking in an educational assessment system. International Journal of
Technology in Teaching and Learning, 5(2), 119-137.


Lai, G., Calandra, B. & Ma, Y. (2008). Leveraging the potential of design-based research to
enhance preservice teachers’ online reflective practice: A case study. In C. Crawford et al. (Eds.),
Proceedings of Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International
Conference 2008 (pp. 1132-1139). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.

Calandra, B., Ma, Y. & Lai, G. (in press) Multimedia teaching and learning: Trends and issues in
the west. In R. Ouyang & C.X. Wang (Eds.), Instructional Technology. China: Renmin University
Press.


Conference Presentations with advisees


Dr. Calandra has been committee member for 11 more doctoral students.
Y. Ma  Ph.D. IT  Exploring Faculty Perceptions of a Case Library as an Online Teaching Resource  Graduated in 2005: faculty at ULL

O. Ari  Ph.D. Teaching & Learning  Meta-comprehension Training for Remedial College Readers  Graduated 2009: faculty at Appalachian State

G. Clark  Ph.D. Teaching & Learning  How Do Students Reason and Understand History Using Digital Historical Resources?  Writing dissertation

A. Butler  Ph.D. IT  Evaluating Online Mathematics Courses in Higher Education Writing prospectus

D. Millington  Ph.D. IT  Evaluating a Corporate, Blended Learning Solution: A Case study Writing prospectus

B. McPhail  Ph.D. Teaching & Learning  An Analysis of Student Conception of Graphical Transformation in Redesigned Precalculus Writing prospectus

E. Davis Ph.D. IT Learning by PTCK by Design  Finishing coursework

O. Dalba  Ph.D. IT  Effects of individual learning preference on achievement in online learning environments  Writing prospectus

W. Dennyson  Ph.D. IT Innovations in online teaching and learning  Finishing coursework

D. Sandford  Ph.D. IT Construction of a professional identity among novice library media specialists  Writing dissertation

Dr. Calandra is also: Major advisor for 1 EDS student, and major advisor for around 8 MS students any given year.

Service

The Profession

American Educational Research Association (AERA)

(2010) Presented with leadership award by SIG IT

(2007-10) Chair: Instructional Technology Special Interest Group of AERA
Proposal reviewer: Instructional Technology SIG of AERA

Communications Officer: Instructional Technology SIG of AERA

Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT)

Conference proposal reviewer Teacher Education Division

Conference proposal reviewer Research Division

Conference proposal reviewer Design and Development Division

Professors of Instructional Design and Technology (PIDT)

Program Planner: Annual Meeting, Memphis, TN

Program Co-Chair: Annual Meeting, Blacksburg, VA

Program Planner: Annual Meeting, Estes Park, CO

The University

Task Force for University Strategic Action Plan

Chair, Senate Committee for Information Systems and Technology

Chair, Technology Fees Committee

Technology Steering Group Committee

Mandatory Fees Committee

Faculty Senator, GSU

Information Systems and Technology Committee

University Tech Fees Committee

Committee on Academic Programs

Graduate Programs Committee
(2010) Joint Committee on Undergraduate Attendance

The College

(2010-present) Member of College Technology Steering Group
(2007/8) Member of Dean’s Advisory Committee
(2008) Member of COE Strategic Plan Task Force, GSU
(2008) Co-Chair of Special Interest Group for Strategic Planning Retreat
(2005/6) Dean’s Advisory Committee
(2005/6) Dean’s Task Force for the Georgia Teacher Success Model Initiative
(2003/4) Speakers Symposium Committee
(2003) College Technology Committee
(2003) College Website Committee

The Department

(2011) Learning Technologies Unit Lead
(2006-present) Faculty Coordinator for 5-7 sections each semester of IT 2010
(2008-2011) Department Promotion and Tenure Committee
(2008-2010) Instructional Technology MS Program Coordinator
(2010) Search committee for Faculty Member in Language and Literacy
(2009) Search committee for Faculty Member in Math Education
(2009) Search committee for Faculty Member in Language and Literacy
(2008) Search committee for Faculty Member in Language and Literacy
(2003/4) Chair: Technology Committee

(2003/4) Member: 2 MSIT faculty search committees

(2003) Member: MSIT Middle Grades Committee

The Community

(2008-present) Dr. Calandra, his colleagues, and his students, as part of a recurring grant, continue to develop innovative, technology enhanced, project-based summer and after-school activities for middle school students in the Atlanta Metro area.

(2006-2010) Dr. Calandra was a youth soccer coach at the Decatur-DeKalb YMCA.

(2008, 2010) Dr. Calandra donated web development and design work to CARE International as a part of the Safety and Security Awareness Training Project.

(2007/8) Dr. Calandra worked in an advisory capacity with Barrow county schools on their Internet 2 initiative.

(2005/6) Dr. Calandra worked as a technology site coordinator and advisor for the PDS2 professional development schools grant.
Chahine
CURRICULUM VITAE

NOVEMBER 18, 2011

Name Iman Chafik Chahine (formerly Iman Shahin)

Title Assistant Professor of Mathematics Education

Department Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology

Office Address Georgia State University, P.O. Box 3978, Atlanta, Georgia 30302-3978

Office Phone 404-413-8407

Office Fax 404-413-8063

Email Address ichahine@gsu.edu

Tenure Status Tenure-Track Position

EDUCATION

2008 PhD Math Education; University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

1997 M.Ed. Math Education; American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon

1992 T.D. Teaching Math; American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon

1985 BS Mathematics; American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

2009-present Assistant Professor of Mathematics Education, COE, MSIT department, Georgia State University

2009-present Affiliated Faculty, Middle East Institute, Georgia State University

2009-present Graduate Faculty Membership, Georgia State University
2004 –2008 Graduate Instructor, Department of African American and African Studies, Arabic Language and Culture Program, University of Minnesota

2003-2004 Instructor (designed and taught method courses for science and math elementary teachers- licensure program), Middle East Canadian University of Art and Technology (MECAT), Lebanon

ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

2010-present Program Director, Indigenous Mathematical Knowledge System, South Africa

2009-present Program Director, Ethnomathematics in Morocco Study Abroad Program

2008-2009 Interim Director of the Arabic Language and Culture Program, Department of African American and African Studies, University of Minnesota

2003 -2004 Assistant Principal, National Brothers’ School, Beirut, Lebanon

1997- 2000 Coordinator and Project Manager Middle East Studies and Research Center (MESAR), Lebanon

1997-2000 Research Assistant Education Department, American University of Beirut, Lebanon


ASSISTANTSHIPS AND AWARDS

Internal Awards & External Awards [§ 95000]
2010  Service, Teaching and Research (STaR) Fellowship Program, An National Science Foundation Program. The program includes 18 months training seminars for mathematics education fellows, Park City, Utah

2010  Conference Grant, the Compact for Faculty Diversity, Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Scholars Program, Tampa, Florida

2010  Seminar Grant, The 22nd Annual convention of Revolutionary Sciences, Association of Psychological Sciences, Boston, MA.


2010  Study Abroad Center Site Visit fund to South Africa, Georgia State University

2009  Study Abroad Center Site Visit fund to Morocco, Georgia State University

2008  Conference Grant, “Mathematics for Social justice: The Effect of Teaching Fractions in Five Lebanese Schools Using a Non-Traditional Curriculum”, Long Island University, Brooklyn-NY

2007  International Student Colonial Dames Scholarship,

2004-2008  Graduate Assistantship, University of Minnesota,
Peer-Refereed Published Journal Manuscripts


Published Peer-Reviewed Abstracts or Proceedings

Chahine, I. C. (2010). The ethnomathematical case study of Lebanese students using


Publications under Review


Publications in Preparation for Review


Peer-Reviewed Presentations


Chahine, I. C. (October, 2010). Embodied and situated: The ethnomathematical experience of


Chahine, I. C. (April, 2008). Teaching fractions using RNP: The experience of Lebanese students, Minnesota Council of Teachers of Mathematics Annual Meeting & Exposition, Duluth, MN.


Chahine, I. C. (April, 2007). Making change in teaching money, Minnesota Council of Teachers of Mathematics Annual Meeting & Exposition, Duluth-MN.


Editorial Service

2010 Associate Editor, Journal of Urban Mathematics Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA

2010 Editorial Board Member, The Near and Middle Eastern Journal for Research in Education, Doha, Qatar

Impact on Students: Evidence of student achievement

Collaborative work with students


Invited Presentation

2010 The NCTM Summer Institute on High School Mathematics, Infusing the Classroom with Reasoning and Sense Making, Orlando, FL

Published Research Projects


Unpublished Research Reports

2009  Arabic Language Study Abroad Project: A Partnership between University of Minnesota and ALIF institute in Fez-Morocco

2005-2006  Collaborative Evaluation Community Project: A NSF funded partnership between the University of Minnesota and Saint Paul Public Schools

2004  Review of the Mathematics Curriculum and Textbooks, Grades 1-12, Ibn Khuldoon School

2003  Curriculum Review of the National Saudi Math Program for Teaching Women Kingdom schools, Saudi Arabia

2000  Competency-Based Evaluation for grades 5,6,8,9 sponsored by UNESCO Lebanese Association for Educational Studies, Lebanon

Research Projects in Progress

2010  Impacting the Teaching of Rational Number Concepts in Qatar (I-TRcIQ). A research proposal submitted to the Qatar Foundation National Priorities’ Fund (NPRP)

2010  Enhancing Middle Level Mathematics Teachers’ Proportional Reasoning Skill. A research proposal submitted to the Teacher Quality Grant Program, University of Georgia.

2010  The Role of Precalculus as a Gatekeeper in Determining Success in Calculus I
Classes: A Mixed-Method Case Study. A research proposal submitted for URSA Research Initiation Grant internal grant in collaboration with the Department of Mathematics & Statistics, and Neuroscience Institute, Georgia State University.

2010 Cross-Cultural Collaborations to Integrate Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) into the Teaching of Mathematics Using Multimedia Learning Technologies. Proposal submitted for a URSA Research Initiation Grant to support a joint partnership between Georgia State University and Durban University of Technology in Durban-South Africa.

2010 Experiencing the Prodigies of Ethnomathematics: Immersion-Based Learning in Trans-Cultural Settings. Proposal submitted for a URSA Faculty Mentoring Grant.

DISSERTATION

Chahine, I.C. (2008). The effect of using Rational Number Project Curriculum on the acquisition of basic fraction concepts by fifth grade Lebanese students. (Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Curriculum & Instruction, University of Minnesota)

MASTER’S THESIS


TEACHING

University Level Teaching in the U.S.A

2010 Fall EDMT 8290: The Study of Learning and Instruction in Mathematics: Rational Number Concepts and Proportional Reasoning. Student Enrollment= 15 (MED-PhD)

2010 Summer EDMT 8420: Topics in School Mathematics Curriculum: Introduction to
Ethnomathematics. Student Enrollment= 19 (MED-PhD)

2010 Spring  EDMT 8430: Socio-cultural and socio-historical Issues in Mathematics Education. Student Enrollment =16 (MED-PhD)

2010 Spring  EDCI 7680. Practicum II: Student Teaching Field Experiences. Student Enrollment=22 (TEEMS-MCE)

2009 Fall  EDCI 6540: Principles of Instruction in Middle Childhood Mathematics and Science. Student Enrollment=18 (TEEMS-MCE)

2008 Spring  ARAB5101: Advanced Studies in Arabic Culture. Student Enrollment=15. (Department of AFRO Studies, University of Minnesota)

2007 Fall  ARAB 1101: Arabic Language and Culture for Beginners I. Average Enrollment=27. (Department of AFRO Studies, University of Minnesota)

ARAB 3101: Intermediate Arabic language and Culture I. Average Enrollment=22. (Department of AFRO Studies, University of Minnesota)

2007 Spring  ARAB 1102: Arabic Language and Culture for Beginners II. Average Enrollment=25. (Department of AFRO Studies, University of Minnesota)

ARAB 3102: Intermediate Arabic language and Culture II. Average Enrollment=21. (Department of AFRO Studies, University of Minnesota)

2006 Fall  ARAB 1101: Arabic Language and Culture for Beginners I. Average Enrollment=25. (Department of AFRO Studies, University of Minnesota)

ARAB 3101: Intermediate Arabic language and Culture I. Enrollment=22. (Department of AFRO Studies, University of Minnesota)

2006 Spring  ARAB 1102: Arabic Language and Culture for Beginners II. Average Enrollment=25. (Department of AFRO Studies, University of Minnesota)

ARAB 3102: Intermediate Arabic language and Culture II. Average Enrollment=22. (Department of AFRO Studies, University of Minnesota)

2005 Fall  ARAB 1101: Arabic Language and Culture for Beginners I. Average Enrollment=25. (Department of AFRO Studies, University of Minnesota)

2005 Spring  ARAB 1102: Arabic Language and Culture for Beginners II. Average Enrollment=25. (Department of AFRO Studies, University of Minnesota)
2004 Fall  ARAB 1101: Arabic Language and Culture for Beginners I. Average Enrollment=25. (Department of AFRO Studies, University of Minnesota)

University Level Teaching in Lebanon

2004 Spring  EDU 302: Teaching Mathematics in the Reform Context. Enrollment=25 (Department of Curriculum & Instruction, MECAT University, Lebanon)

       EDU 301: Mathematics for Elementary Teachers. Student Enrollment=25. (Department of Curriculum & Instruction, MECAT University, Lebanon)

2003 Fall  EDU 311: Fundamentals of Science Education, Fall 2003. Student Enrollment=30. (Department of Curriculum & Instruction, MECAT University, Lebanon).

     EDU 210 Research Methods for Social Sciences I, Fall 2003. Student Enrollment=30. (Department of Curriculum & Instruction, MECAT University, Lebanon)

High School Level Teaching in Lebanon

2000-2003  Instructor and Head of the Mathematics Department, Kingdom Schools, Riyadh Saudi Arabia

1986-1994  Coordinator and Mathematics Teacher (taught Financial and General Mathematics), Computer & Engineering College, Lebanon

SERVICE

2010 Spring  Founding member of the Lebanese Association of Psychological and Educational Measurement (LAPEM) commissioned by the Lebanese government to develop an Arabic version of the IQ tests, ranging from pre-school up to secondary school

2010 Spring  Reviewer: PME/NA
2010–present   Reviewer: International Education Fee (IEF) Study Abroad Programs, Georgia State University

2009 Fall   Reviewer: International Education Fee (IEF) Study Abroad Programs, Georgia State University

2009 Spring   Reviewer: FLAS scholarships’ committee, Global Studies Consortium, University of Minnesota

2008 Fall   Reader/ Panelist: Critical Language Scholarship Program at the Council of American Overseas Research Centers (CAORC)

2006 Spring   Organizer and Facilitator: A Lecture on “Ethnomathematics: The Mix of Concepts and Culture”, University of Minnesota

University/ College Levels

2010-present   Member of the College of Education (COE) Certificate in International Education Committee, Georgia State University

Local/ Departmental

2010 -present   Member of the MSIT Advanced Graduate Degree Program Committee, Georgia State University
2010 -present  Member of the MSIT Culture, Climate and Equity Committee, Georgia State University

Professional Membership

2010-present  Member: The Benjamin Banneker Association

2009 -present  Member: For the learning of Mathematics Group

2009 -present  Member: American Educational Research Association (AERA)

2008 fall  Member: University of Minnesota African American and African Studies Curriculum Committee

2006-present  Member: International Study Group on Ethnomathematics

2005-present  Member: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics

Professional Development

2010  May  The Association For Psychological Science 22nd Annual Convention on Revolutionary Science, Boston, MA

2010 Summer  The Seven Habits of highly Effective People Signature Program, Career Training Program, Georgia State University

2010 Summer  The Fourth International Conference on Ethnomathematics, Towson, Maryland
2010 July  IES Grant Writing Workshop for Development & Innovation Projects, Online Webinar

2010 August  IES Grant Application, online Webinar


2010 Spring  The Thirteenth Consultation of The International Consortium for Research in Science and Mathematics Education (ICRSME XIII), La Manzanilla, Mexico.

2010 Fall  The Compact for Faculty Diversity- The Institute on Teaching and Mentoring, Tampa, FL

2010 Fall  Advanced Training Program: A series of Advanced Education Research Design and Methods seminars. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA

2010 Fall  Faculty Mentoring Conversations, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA

Media Products

2010  Designed a program brochure for Indigenous Knowledge Systems Study Abroad Program. The flyer included a detailed description of the course content and cultural immersion experience.
2009  Designed a program brochure for Ethnomathematics in Morocco Study Abroad Program. The flyer included a detailed description of the course content and cultural immersion experience.

Collaborators & other Affiliations

1. Collaborators.

Lesa Clarkson  University of Minnesota, MN
Robert delMas  University of Minnesota, MN
Lina Ibrahim  Lebanese Association for Psychological Assessment, Lebanon
Walid El Karni  Kingdom school, Saudi Arabia
Murad Jurdak  American university of Beirut, Lebanon
Youssef Kheirallah  Al-Akhawayn University, Morocco
Ramzi Nasser  Qatar University, Qatar
Hissa Bin Ali  Qatar University, Qatar
Thomas Post  University of Minnesota, MN
Mogege Mosimege  University of South Africa, South Africa
Joan Lucy Conolly  Durban Institute of Technology, Durban, South Africa

2. Graduate advisor(s).

Lesa Clarkson  University of Minnesota
Thomas Post  University of Minnesota

3. Ph.D. Dissertation advising at Georgia State University.

I am currently advising 8 students at the doctorate level and serve on the following committees:
Thesis Committee Chair
Stanley Shaheed         Mathematics Education
Tanya Dwellingham      Mathematics Education
Alanna Johnson         Mathematics Education

Member of Thesis Committee
Eze Nwago              Instructional Technology
Marsha Williams        Mathematics Education
Pinder Naidu           Mathematics Education
Lynwall Clarke         Mathematics Education
Angela Fain            Special Education
Choi
Jayoung Choi, Ph.D.

Georgia State University
Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology
College of Education
Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 30302
404-413-8380
jayoungchoi@gsu.edu

Academic Appointments

- Clinical Assistant Professor, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, Fall, 2010-present
- Full time Adjunct Faculty, School of Modern Languages, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2008-summer, 2010
- Part time Instructor, School of Modern Languages, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2003-2008
- Part time Instructor, Department of English as a Second Language, Georgia Perimeter College (Clarkston Campus), 2003-2004

Education

Ph.D. in Language and Literacy Education, Department of Middle and Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, 2009
Concentrations: English as a Second Language, Reading, Multicultural Education

Dissertation: Asian English Language Learners’ Identity Construction in an out-of-school Read, Talk, and Wiki (RTW) Club

Committee: Gertrude Tinker Sachs (Chair), Dana Fox, Joel Myers, Stephanie Lindemann

Finalist for AERA Second Language Research SIG Outstanding Dissertation Award, 2008

M.A. in Applied Linguistics and English as a Second Language, Georgia State University, 2003

Thesis: Proposing a Theme-based Listening/Speaking Course in Korea: Using Video Materials

Advisor: John Murphy

B.A. in English, Incheon University, Incheon, South Korea, 2001

Major: English Language and Literature

Teaching Certification

ESOL Certification/Reading Endorsement, Department of Middle and Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, 2009

Certified Georgia Educator, Georgia Professional Standards Commission, Certified to Teach English (6-12); ESOL(P-12); Middles Grades Language Arts (4-8)

Reading Endorsement (P-12)

Publications


Grants, Honors, and Awards

- Conference Travel Grant to Symposium on Second Language Writing (SSLW), School of Modern Languages, Georgia Institute of Technology, Nov., 2009
- Who’s Who in America, Marquis Who’s Who, 2009-2010
- Finalist for AERA Second Language Research SIG Outstanding Dissertation Award, 2008
- The Hayden-Waltz Doctoral Dissertation Award ($1000), College of Education, Georgia State University, 2008
- "Thank A Teacher" Program Certification Recipient, Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CETL), Georgia Institute of Technology, 2008
- Conference Travel Grant to TESOL, Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, 2007
- Professional Development Scholarship, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), 2007
- Conference Travel Grant to TESOL, Department of Applied Linguistics and ESL, Georgia State University, 2003
- Phi Beta Delta Honor Society for International Scholars, 2003-2009
- Korean American Association Scholarship ($1000), 2002
- Excellent Undergraduate Student Scholarship, Incheon University, Incheon, South Korea, 1996-1997

Courses Taught
Georgia State University, fall 2010-present, Clinical Assistant Professor in ESOL/Literacy

EDCI 7660 Capstone Practicum 3 (Online-Master’s), Fall 2010, Spring 2011
EDCI 7670 Practicum 1 (Online-Master’s-M.A.T. students), Fall 2010
TSLE 7250 Applied Linguistics for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (Online Master’s Level Course), Spring 2011
TSLE 7440 Methods and Materials for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (Online Master’s Level Course), Spring 2011
TSLE 7260 Cultural Issues for the Bilingual/English as a Second Language Teacher (Online Master’s Level Course), Summer 2011

Georgia Institute of Technology, Fall, 2003- Summer, 2010, Lecturer in Korean Language

KOR 1001 Elementary Korean 1 (Undergraduate) (team teaching), Spring 04, Fall 05, 06, 07, 08, 09; Summer, 09
KOR 1002 Elementary Korean 2 (Undergraduate) (team teaching), Fall 03, 05; Spring 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10
KOR 3001 Intermediate Korean 1 (Undergraduate), Fall, 03, 04, 05, 06, 08, 09
KOR 3002 Intermediate Korean 2 (Undergraduate), Spring 04, 05, 09, 10
KOR 4001 Advanced Korean 1 (Undergraduate), Fall 06, 08, 09
KOR 3813 Business Korean 1 (Undergraduate-study abroad program) summer, 2010
KOR 3823 Business Korean 2 (Undergraduate-study abroad program) summer, 2010
KOR 3833 Exploring modern Korea with a focus on reading and speaking (Undergraduate-study abroad program) summer, 2010
Georgia State University, Fall, 2006- Fall, 2008, Graduate Teaching Assistant

RGTR 0198 Regents Reading Skills for Non-native Speakers of English (GSTEP), Fall 08
RGTR 0198 Regents Reading Skills for Native Speakers of English, Fall 06, 08; Spring 07, Summer 07, 08

Georgia Perimeter College (Clarkstone campus), Fall 2003-Spring 2004, Instructor in ESOL

ENSL 0070 Integrated Skills 1 (Undergraduate), Spring 04
ENSL 0071 Applied Grammar 1 (Undergraduate), Fall 03

Other Teaching Experience

Student Teacher

- Meadow Creek High School, Georgia, Sheltered ESOL & Language Arts for 9 and 10th Grades, 2009 (for five months)
- Sandy Springs Middle School, Georgia, ESOL & Math for 6, 7, 8th Grades, 2007 (for two months)
- North Springs High School, Georgia, ESOL & Biology, 2007 (for two months)

Tutor

- Taylor Road Middle School, ESL Class, Fulton County, Georgia, Jan. 2010 to May, 2010
- Georgia State University, ESL Reading and Writing, 2002
- Freelance English Language Tutor, 1996-2000
Community Teacher

- Korean American Professional Association (KAPA), Pan Asian Community Center, Intermediate Korean, 2003-2004
- St. Bedes Church, Chamblee, Georgia, Survival English, 2003
- Fulton County Central Library, Atlanta, Georgia, Conversational English, 2002-2003

Professional Experience

Administration

- Coordinator of the Reading, Language and Literacy-ESOL programs, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, Fall, 2010-present
  - Redesign course syllabi
  - Mentor and advise graduate students
  - Hold academic advising sessions

- Director of KOREA 2010 Language for Business and Technology (LBAT), School of Modern Languages, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2008-summer, 2010
  - Developed curriculum for Business Korean, Current Issues and Technology in Korean, and Exploring Modern Korea with a Focus on Reading and Speaking
  - Held information sessions, communicate with a host university in Korea, collaborate with faculty of the Study and Word Abroad Program, coordinate cultural excursions and business site visits in Korea, publicize the LBAT program to students in the university system of Georgia, and advise undergraduate students
Research Positions

🔹 Research Assistant. Heritage Language Learners’ Literacy Practice and Development: A Case of Korean College Students in the United States. Youngjoo Yi, Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, 2009

- Engaged in a collaborative and action research project exploring college heritage language learners’ literacy practice in a college classroom setting

🔹 Research Assistant. A Middle School Reading Teacher’s Professional Growth. Michelle Zoss, Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, 2008

- Transcribed and analyzed longitudinal qualitative data in a project that examined one middle school reading teacher’s professional growth with the mentoring of a university researcher

🔹 Research Assistant. Health Literacy. Mary Deming, Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, 2006

- Collected data, conducted interviews, and analyzed quantitative data in a research project regarding health literacy
Research Assistant. Pre-service TESOL Teachers’ Racial Perceptions. Gertrude Tinker-Sachs, Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, 2005

Analyzed qualitative data and engaged in a collaborative data analysis process to achieve a stronger inter-coder reliability

Presentations

Featured Presentations


Paper Presentations

"The Use and Role of Pop Culture in Heritage Language and Literacy Learning" (with Youngjoo Yi), AERA, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 8-12, 2011

"High school ELLs' Engagement with Multicultural Literature in an Out-of-School Read, Talk, and Wiki Club", KSU’s Annual Conference on Literature for Children and Young Adults, Kennesaw State University, Kennesaw, GA, March 31, 2011

"Negotiation of College English Language Learners’ Investment in English Across Multiple Communities " (with Youngjoo Yi). The American Association for Applied Linguistics, Chicago, Illinois, March 26-29, 2011

“Multimodal Reading Logs in a Korean Heritage/Foreign Classroom in the US” XI SEDLL International Conference for Competency-Based Foreign Language Teaching and Learning, Jaen, Spain, Dec. 3, 2010

“Embedding “Multimodality” into the ESOL classroom.” Georgia TESOL, Atlanta, Georgia, Oct. 9, 2010
“Benefits and Challenges of Multilingual and Multimodal Literacy Research” (with Youngjoo Yi & Jeongsoo Pyo). The American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL), Atlanta, Georgia, March 6, 2010

“Multimodal Literacy Practices of Korean Heritage Language Learners.” The conference on Literacy, Urban Issues, and Social Studies Education (CLUES), Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, March 27, 2010


“Living in the Bilingual and Bicultural World: “I Don’t Have Any Motivation to Learn Korean.”” Georgia Read and Write Now (GRWN), Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, 2007

“The Illusion of Homogeneity: Talking about “Otherness” in (Post) Secondary Korean and Japanese Language Classrooms” (with Azusa Uchihara). Georgia Read and Write Now (GRWN), Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, 2007


“Stepping out from behind the desk and listening to our students’ music.” (with Tinker Sachs, G, Davidson, W., Schreiber, H., & Shomaker, A.). Georgia Read and Write Now (GRWN), Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, Jan., 2006

“Making Sense of Bilingual and Bicultural Worlds: Four Case Studies.” Georgia Read and Write Now (GRWN), Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, 2006

“Integrating 4 Language Skills and Activities Teaching English and Korean Language to Adult Beginning Learners.” Georgia Read and Write Now (GRWN), Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, 2005

“A Future Teacher Educator’s Hybrid Identity.” Georgia Association of Teacher Educators (GATE) Conference, Savannah, Georgia, 2005

“A Future Teacher Educator’s Hybrid Identity: From the Perspective of a Korean and English Bilingual.” Sino-American Conference, Kennesaw State University, Kennesaw, Georgia, 2005

“Exploring Hybrid Identity.” Association of International Students in Education (AISE) Conference, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, 2005
Poster Presentations

- “Challenges and Successes of Conducting Identity Research on High School English Language Learners.” TESOL Doctoral Forum, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Colorado, Denver, March 25, 2009
- “Asian English Language Learners’ Identity Construction in an After school Read, Talk, and Wiki (RTW) Club” The conference on Literacy, Urban Issues, and Social Studies Education (CLUES), Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, February 13, 2009
- “Bilingual and Bicultural Experiences of Korean Americans” Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Seattle, Washington, March 24, 2007

Presentations as Guest Speaker

- “Qualitative Data Management and Analysis” Critique of Educational Research (Ph.D. course taught by Youngjoo Yi). Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, April 19, 2011
- “Mediating Identities of Asian Adolescent ELLs: An out-of-School Multicultural Literature Read, Talk, Wiki (RTW) Club.” Second Language Acquisition (Master’s course taught by Gertrude Tinker-Sachs). Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, November 7, 2008
- “Analyzing Qualitative Date by Utilizing Nvivo.” Ethnography 2 (Ph.D. course taught by Joel Meyers). Department of Counseling and Psychological Services, Georgia State University, 2007
- “The Use of Technology and Hands-on Activities in a Foreign Language Class” Second Language Acquisition (Master’s course taught by Gertrude Tinker-Sachs). Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, 2006

Service
Refereeing Activities

- Proposal Reviewer. National Reading Conference (LRA/NRC), 2010
- Manuscript Reviewer. Foreign Language Annals, November, 2010

Conferences

- Volunteer. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Colorado, Denver, March 27, 2009
- Volunteer. Job Market Place, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Seattle, Washington, March 25, 2007
- President & Vice President. Association of International Students in Education (A.I.S.E.), College of Education, Georgia State University, 2004-2006

Schools

- Search Committee for the Assistant Professor position in Middle Level Education, MSIT, COE, Georgia State University, Spring, 2011
- Invited Steering Committee member for a collaborative and multidisciplinary Research proposal: 2nd Century Initiative 2010, “Breaking the Glass Ceiling of Achievement for Children who are Deaf and Hard of Hearing”, Georgia State University, Fall, 2010-present
- Novice Scholars’ Association (NSA), Accountability support group formed by new scholars in the MSIT department, COE, Georgia State University, Fall, 2010-present
Participant, Advanced Training in Education Research Methods and Design, COE, Georgia State University, Fall, 2010

Organizer, Determining admission requirements for all non-degree endorsements, MSIT, COE, Georgia State University, Fall, 2010

Search Committee for full time Korean Lecturer, Georgia Institute of Technology, Spring, 2010

Guest Speaker, International Film Series. The Culture Fest. Georgia Institute of Technology, April 5, 2010

Faculty Assistant, The Development of Work Abroad Program in Korea, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2009

Faculty Advisor, Korean Undergraduate Student Association (KUSA), Georgia Institute of Technology, 2007-2009

Coordinator, Korea Culture Festival, Third Year Korean Class, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2008

Search Committee for part time Korean Language Instructor, Georgia Institute of Technology, Fall 2006

Student Reporter, Incheon University Student Magazine, Incheon, South Korea, 1996-1998

Community

Volunteer Translator. Health Fair, Pan Asian Community Center, Duluth, Georgia, 2003

Volunteer Translator. Fantastic International Film Festival, Pucheon, South Korea, 2000


Professional Memberships

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)
American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL)
American Educational Research Association (AERA)
International Reading Association (IRA)
National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
Georgia Association of Educators (GAE)

Graduate Course Work

Applied Linguistics and TESOL (Master’s Courses)

Intercultural Communication (Pat Dunkel)
Approaches to Teaching English as a Second Language (John Murphy)
Sound System of the English Language (Linda Grant)
Practicum in Teaching English (Debra Snell)
General Linguistics (Roderick Jacobs)
Second Language Acquisition (Nan Jiang)
Sociolinguistics (Stephanie Lindemann)
Psycholinguistics (Nan Jiang)
English Grammar for ESL/EFL Teachers (Pat Byrd)
Materials Design, Development and Publication (Pat Byrd)
Second/Foreign Language Listening Comprehension (Pat Dunkel)
Second Language Reading: Theory and Practice (Joan Hildenbrand)
Literacy and Language Education (Doctorate Courses)

- Facilitating and Understanding Adult Learning (Daphne Greenberg)
- Theoretical Models of Literacy Learning Focusing on Writing (Mary Ariail)
- Theoretical Models of Literacy Learning Focusing on Reading (Joyce Many)
- Sociology of Education (Russell Irvine)
- Language Variation and Learning (Gertrude Tinker Sachs)
- Graduate Writing Support Group (Joyce Many)
- Critique of Education Research (Dana Fox)
- Directed Reading-Identity Research (Gertrude Tinker Sachs)
- Multicultural Education (Patricia Carter)
- Development of Racial and Cultural Identity (Miles Anthony Irving)
- Advanced Development of Personality and Society (Ann Kruger)
- Research Seminar (Amy Flint)
- Teaching Internship (Gertrude Tinker Sachs)
- Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Reading (Tammy Fredrick)
- Linking Literacy Assess/Instruct At-Risk Readers (Tammy Fredrick)
- Literacy in Content Areas (Terry Fisher)
- Methods of Bilingual/ESOL (Gertrude Tinker Sachs)
- Practicum Student Teaching I (Tammy Fredrick), II (Terry Fisher), III (YoungJoo Yi)
- Psychology of Learning (Karen Zabrucky)
- Exceptional Children and Youth (Mary Calhoon)

Research Methods Courses
Educational Statistics 1 (John Caras)
Educational Statistics 2 (Carolyn Furlow)
Case Studies (Jennifer Esposito)
Ethnography 1 (Joel Meyers)
Ethnography 2 (Joel Meyers)
Criswell
Curriculum Vitae

Brett Allen Criswell

1312 Trees of Kennesaw Parkway

Kennesaw, GA 30152

(404) 413 – 8416 (Office phone)

(570) 854 – 9900 (Cell phone)

bcriswell@gsu.edu (University e-mail)

brett.criswell@gmail.com (Personal e-mail)

Education

_completed a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction August 2009
with an emphasis in Science Education at the
Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802

_completed an M.S in Science Education at the May 2003
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260

_completed a B.S. in Chemistry Education at May 1988
Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA 15705

Other Educational Experiences

_completed Learning & the Brain Conference 2010

_completed Atlas for Science Literacy Training 2010

_member of the team designated to revise the Pennsylvania 2006 – 2007
State Science Standards (Chemistry Group)

_completed Chemistry for Kids 1996 – 2004

This was an educational outreach program that I ran at the
high school modeled off of the Pittsburgh Chemistry Van

- Member of the Bloomsburg team for the Collaborative for Excellence in Teacher Preparation in Pennsylvania Project 1999 – 2003

- Flinn Chemistry Workshop June 2003

One week training program based on using demonstrations and labs in an inquiry model

- Susquehanna Van Program June 2002

One week training program designed to develop competence in using Calculator-Based Laboratory (CBL) equipment

- ChemEd Conferences: One week conference highlighting new approaches to teaching chemistry held on odd years
  - Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, Connecticut August 2001
  - Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina August 1997
  - Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia August 1995

- Governor’s School for Physical Sciences: Two week workshop focusing on the inclusion of inquiry-based activities in the curriculum within the framework of the Pennsylvania State Science Standards Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA

College Pedagogical Experiences

- Limited term Clinical Assistant Professor in the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology at Georgia State University; Coordinator of the MAT Middle Childhood Education Math & Science and the MAT Secondary Childhood August 2010 – Present
Education Science programs; responsible for teaching Middle-school Science methods course, supervising practicum students, and teaching doctoral courses

Tenure-track faculty in the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry at Kennesaw State University with teaching responsibilities in both education and chemistry; courses include SCED 4416 / 6416 (methods class), SCED 4417 / 6417 (field experience), SCED 4475 / 6475 (student teaching field experience and seminar), SCED 7750 (Contemporary Issues in Science Education), SCI 7725 (Chemistry for MEd and MAT students)

Graduate Assistant Position at Penn State University as Instructor for SciEd 411 and SciEd 412 (science education methods courses) Fall 2007, Spring 2008, and Fall 2008

Graduate Assistant Position at Penn State University as Supervisor of Field Studies Students in Science Education for 495C Course (Pre-Student Teaching) Fall 2004 and Spring 2005

K – 12 Pedagogical Experience

Chemistry Teacher at Central Columbia High School 4777 Old Berwick Road 2007 (except 1994 – 1995 during which I was on a Leave of Absence to pursue my M.S.) Bloomsburg, PA 17815 Phone (570) 752 – 0535 www.ccsd.cc (Home page) My duties there include teaching Chemistry I (introductory course) August 1988 – 2007 (except 1994 – 1995 during which I was on a Leave of Absence to pursue my M.S.)
• Organic Chemistry (advanced elective course) 2005 during which I
• Chemistry II (advanced elective course) am on a sabbatical
• Independent Study Chemistry (project work) to pursue my Ph.D.

Other Pedagogical Experiences

- Graduate Assistant at the University of Pittsburgh working on their Chemistry Van Program (involved performing demonstration programs and conducting professional development for science teachers in the Pittsburgh area)

- Research Assistant in the laboratory of Dr. Harold Pinnick at Bucknell University working on a project to complete the total synthesis of an organic compound having potential as a pharmaceutical

Honors / Awards

- Recipient of GRT assistantship in Science Education 2008 – 2009
- Recipient of the Vince Lunetta Scholarship for the Outstanding Doctoral Student in Science Education 2007 – 2008

Publications

- Inquiry in the Chemistry Classroom: Perplexity, Model
Testing, and Synthesis (2007), Chapter in Science as Inquiry
in the Secondary Setting, Washington, DC, NSTA Press
(co-written with Scott McDonald and Oliver Dreon)

Connecting Acids and Bases with Encapsulation . . .
and Chemistry with Nanotechnology, Journal of Chemical
Education, 2007, 84, 1136

Mistake of Having Students Be Mendeleev for Just a Day,
Journal of Chemical Education, 2007, 84, 1140

The Extraction and Isolation of Saltpeter from Nitred Soil.
A Curriculum Alignment Project for a First-Year High
School Chemistry Course, Journal of Chemical Education,
2006, 83, 241

Ions or Molecules? Polymer Gels Can Tell, Journal of
Chemical Education, 2006, 83, 576A

A Diaper a Day and What's Going on with Gaviscon?:
Two Lab Activities Focusing on Chemical Bonding Concepts,
Journal of Chemical Education, 2006, 83, 574

Two "Gas-in-a-Bag" Reactions To Show the Predictive
Power of the Relative Acid–Base Strength Chart,
Journal of Chemical Education, 2006, 83, 1167

Presentations

The Southeastern Association for Science Teacher Education (SASTE) Conference, Kennesaw, GA
October 9th – 10th, 2009

• Helping Bridge the Gap between the Everyday
and the Scientific – A Model for Structuring Teacher Talk

- The Annual Conference of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching (NARST), Garden Grove, CA 2009
  - The Invisible College for Inquiry Science Study: Developing Teachers through Research (Presentation with other members of the Penn State research group)
  - The Impact of Video Analysis on the Development of Professional Vision in Pre-service and Practicing Teachers (Presentation with other members of the Penn State research group)

- The Annual Conference of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching (NARST), Baltimore, MD 2nd, 2008
  - When a ‘Dead End’ Is Really Just the Beginning: Exploring a Proposed Participant Structure and Its Contributions to Progressive Discourse in the Science Classroom (Part of a Paper Set)

- Franklin & Marshall’s “How People Learn: The Implications of Learning Research for Science Education” Conference, Lancaster, PA
  - Mentoring new inquiry-minded science teachers: Experiences from ICISS (Co-Presenter)

- Bloomsburg University’s Annual Education Conference, Bloomsburg, PA
  - Using Materials Science as an Unifying Principle in
Secondary Physical Science Course (Sole Presenter)

• From Cookbook Chemistry to Inquiry Chemistry in October 2000

One Easy Lesson (Sole Presenter)

• The ACS National Convention, Local Session on Improving Secondary Chemistry Education, Princeton, N.J.

• The Four Elements and the Future of the Planet: An Introductory Chemistry Curriculum with an Engaging Storyline (Poster Presentation; Sole Presenter)

• Annual Summer Conference of the Collaborative for Excellence in Teacher Preparation in Pennsylvania (CETP-PA), Bloomsburg, PA

• Constructivist Teaching in the High-School Chemistry Curriculum (Sole Presenter)

Grants

• Direct to Discovery: A Science Learning System for the Future; Co-PI; $449,885 Submitted 1/5/11 to NSF DR K-12 Program

• Supporting Science Talk through Forces, Food, and Photons; PI; funded for $48,659 Submitted November 8, 2010 to Georgia Teacher Quality Grant Office

• Recruiting and Retaining Teacher Leaders in Physics and Chemistry; Co-PI; funded for $2,841,528 Submitted March 8, 2010 to NSF Noyce Track II

• 5th and 8th Grade Team Leader in the Northwest Georgia Math & Science Partnership Grant Summer 2009 – Spring 2010

• Toshiba America Foundation grant of $4,500 on Nanotechnology in the Chemistry Classroom 2005 – 2006 school year
Professional Memberships

- Member of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching

Service

- Reviewer for the Journal of Teacher Education  
  Fall 2010 – Present
- Reviewer Journal of Chemical Education  
  Winter 2009 – Present
- Ad hoc reviewer for the Journal of Experimental Psychology  
  Winter 2007 – Spring 2009
- Ad hoc reviewer for Science Education  
  Winter 2007 – Present
Cross
STEPHANIE L. BEHMCROSS

Mailing Address: Phone: (404) 413-8418
College of Education ~ MSIT Email: scross@gsu.edu
P.O. Box 3987 Office: COE 663
30 Pryor Street
Atlanta, GA 30302-3978

Present Rank: Clinical Assistant Professor
Tenure Status: Non-tenure track
Department: Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology
Units: Middle Level Education and Mathematics Education

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Curriculum & Instruction, Mathematics Education August 2008
College of Liberal Arts & Human Sciences
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

M.A., Curriculum & Instruction, Secondary Mathematics Education May 2003
College of Human Resources & Education
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Certified to teach mathematics grades 6-12

B.A., Interdisciplinary Studies (Mathematics and Business) August 2001
College of Arts & Sciences
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
EMPLOYMENT

Clinical Assistant Professor of Middle Level Education  Aug 2009 – Present
Georgia State University, College of Education, Atlanta, GA

Middle School Mathematics Teacher  Aug 2007 – June 2009
Community Charter School of Davidson, Davidson, NC

Graduate Research and Teaching Assistant  Aug 2001 – July 2007
Department of Mathematics, Virginia Tech

Supervisor of Secondary Mathematics Student Teachers  Aug 2003 – June 2004
Department of Teaching and Learning, Virginia Tech

Course Consultant/Developer  Summers 2002 - 2006
Virginia Tech, Department of Mathematics

University of Virginia, School of Education

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Student teachers’ identity development and changing conceptions of teaching during fieldwork
Preservice teachers’ conceptions of theory and practice in middle grades education programs
Teachers’ sense of efficacy and agency in curricular decision-making in middle grades mathematics
Affordances and limitations of textbook use for teachers and students in mathematics classrooms
Curriculum integration and authentic problem-based learning in middle grades mathematics education
PUBLICATIONS


SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPTS


RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS


RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS (CONTINUED)


EDITOR EXPERIENCE

Associate Editor: September 2010 - present

Journal of Urban Mathematics Education (JUME)

Editorial Review Board Member: December 2010 - present

Research in Middle Level Education (RMLE) Online

Assistant Editor:

RESEARCH AND GRANT EXPERIENCE

Teacher Quality Grant, Enhancing Middle Level Mathematics Teachers' Understanding of Proportional Reasoning Skills and Rational Number Relationships

Amount Awarded: $44,500
Grant duration: Spring 2011-Summer 2012
Role: Co-PI

Writing Across the Curriculum Grant, Georgia State University, 2010
Amount Awarded: $2000 to support development of a writing intensive course
Grant duration: Had to decline award due to summer writing conference conflict
Role: Author

Dissertation Research, Preservice Elementary Teachers' Learning with Mathematics Curriculum Materials During Preservice Teacher Education
Committee Chair: Dr. Gwendolyn M. Lloyd, Department of Mathematics, Virginia Tech
Committee Members: Dr. Vanessa Pitts-Bannister, Dr. Jesse (Jay) Wilkins, Dr. Melvin (Skip) Wilson, and Dr. Anderson Norton, Department of Teaching and Learning, Virginia Tech
Research Assistant, Virginia Tech, 2006 - 2007

Improving the Learning of Preservice Secondary Mathematics Teachers through Engagement with Middle & High School Curriculum Materials (NSF 0536678, PI Gwendolyn Lloyd, co-PI Vanessa Pitts-Bannister)
Assisted in the collection and analysis of data for research on preservice secondary mathematics teachers' use of innovative middle school and high school mathematics curriculum materials
Research Assistant, Virginia Tech, 2001 - 2005

Assisted in the collection and analysis of data for research on preservice teachers’ use of innovative elementary and middle school curriculum materials

Grant Course Developer, Preparing Highly Qualified Middle School Mathematics Teachers Across Virginia (PI Nancy Iverson, University of Virginia), Virginia Tech, Summer 2004, 2005, 2006

Developed curriculum for three mathematics courses for inservice teachers to be utilized by teacher educators at 5 universities across Virginia

Grant Recipient, Graduate Research Development Program, Virginia Tech Graduate School, Spring 2005, Awarded $300 for dissertation research

Role: Author

Grant Recipient, Doctoral Student Research Grant Program, Virginia Tech Department of Teaching and Learning, Spring 2004, Awarded $2500 for dissertation research

Role: Author and PI

Grant Recipient, Travel Fund Program, Virginia Tech Graduate Student Assembly, Fall 2003 and Fall 2004, Awarded $300 each semester for conference travel

INVITED CONFERENCES, OTHER PRESENTATIONS AND WORKSHOPS

Invited Course Speaker, Spring 2010

   ELL Practicum Seminar, Dr. Gertrude Tinker Sachs

   Topic: Classroom management in the middle grades

INVITED CONFERENCES, OTHER PRESENTATIONS AND WORKSHOPS (CONT.)

Invited Workshop Participant, 2008-09

   Using the Outdoors to Teach Experiential Science [UTOTES]

   Ongoing Charter School participation funded through the NC Museum of Natural Sciences
Invited Conference Participant, May 2007

Doctoral Fellows Meeting of the Center for the Study of Mathematics Curriculum (CSMC)

Participation funded by CSMC

Invited Conference Participant, February 2006

Annual Research Meeting of the Center for the Study of Mathematics Curriculum and the Preconference (an authors’ meeting for the edited book, Factors Influencing Student Teachers’ Interactions with Mathematics Curriculum Materials)

Participation funded by editors’ NSF conference grant and CSMC

Invited Conference Participant, University of Missouri-Columbia, Summer 2004

Show-Me Researchers’ Workshop, “Instruction Materials and Teachers” working group

Participation funded by Show-Me Center


TEACHING AND SUPERVISION ASSIGNMENTS

Georgia State University:

EDCI 3200: Organization and Instruction of Middle Grades Curriculum

EDCI 3220: Understanding and Supporting Middle School Learners

EDMT 4460: Concepts and Methods in Middle Level Math

EDCI 4600: Practicum I

EDCI 7670: Practicum II/III

Summary of 2010 GSU Student Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Times Taught</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Overall Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 3200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: 1Scale is from 1.0-5.0, with 5.0=Extremely Effective.

Virginia Tech:

MATH 1614: Number and Operations for Teachers; times taught: 4; average enrollment: 25
MATH 1624: Geometry and Statistics for Teachers; times taught: 4; average enrollment: 20
MATH 4654: Capstone Thesis Seminar for Teachers; times taught: 1; enrollment: 12
MATH 4625: Number and Operations for Highly Qualified Teachers; co-creator
MATH 4626: Geometry and Statistics for Highly Qualified Teachers; co-creator

OTHER TEACHING AND COURSE DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCES

Middle School Math Teacher, 2007 – 2009
Community Charter School of Davidson – Davidson, NC

- Planned and taught integrated, differentiated math and science units for 6th and 7th grade
- Developed mathematics curriculum for the entire middle school program

Course Consultant/Developer, Summer 2002, 2003, 2004
Virginia Tech, Department of Teaching and Learning – Blacksburg, VA

- Helped develop two mathematics content courses for inservice secondary mathematics teachers for 4 universities across Virginia

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AND MEMBERSHIPS

Leadership/Committee Positions at Georgia State University:

University Level:
Critical Thinking through Writing Georgia State University Ambassador, B.S.E. Middle Level Education representative, 2009-present

College Level:

Kappa Delta Pi, College of Education, Faculty Advisor, 2010-present

PEF Curriculum Committee, Middle Level Representative, Georgia State University, College of Education, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, 2010-2011

College of Education Student Affairs Committee, Georgia State University, Representative from the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, 2009-2010

Charter School Initiative, College of Education, Invited Ad-Hoc Committee Member 2009-10

Department Level:

MSIT Annual Clinical Faculty Evaluation Committee, Georgia State University, College of Education, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, 2010-2011

Urban Adolescent Teaching and Learning Unit Leader, Georgia State University, College of Education, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, 2009-11

Middle Level B.S.E. Middle Level Education Coordinator, Georgia State University, College of Education, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, 2009-11

Middle Level M.Ed. Middle Level Education Coordinator, Georgia State University, College of Education, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, 2009-11

Middle Level Ed.S. Middle Level Education Coordinator, Georgia State University, College of Education, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, 2009-11

Other Leadership and Service Positions:

Student Recruitment for GSU B.S.E. Middle Level Program, Present program information in select courses as Georgia Perimeter Colleges, 2009-2010

Central Piedmont Community College Advisory Committee, Invited teacher representative to the advisory committee for teacher education initiatives, 2008-09
Search Committee Member, Invited graduate student representative to the search committee for a tenure-track mathematics education position in the Department of Teaching and Learning, 2007

Curriculum & Instruction Representative to the Executive Committee, Virginia Tech School of Education Student Association (VT SOESA), 2004-05


PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AND MEMBERSHIPS (CONTINUED)

Reviewer:

- Journal for Research in Mathematics Education
- Journal of Urban Mathematics Education
- Research in Middle Level Education

Member:

- American Educational Research Association (AERA)
- National Middle School Association (NMSA)
- Association of Mathematics Teacher Educators (AMTE)
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)
- North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Math Ed. (PME-NA)
Deming
MARY P. DEMING
590 Emory Oaks Way
Decatur, Georgia 30033
(H) (404) 376-8969
(W) (404) 651-0175

EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy in Communicative Arts,
Georgia State University,
Atlanta, Georgia
Additional graduate courses in Reading Education, Literature, Ethnography, Research methods

Master of Science in English Education,
Florida International University,
Miami, Florida

Bachelor of Science in English Education,
Florida State University,
Tallahassee, Florida

PROFESSIONAL
EXPERIENCES

2010-11 Coordinator of TEEMS English MAT program
2006-2008  Director of Teacher Quality Initiatives for P-16 Initiatives,  
University System of Georgia Board of Regents

2004-2006  Professional Development Schools Coordinator for Middle and Secondary  
Schools for the College of Education, Georgia State University

2002-2004  Chair, Middle, Secondary and Instructional Technology Department (MSIT),  
Georgia State University

2000-2002  Coordinator, Language and Literacy Unit, MSIT, Georgia State University

2000-2010  Associate Professor, Language and Literacy Unit, MSIT, Georgia State  
University

1998-1999  Joint appointment in the Department of English/Department of Learning  
Support, Georgia State University

1998-2000  Visiting Associate Professor in the College of Education, Georgia State  
University

1997-1998  Coordinator and Associate Professor-Composition Unit, Department of Learning  
Support Programs, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

1992-1995  Coordinator-Composition Unit, Department of Learning Support Programs,  
Georgia State University
1995-1999    Associate Professor of Composition, Department of Learning Support Programs, Georgia State University

Summer 1992   Coordinator, BRIDGE Summer Enrichment Program, Division of Developmental Studies, Georgia State University

1989-1995    Assistant Professor of Composition, Division of Developmental Studies, Georgia State University

1987-89      English Coordinator/Assistant Professor, Developmental Studies, DeKalb College, Clarkston, Georgia

1986-87      English Instructor, Developmental Studies, DeKalb College, Clarkston, Georgia

1984-86      Director, Computer/Learning Laboratory, Division of Developmental Studies, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

1983-86      Graduate Teaching Assistant, Division of Developmental Studies, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

Summer 1990  Faculty Member, BRIDGE Summer Enrichment Program,

Summer 1985  Division of Developmental Studies, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

Winter -    Instructor, Study Skills, Composing on the Computer, Saturday School,
Spring 1986  Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

Fall 1985  Part-time Reading Instructor, Developmental Studies,
          Kennesaw State College, Kennesaw, Georgia

Summer 1984  Graduate Research Assistant, Special Education Department,
             Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

Fall 1983-  Graduate Research Assistant, Dean's Office, College of Education,
Winter 1984  Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

Spring 1983  Graduate Teaching Assistant, Curriculum and Instruction Department,
             Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

1981-82  Part-time English and Humanities Instructor,
         Biscayne College, Opa-locka, Florida

1978-82  Part-time English Instructor, St. John Vianney Seminary, Miami, Florida

1972-1982  High School English Teacher, Miami, Florida

PUBLICATIONS

Understanding the complexities inherent in large scale implementation of the PDS model by an
urban research institution. In J. Many & C. Bohan (Eds.) Clinical teacher education: Reflections
from an urban professional development school network. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing,


Exploring urban literacy and developmental education (pp. 67-77). Minneapolis: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy. (Reprint from 1997 monograph).


Deming, M.P. (1998). Mainstreaming basic writers. Chronicling the debate [Monograph]. The role of developmental education in preparing successful college students. Published by NADE/National Resource Center for the Freshman Year Experience and Students in Transition at the University of South Carolina.


BOOKS


**DISSERTATION**


**GRANTS**

Curlette, W., Benson, G., Ogletree, S. & Deming, M.P. (Co-PI). Successful Teaching Using Accumulated Results and Support (STARS) Leveraged with Internet and Virtual Education (LIVE) ($28,000,000) submitted to i3 grants, May 2010, not funded.

Assisted on two State Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants (2008):

Inquiry Toolbox for Science Teachers (ITST) project with Fulton County’s Tri-Cities Cluster.

Writing that Works: Improving High School Content Knowledge and Writing Performance Using WAC and ESL Theory and Practice with Cross Keys High School and the GSU English Department.
Assisted on Systemic Professional Development Schools Approach to Education Reform for the Knowledge Economy: A proposal to the U.S. Agency for International Development Mission in Jordan.

Deming, M.P. & Paterson, P. Creating the Ideal Middle School ($1.35 million) submitted to NCTAF/Knowledge Works Foundations, March 2008, not funded.

Deming, M.P. & Paterson, P. Professional Pathways Grant ($600,000) submitted to Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, June 2007, not funded.


EDITORIAL ACTIVITIES

Reviewer, Health Education Research, 2005


Member of the editorial board, SRATE Journal, 2002-2008

Member of the editorial board of the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy’s (CREDUL) 2000, 2001 monographs.

Occasional reviewer, College English.


CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS (NATIONAL)


presented at the National Association for Developmental Education’s Annual Conference, Louisville, KY.


Experience commentaries by urban developmental studies students. Paper presented at the National Association for Developmental Education Annual Conference, Little Rock, AK.


Workshop conducted at the Conference on College Composition and Communication Annual Convention, Washington, D.C..


Deming, M.P. (1994, March). Beyond the cognitive domain (workshop discussion leader). Workshop conducted at the Conference on College Composition and Communication Annual Convention, Nashville, TN.


Deming, M.P. (1993, April). Beyond the cognitive domain (workshop discussion leader). Workshop conducted at the Conference on College Composition and Communication Annual Convention, San Diego, CA.


Deming, M.P., with B. Benson, D. Denzer, & M.V. Gold. (1990, November). Alternatives for meeting the needs of diverse students: Learning from ESL and basic writing. Paper presented at the National Council of Teachers of English Convention, Atlanta, GA.


Deming, M.P., with DeKalb College Developmental Studies Faculty. (1989, March). The coming of age of the academic support center. Paper presented at the National Association for Developmental Education Annual Conference, Cincinnati, OH.


CONFERENCES PRESENTATIONS (LOCAL and STATE)

Deming, M.P. (November 2010). The TEEMS English MAT Program. Presentation to the Department of English, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Deming, M.P., with M.V. Gold, & M.A. Errico. (February 2001). Using the novel When I was Puerto Rican in a high school English class. Paper presented at the Georgia Council of Teachers of English, Savannah, GA.


Deming, M.P. (1996, July). Introduced GCTE College Teacher of the Year Award. UGA/GCTE Twenty-fifth Annual Summer Conference on the English Language Arts, Athens, GA.


Deming, M.P. (April, 1996). Introduced Dr. James L. Muyskens, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (presenter). The Twenty-first Annual LS/DS Conference of GA., Jekyll Island, GA.


Deming, M.P. (1990, July). The influence of gender on the reading and writing processes of high school and college students. Paper presented at the Nineteenth Annual Conference on Teaching the English Language Arts, Athens, GA.


Deming, M.P., with M.V. Gold, B. Benson, & D. Denzer. (1989, December). ESL and basic writers: Two sides of the same coin? Paper presented at the Culture, Writing and the Interrelationships Conference, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Deming, M.P., with M.V. Gold. (1988, February). The many faces of college English: Meeting the diverse needs of a changing college population. Paper presented at the Seventeenth Annual Conference on Teaching the English Language Arts, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

Seventeenth Annual Conference on Teaching the English Language Arts, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA.


COLLOQUIA AND SEMINAR PRESENTATIONS

Deming, M.P. (1998, November). Using your five senses to explore descriptive writing (seminar leader). Inman Middle School’s Eighth Annual Writing Workshop, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, GA.

INVITED PAPERS

Deming, M.P. (2002, November). Participant in the Fourth Meeting on Future Directions in Developmental Education sponsored by the Center for Research on Developmental Education Urban Literacy, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Deming, M.P., with TEEMS students, V. Bos, & J. Steinberg. (2001, October). Situating grammar through the language arts curriculum. Presented as part of the Conversations with GSU Department of English, Atlanta, GA.

Deming, M.P. (2000, April). Invited speaker for the College Composition and Communication Conference Basic Writing Workshop, Minneapolis, MN.


WORKSHOP


SERVICE TO THE DEPARTMENT
Mentor Dr. Michelle Zoss (2010).

Program Coordinator of TEEMS English MAT Program (2010).

Member of the Initial Teaching Preparation Committee (2010).

Member of MSIT Reading Faculty Search Committee (2010).

Member of MSIT Faculty Annual Evaluation Committee (2009-2010).

Program Coordinator for the Language and Literacy Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree (2008-present)

Member of MSIT’s Middle Childhood Clinical Assistant Professor’s Search Committee (2008-present)

Member of MSIT’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (2008-present)

Member of MSIT’s Advisory Committee (2002, 2004, 2005)

Member of the Georgia Read/Write Now Planning Committee (1999-2002)

Member of the Department of English’s Teaching Secondary English Committee (1998)

Member of the Department of Academic Foundation’s Curriculum and Research Committee (1998)
Member of Curriculum and Research Committee (1996-1997); Assessment Subcommittee (1997)

Member of Executive Committee (1990-1992; 1993; 1994; 1995; 1996)

Member of Learning Laboratory, Director's Search Committee
Division of Developmental Studies (1992)

Member of Promotion and Salary Appeals Committee (1993-1995)

Member of Affirmative Action Committee (1991)

Member of Student Affairs Committee (1989-1990)

Member of Composition Search Committee (1989-1990; 1995)

Faculty Mentor (1989-Present)

Bridge Mentor (1989-1991)

SERVICE TO THE COLLEGE

Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee (2010).
Member of the Cumulative Review Faculty Committee (2010).

SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY

Serving on two doctoral committees: Susan Hunter and Cindy Thompson (2008-2010).

University Undergraduate Assessment Committee (2008-present)

SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

Member of the Gwinnett-GSU Reading Endorsement Initiative for Special Educators Research Group.


Georgia Framework for Teaching Workshop, Georgia Southern University (2006).

Member of Gwinnett County’s Phoenix High School Advisory Board (1999-2000)

Outside promotion and tenure reviewer for dossier of Dr. Patricia James, the University of Minnesota (2000)

Reviewer of Board of Regents’ Title Two Grants (2000)

Representative from the Department of English to the Educational Partnership Task Force between Atlanta Public Schools and Georgia State University (1999).
Reviewer of the National Organization of Developmental Education’s (NADE) Annual Convention Proposals (Summer 1998)

Member of the local planning committee of the National Organization of Developmental Educators (NADE) annual conference held in Atlanta in March 1999.

Past-President of the Georgia National Association of Developmental Educators (NADE/Georgia)

Scholarship Chair for Georgia National Association of Developmental Education (NADE/Georgia) (1996-1997)

President of the Georgia National Association of Developmental Educators (NADE/Georgia) (1995)

Member of NADE/Georgia Awards Committee (1995-1997)

Atlanta Bid Committee, NADE/Georgia (for 1998 National NADE Convention)

Member of NADE Membership Committee (1995-1997)

Member of Georgia Council Teachers of English (Member of Board of Directors (1990-1997)

N.C.T.E. Liaison 1994-1997; College Teacher of the Year Award Committee (1995-1997)

Reviewer of NADE Annual Convention Proposals (1994; 1997)
Member of the Committee on Women in the Profession for National Council of Teachers of English (1990-1991)

Member of Georgia Council of the International Reading Association Board of Directors (1990-1992)

Member of NADE-Georgia Nominating Committee (1990-1992)

Chair, Excellence in English Program, Georgia Council of Teachers of English (1991-92)

Chair, Georgia Write Now Conference's "Best Video Contest" (1991-92)

Chaired Video-based CASE Analysis to Enhance Teacher Preparation. Thirty-fourth Annual College Reading Association Conference, Nashville, Tennessee, November 2-4, 1990

Member of Planning Committee, Georgia Write Now Conference, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia (1989-1995)

Chaired Crossing Boundaries in Second Language Learning, Forty-Second Annual Convention Conference on College Composition and Communication, Boston, Massachusetts, March 21-23, 1991

Member of Planning Committee for International Reading Association National Conference, (1990)

Member of State Awards Function Planning Committee for the Thirty-fifth Annual International Reading Association's Convention, Atlanta, Georgia, May 6-11, 1990
Member of Planning Committee for National Council Teachers of English National Conference (1990)

Member of Registration Committee and Meeting Room Arrangements Committee National Council of English Teachers' Convention, November 16-21, 1990, Atlanta, Georgia

Member of College Reading Association National Convention's Local Arrangement Committee (1988)

Member of Conference on College Composition and Communication's National Convention's Local Registration Committee (1987)

Member of Metro Atlanta College Developmental Reading Council Board of Directors and Research Committee (1987-1991)

Member of National Council of Teachers of English Computer Technology Committee (1989-1990)

Member of International Reading Association Micro Sig Computer Committee (1989-1990)

Co-chaired The Voices of Authority: Gender Issues in Teaching Writing, Conference on College Composition and Communication, Chicago, Illinois, March 22, 1990

Introduced Dr. Virginia Spencer Carr: Evolvement of a Biography. Georgia Write Now Conference: Integrating for Literacy, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, January 26-27, 1990
Presider, Dr. Kay Ellen Rutledge: TCT: Its Development and Impact. Eighteenth Annual Conference on Teaching the English Language Arts, Athens, Georgia, July 13, 1989

Presider, Second General Session: Dr. John Stone. Conference on Written Communication: Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, January 30, 1988

Presider, Read, Respond, Write. Georgia Council of the International Reading Association, Atlanta, Georgia, March 1986.

University Faculty Grievance Committee (2005)

College of Education’s Representative to the Search Committee for the Dean of Arts and Sciences (2002).

Search Committee Chair for Language and Literacy Searches (2001-2002)

Search Committee member for Counseling and Psychological Services (2004)

Member of the College of Education’s Academy for Future Teachers’ Committee (2000-2001)

Member of and secretary for the Professional Education Council’s (PEC) Cultural Diversity Committee (1998-2002)

Member of the Professional Education Council’s (PEC) Secondary Committee (1998)

Member of the Interfaith Council; One of the judges for the essay contest: What does it mean to be a person of faith in a world of many faiths? (1998)
Member of the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee (WAC) (1995-2002)

Member of Freshman English Committee (1996-1997)

Member of Provost's Strategic Planning Committee (1995)

Chair and member of numerous doctoral committees, College of Education (1997-present)

Member of a Dissertation Committee, Department of Nursing (1995-1996)

Member of a Master’s Thesis Committee, College of Education (1995-1997)

Member of the University-Wide Placement Committee (1994)

Reading Professor Search Committee, College of Education (1994)

Nominated by division colleagues for Membership on the Provost Search Committee (1993)

Member of English as a Second Language Faculty Search Committee (1992)

Member of the GSU Women's Concerns Task Force (1991-1993)

Member of Presidential Inauguration Committee (1989-90)
CONSULTATIONS

Consultant for the Second Meeting on Future Directions in Developmental Education sponsored by the Center for Research in Urban Literacy (CRDEUL), General College and the University of Minnesota, April 2001.

Consultant to Pima County Community College Developmental Studies faculty from Tucson, Arizona, May 18, 1994.

Consultant for Chesapeake Community College, Wye Mills, Maryland (May, 1991)

Consultant for the National Center for Developmental Education, Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina (1990-1997)

Computer Software Consultation, Developmental Studies Learning Lab, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia (March, 1990)

Establishing a Computer/Learning Laboratory Consultation, English Department Writing Center Staff, Georgia State University (Winter, 1986)

Bank Street Writer Presentation, Special Services Faculty and Staff, Georgia State University (June, 1985)

Bank Street Writer Presentation, Learning Laboratory, Division of Developmental Studies, Georgia State University (March 1985)

Punctuation Series, Learning Laboratory, Division of Developmental Studies, Georgia State University (March, 1985)
Computer Software Acquisition Consultation, Atlanta University Library Staff (September, 1985)

PROFESSIONAL HONORS

Successfully completed IT 7360, Teachers and Technology and EPRS 8550, Ethnography I (2000, 2001)

Successfully renewed Georgia T-7 Teaching Certificate

Recipient of the Georgia Council of Teachers of English 1999 College Teacher of the Year Award

Recipient of the Metro Atlanta Developmental Reading Council’s Research Award (1997) (with M.V. Gold, C. Callahan, T. Mangram and M.A. Errico)

Recipient of the 1996 NADE Outstanding Research/Publication Award (with M.V. Gold)

Making Connections through Reading and Writing (with M. V. Gold) named NADE/Georgia’s Outstanding Publication for 1995

Nominated for Distinguished Alumni Professor Award, Georgia State University (1991)

Recipient of the Metro-Atlanta College Developmental Reading Council's Research Award (1988)
Dr. Gwen Benson, Associate Dean of the College of Education, Georgia State University, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303.

Dr. Dana Fox, Chair, Middle, Secondary, and Instructional Technology Department, College of Education, Georgia State University, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303, (404) 651-2251.

Dr. Joan M. Elifson, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Floyd College, P.O Box 1864, Rome, GA 30162-1864 (706)295-6331

Dr. Maria Valeri-Gold, Professor of Reading, Freshman Studies, Georgia State University, University Plaza, Atlanta, Georgia 30303, (770) 471-9465.
Kadir Demir, Ph.D.

Last Updated in May 2011

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Personal Data

   University Address:

   Georgia State University
   Middle/Secondary Education & Instructional Technology Department
   P.O Box 3978
   Atlanta, GA 30302
   Office: (404) 413-8410
   Fax: (404) 413-8063
   E-mail: kadir@gsu.edu

2. Academic Record

   a. Institutions Attended:

      2002-2006  Ph.D. Curriculum and Instruction – Science Education, University of Missouri, Columbia (MU).
      • Dissertation Title: “Alternative Certification Science Teachers’ Understanding and Implementation of Inquiry-Based Instruction in Their Beginning Years of Teaching.”
      • Doctoral Committee Chair: Dr. Sandra Abell.

      • Advisor: Dr. John Wedman

• Advisor: Dr. Lloyd Barrow.

1993-1996 Bachelor of Science – Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.

• Biology Teaching Degree

b. Academic Appointments:

2008-Present Georgia State University Assistant Professor
Atlanta, GA

2006-2008 University of Toledo Postdoctoral Fellowship
Toledo, OH

2001-2006 University of Missouri-Columbia Graduate Teaching Assistant
Columbia, Missouri Teaching Intern Supervisor
Graduate Research Assistant

Testing Specialist

Batman, Turkey Education – Grades 6-11, Kultur

Middle School; Yahya Kemal High School

1994 – 1996 Seckin Dersanesi, Inc. Teaching Assistant (Biology) – Grades 9-11
Ankara, Turkey and High School Graduates

3. Awards and Honors

• In the annual EXCEL Awards Competition conducted by the Association Media and Publishing, my article “Science From the Pond Up: Using Measurement to Introduce Inquiry” (published in the March/April 2010 issue of JCST) was selected by their Board of Directors for a bronze award in the feature article category.

• Awarded scholarship by American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) to attend Developing and Using Assessments Aligned to Science Learning Goals workshop (AAAS Project 2061 professional development workshop for educators) (2010).
• Minority Faculty Development Grant ($800) awarded by Office of Underrepresented Faculty at GSU (Spring, 2010).

• Minority Faculty Development Grant ($800) awarded by Office of Underrepresented Faculty at GSU (Fall, 2009).

• Recognized by University of Toledo’s UT3, UToledo. UTeach. UTouch the Future, program because of scholarly research contribution to the program (2008).

• Selected to present dissertation proposal at American Educational Research Association’s Division K Graduate Seminar, April 2005, Montreal, Canada.

• Awarded full scholarship to study at the English Language School of the prestigious Middle East Technical University – Ankara, Turkey, 1999-2000.

• Awarded full scholarship to study at any university in the United States of America by the Turkish Government, Ministry of Education, 1999.

• Turkish Education Association (TED) Scholarship – Ankara, Turkey, 1992-1996.

• Selected as one of the 10% of high school graduates at the Nationwide University Entrance Examination for free education in Education (Biology) at Gazi University Ankara, Turkey, 1992.

4. Membership in Academic and Professional Organizations

• American Education Research Association (AERA)

• Association for Science Teacher Education (ASTE)

• National Association for Research in Science Teaching (NARST)

5. Courses Taught

Georgia State University

EDSC 8600 Science in School Curriculum: Spring 2010

EDSC 8600 Science in School Curriculum: Spring 2011 (Online)

EDCI 7660 Practicum I (Student Supervision): Fall 2008, 2009

EDCI 7670 Practicum II (Student Supervision): Spring 2009, 2010

EDCI 7680 Practicum III (Student Supervision): Spring 2009, 2010

EDCI 7540 Theory and Pedagogy in Middle Childhood Mathematics and Science: Fall 2008
EDSC 7550 Theory and Pedagogy of Secondary Level Science Instruction: Fall 2009, Fall 2010

University of Missouri – Columbia:

Q7378 Electronic Portfolio Development (Graduate Course, fall 2005)

University of Toledo

Cl 4980/5980 Exploring Urban Mathematics and Science Teaching (Undergraduate/Graduate Course, winter 2007)

6. Teaching Internship

University of Missouri – Columbia:

TDP4650 Teaching Science in Secondary Schools III (Graduate Course, Fall 2004)

RESEARCH, GRANT, & SCHOLARSHIP

1. Publications:


2. Presentations at Professional Meetings


and learning environments. Paper accepted for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, New Orleans, LS.


programs: Strategies tried and lessons learned. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Education of Teachers in Science, Nashville, TN.


3. Editorial and Review Responsibilities

- Reviewer, Science Education, 2010-Present.
- Reviewer, Science Education International, 2010-Present.
- National Science Foundation, 2010.

4. Grant Activities

a. Internal Grants:

i. (PI) Demir, A. (2010, $10,000). Inquiry-based science teaching: Documenting the progress in beginning science teachers’ views and practice. Georgia State University- Research Initiation Grant. (Not Funded)

ii. (PI) Demir, A. (2010, $800). NARST Travel Grant: Minority Faculty Development Grant for Travel. (Funded)

iii. (PI) Demir, A. (2009, $7,500). Understanding linkages between faculty perceptions of inquiry based teaching and learning and actual classroom practices. Georgia State University-STEM Faculty Initiative. (Funded)

v. (PI) Demir, A. (2009, $800). NARST Travel Grant: Minority Faculty Development Grant for Travel. (Funded)

b. External Grants:


v. (Grant Facilitator) Demir, A. (Fall 2009- Spring 2010, $18,000). PDS2 No Cost Extension Grant, Lilburn Middle School. US Department of Education. (Funded)

SERVICE

1. Service to Professional Organizations

• SASTE- The Southeastern Association for Science Teacher Education’s 2010 Conference Organizer

• National Association of Research in Science Teaching (NARST) Research Committee Member, 2008- present.

• NARST International Committee Member, 2006-2008.

• Assistant, Missouri State Science Olympiad, 2004.


• Student coordinator for Turkish Education Association (TED) – Ankara, Turkey, 1992-1996.
2. Service to University (University/College/Department/Unit)
   • Professional Development School (PDS)- University Site Coordinator at Lilburn Middle School (2008- 2010)
   • MSIT Annual Faculty Review Committee Member 2009-2012.
   • GSU Content Knowledge Committee Member 2010-2012.
   • I-MAST-Program Advisor (2009-Present)
   • PhD program Coordinator in Science Education (Fall 2009-Present)
   • Certificate in International Education Committee College of Education (2010-Present)
   • The Teaching Excellence and Achievement (TEA) Program (2010, 2011)
   • Professional Education Faculty, Member (2008-present)
   • College of Education Faculty, Member (2008-present)
   • Science Education Unit Member (2008-Present)
   • Middle Childhood Education Search Committee- Member for MCE Clinical Assistant Professor Position (2008)
   • Contributed to the Guidelines for MSIT Annual Faculty Evaluation (2008)

3. Service to Community
   • Judge, Annual Essay Contest, Istanbul Center for Culture and Dialogue, Atlanta, GA, 2009-2010.

ADVISING

• Major Advisor for Science Education Doctoral Students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dissertation Title</th>
<th>Institution/Department</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Davis</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>GSU/MSIT</td>
<td>Course work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Dunac</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>GSU/MSIT</td>
<td>Course work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Schulte</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>GSU/MSIT</td>
<td>Course work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Stoll</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>GSU/MSIT</td>
<td>Course work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steve Tester  N/A  GSU/MSIT  Course work

- Committee Member for doctoral students:

Name  Institution/Department  Dissertation Title  Status
C. Sutton-Brown  GSU/Educational Policy Studies  Microfinance and Women’s Empowerment: A photovoice study  Graduated
F. Sarsar  GSU/MSIT-Instructional Technology  N/A  Course Work

PROJECTS & GRANT ACTIVITIES

2010-Present  Project Title: NET-Q- Network for Enhancing Teacher Quality Project ($13.5 million)

Project Description: The primary goals of the project are to enhance teacher preparation programs, create a teacher residency program, impact teacher retention and student achievement.

Source of Funding: US Department of Education

Role(s): Coach in Residence

- Provide assistance to science teachers in obtaining access to learning resources and materials
- Facilitated reflective teaching practices amongst teachers
- Delivered instruction on best teaching practices
- Serve as a liaison between Banneker High School and GSU’s College of Arts and Sciences and College of Education

2010  Project Title: Teaching excellence and achievement program (TEA) ($xxxx)

Project Description:

Source of Funding: U.S. Department of State/International Research and Exchange Boards (IREX).
Roles:

2009-Present  Project Title: I-MAST- Impacting Metro Atlanta Science Teaching ($900,000)
Project Description: Designed to recruit, prepare, and support highly qualified urban science teachers at GSU College of Education.

Source of Funding: National Science Foundation

Role(s): Co-PI
• Program advisor
• Selection committee
• In charge of the program and oversee project personnel in year 3

2009-Present  Project Title: STEM Initiative- Understanding Linkages Between Faculty Perceptions of Inquiry Based Teaching and Learning and Actual Classroom Practices ($7,500)
Project Description: This research project is aiming to explore faculty’s perception of reform-based teaching practices.

Source of Funding: Georgia State University

Role(s): PI

2009-Present  Project Title: PRISM II- The Georgia Partnership for Reform in Science and Mathematics ($2.032,900 million)
Project Description: The PRISM Phase II Project is designed to capture evidence of changed culture through a partnership driven research project involving studies of three key PRISM strategies. Those strategies are K-16 professional learning communities, higher education recognition and reward for involvement in efforts to improve K-16 teaching and learning in science and mathematics, and the public awareness campaign.

Source of Funding: National Science Foundation

Role(s): Researcher
• Research team member
• Data Collector
• Literature Review on
• Teacher Change
• IRB Coordination
• GSU Liaison

2009  Project Title: Teaching excellence and achievement program (TEA) ($211,695)

Project Description:

Source of Funding: U.S. Department of State/International Research and Exchange Boards (IREX).

Roles:

2008-2009  Project Title: PDS2- Professional Development Schools ($6 million)

Project Description: PDSs were partnership that offered opportunities for GSU and pre K-12 schools to join together to foster the evolution of unique sites where schools and university have the shared goal of enhancing the education of professionals through a series of commitment to collaboration.

Source of Funding: US Department of Education

• Worked with University personnel (College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education) and the School Site Coordinator to place Georgia State University’s student teachers with excellent mentor teachers.
• Worked with the School Site Coordinator to organize and to develop an Orientation Session for Georgia State University’s student teachers
• Worked with University personnel (College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education) and the School Site Monitors Georgia State University’s student teachers’ work during their semester experiences
• Assisted Clinical Teachers in developing supervision/coaching skills

2006-2008  Project Title: UT3 - UToldeo. UTeach. UTouch the Future ($6 million)

• Source of Funding: US Department of Education’s Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant
• Project Description: Designed to recruit, prepare, and support highly qualified urban science and mathematics teachers at The University of Toledo’s Judith Herb College of Education
• Role(s): Worked as a post-doctoral fellow on the project
o Contributing research team and seeking out opportunities to explore changes in the grant
Leading science and mathematics faculty members in several research projects

Assisting other faculty members with their research interests

Designed and developed workshops for A&S faculty

2003-2006  Project Title: SMAR²T: Science and Mathematics Academy for the Recruitment and Retention of Teachers ($900,000)
  • Source of Funding: National Science Foundation
  • Project Description: Designed to recruit, prepare, and support highly qualified science and mathematics teachers at University of Missouri-Columbia
  • Role(s): Graduate research assistant

2003-2004  Project Title: Converting Cookbook Laboratories into Inquiry ($200,000)
  • Source of Funding: National Science Foundation
  • Project Description: Primary goals were to enhance teacher preparation programs, create a teacher residency program, impact teacher retention and student achievement.
  • Role(s): Graduate research assistant
Dunn
Alyssa Hadley Dunn, Ph.D.

www.alyssadunn.com

Georgia State University
College of Education
Department of Middle-Secondary Education
2280 Glendale Drive
Decatur, GA 30032
(404) 723-3826
adunn12@gsu.edu

EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Studies, 2011
Emory University, Atlanta, GA
Dissertation: Global Commodities or Culturally Relevant Educators?: The Recruitment of Foreign Teachers for U.S. Urban Schools
Dissertation Co-Chairs: Dr. Jacqueline Jordan Irvine & Dr. Carole Hahn

Master of Arts in Educational Studies, 2006
Emory University, Atlanta, GA
Thesis: Foreign Teacher Recruitment: A Comprehensive Literature Review
Advisor: Dr. Jacqueline Jordan Irvine

Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education and English, 2005, cum laude
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA
RESEARCH AND TEACHING INTERESTS

Urban and multicultural education; teacher preparation; social justice; international teachers; English methods.

PUBLICATIONS

Books


Chapters in Edited Volumes


Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles


Dunn, A.H. (under review). Teaching superheroes and school reform: College students and “Waiting for Superman.”
Other Publications

Dunn, A.H. (2011, Summer). An overview of international teacher recruitment. What’s the IDEA?: Newsletter of the Georgia Chapter of the National Association for Multicultural Education. Atlanta, GA.


Dunn, A.H. (2010, Fall). Review of Teaching for Joy and Justice: Reimagining the Language Arts Classroom by Linda Christensen. What’s the IDEA?: Newsletter of the Georgia Chapter of the National Association for Multicultural Education. Atlanta, GA.


An extensive curriculum that linked current news media, Georgia state standards for high school English Language Arts and Social Studies, and standardized test standards.

PRESENTATIONS

Invited Talks


Dunn, A.H. (2010, December). International teacher recruitment as political spectacle and symbolic violence. St. Mary’s College, Department of Education, St. Mary’s City, MD.

Conference Presentations


Dunn, A.H. (2010, March). Feeding a critical interdisciplinary understanding of food, culture, and politics through food. Workshop presented at the spring meeting of the Georgia National Association for Multicultural Education, Atlanta, GA.


TEACHING

Clinical Assistant Professor of Urban Teacher Education, Georgia State University, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology

Urban Teacher Residency Professional Practicum, Fall 2011, Graduate course

Visiting Assistant Professor, Emory University Division of Educational Studies

Sociocultural Contexts of Teaching and Learning, Summer 2011, Graduate course

Instructor, Emory University Division of Educational Studies

Education and Cultural Diversity, Fall 2010, Undergraduate course
American Education, Spring 2007, Undergraduate course

Graduate Teaching Assistant, Emory University Division of Educational Studies

School Issues Seminar: English, Spring 2010, Masters course with Dr. Maisha Fisher-Winn

English Curriculum & Instruction, Fall 2009, Masters course with Dr. Maisha Fisher

Educational Measurement, Summer 2009, Masters course with Dr. George Engelhard

Sociocultural Contexts of Education, Summer 2007, Masters course with Dr. Kristen Buras

Education & Cultural Anthropology, Spring 2006, Undergraduate course with Dr. Tracy Rone

University Supervisor, Emory University Masters of Arts in Teaching Program, 2009-2010

Reflective Seminar Facilitator, Emory University Masters of Arts in Teaching Program, 2009

Teacher, Druid Hills High School, Atlanta, GA, 2007-2009

Literature and Composition; American Literature; Creative Writing; Yearbook.

HONORS, AWARDS, & GRANTS

Jacqueline Jordan Irvine Award, April 2011
Awarded for exemplary paper in multicultural education by the Division of Educational Studies at Emory University

MacArthur Genius Grant, Alliance for Ethical International Recruitment, 2011-present
Served as research consultant for MacArthur-funded project ($626,484/2 years), in collaboration with faculty from George Washington University, to develop a code for equitable teacher recruitment

Dean’s Teaching Fellowship, Emory University, 2010-2011
Awarded for demonstrated excellence in undergraduate teaching

Professional Development Research Support, Emory University Graduate School, Spring 2010
Competitive grant funding for dissertation research, $2,500

Division of Educational Studies Full Fellowship, Emory University, 2005-2007, 2009-2011

Founders Scholarship, National Association for Multicultural Education, 2006
For graduate student travel to NAME’s annual conference in Phoenix, AZ.

Dr. Marie Gearan Award, Boston College, 2005
Recognized for outstanding student teaching, academic merit, and university involvement

Commencement Speaker, Boston College Lynch School of Education, 2005

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Advisory Council, Teacher Performance Assessment Committee, July 2011
Advised Pearson Education and Stanford University group on content validation of new teacher performance assessment for secondary English Language Arts

Executive Planning Committee, CitizEd International Conference, May 2011

Co-planner of international citizenship and teacher education conference to be held at Emory University. Organized sessions, events, and receptions and developed program materials

Education International Task Force on Teacher Migration and Mobility, April 2011

Participated in multinational planning committee with EI delegates to prepare report on international teacher migration and ethical recruitment protocols

Reviewer, Urban Education, 2011

Reviewer, American Educational Research Association, 2010-present

Division K, Division G, Urban Teaching and Learning SIG

Core Committee, Georgia Chapter of the National Association for Multicultural Education (GA NAME), 2010-present

Graduate Student Research Roundtable, Division of Educational Studies, 2005-2007, 2010-present

Tutoring Placement Coordinator, Emory University Partnership Advisory Council (EUPAC), 2007-2009

Advisor, Undergraduate Educational Studies Club, Emory University, 2006-2007
Graduate Tutoring Coordinator, Emory University Partnership Advisory Council (EUPAC), 2005-2006

Graduate Research Assistant to Dr. Jacqueline Jordan Irvine, Emory University, 2005-2006

Graduate Assistant, NCATE Committee, Emory University, Summer 2006

Peer Advisor, Boston College Lynch School of Education, 2003-2005

WORKSHOPS & TRAINING

Graduate Student Research Seminar, Division K (Teaching and Teacher Education) of the American Educational Research Association, Seminar at the Annual AERA Conference, April 2010

Welcoming Diversity/Prejudice Reduction Workshop, National Coalition Building Institute at Emory University, March 2010

Teaching Assistant and Teacher Training Opportunity (TATTO), Emory University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Summer 2006

References

Dr. Carole Hahn                                      Dissertation Co-Chair
Professor of Educational Studies
Emory University
1784 N. Decatur Road
Suite 240
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
phone: 404-727-6468
email: rjensen@emory.edu

Dr. Andrea Stairs
Co-author & former
Assistant Professor of Literacy Education
professor at Boston College
University of Southern Maine
221 Bailey Hall
37 College Avenue
Gorham, ME 04038
phone: 207-776-4377
email: astairs@usm.maine.edu
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Chantee L. Earl, Ph.D.

Curriculum Vitae

________________________________________________________________________

Office address:

Georgia State University
College of Education
Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology
P.O. Box 3978
Atlanta, GA 30303-1561
Phone: (404) 413-8399
Email: cmcbride@gsu.edu

Home Address:
316 Altoona Place
Atlanta, GA 30310
Phone: (412) 865-7007
Email: chantee_earl@yahoo.com

________________________________________________________________________

EDUCATION

University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Doctor of Philosophy in Education with a concentration in Social Studies Education,
May 2009

University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Master of Arts in Teaching, August 2001
Bachelor of Arts in History, April 2000
AWARDS AND FELLOWSHIPS

Graduate:

• Provost Development Fund Fellowship ($5,000), University of Pittsburgh, 2009
• Student Leadership Award ($500), University of Pittsburgh, 2009
• Alumni Doctoral Fellowship ($1,000), University of Pittsburgh, 2008
• Paul Masoner Scholarship ($1,000), University of Pittsburgh, 2008
• Radvansky Fellowship ($2,000), University of Pittsburgh, 2008
• Ernest B. Darrow Social Studies Award ($750), University of Pittsburgh, 2007
• Alumni Doctoral Fellowship ($2,500), University of Pittsburgh, 2007

Undergraduate:

• Blue Gold Student Athlete Award – University of Pittsburgh, 2000
• Who’s Who Among America’s College Students, 1999 – 2000
• Dean’s List – University of Pittsburgh, 1998-2000
• Big East All – Academic Team, 1998-2000

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

2010–present  Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA

Position: Clinical Assistant Professor

College of Education: Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology: Social Studies Education Unit

Responsibilities include: serving as TEEMS social studies program coordinator; advising all TEEMS social studies students; teaching social studies education courses; supervising field and student-teaching experiences for middle and secondary pre-service social studies teachers;
attending research seminars and workshops related to TEEMS program; preparing reports for NCATE and various university and state program evaluations

2005–2010    University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

Position: Graduate Student Assistant and Researcher
Department of Instruction and Learning

Responsibilities included: assisting to Coordinator of Field Placements; meeting with M.A.T. and P.Y. students to discuss field placements and program evaluation requirements; analyzing transcripts for prospective M.A.T. and P.Y. students for all content area teacher education programs; developing online transcript analysis program; hosting a series of recruitment workshops for undergraduate students interested in teacher education; working with student services staff to develop a comprehensive plan for minority student recruitment and retention; and serving as School of Education representative at graduate school recruitment fairs and workshops; transcribing digitally recorded classroom discussion and student interview data, and coding and analyzing classroom discussion and student interview data.

2009–2010    University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

Position: Afterschool Program Coordinator
Center for Urban Education

Responsibilities included: Coordinating tutoring and enrichment activities for students; supervising tutoring and enrichment staff; collaborating with school, university, and community partners to create meaningful academic and enrichment experiences for students; developing and implementing afterschool curriculum in literacy and math; and providing monthly professional development for all tutor and enrichment staff.

2001–2005    New Valley High School, Santa Clara, CA

Position: High School Social Studies Teacher
Responsibilities included: obtaining California Single Subject Social Studies Teaching and Cross Cultural Language and Academic Development Certifications; designing and teaching innovative lessons based on standard curriculum to 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students in U.S. History, Economics, Law and Public Service; providing differentiated instruction for ESL and special education students; serving as student advisor assessing overall performance, preparing schedules and aligning student interests with potential career objectives and future fields of study; attending weekly and monthly staff and district in-service meetings on Understanding by Design, assessment, teaching to state and district standards, and educating ESL and diverse learners, and working on WASC Accreditation Preparation and Digital High School Grant Teams.

RESEARCH

Publications:


Presentations:


Toure, J., Knox, R., McBride, C., and Gray, R. (March 2010). Courageous conversations: The state of diversity at the School of Education. Panel presented at the 16th Annual Meeting of the University of Pittsburgh, School of Education Council for Graduate Students in Education Conference, Pittsburgh, PA.


TEACHING

Teaching Assignments:

Georgia State University:

EDSS 6560: Principles of Social Studies Instruction

EDSS 7540: Theory and Pedagogy of Social Studies Instruction
EDCI 7660: Practicum I
EDCI 7670: Practicum II
EDCI 7680: Practicum III
EDCI 6660: Introduction to Secondary Teaching

University of Pittsburgh
IL 2269: Special Topics in Social Studies Ed: Technology
IL 2269: Special Topics in Social Studies Ed: Assessment

SERVICE

Georgia State University:

Middle and Secondary Instructional Technology Department:

• TEEMS Social Studies Program Coordinator, 2010 – present
• Committee for Annual Clinical Faculty Review, Member, 2010 – present
• Secretary for MSIT Department Meetings, 2010 – present

University of Pittsburgh

School of Education:

• Council for Graduate Students in Education, President, 2007 – 2008
• Helen Faison Endowed Chair Search Committee, Member, 2007 – 2008
• Affirmative Action Committee, Member, 2006 – 2007

Profession:

Membership:
• American Educational Research Association (AERA)
• National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS)
• American Educational Studies Association (AESA)
• National Council for Black Studies (NCBS)
Feinberg
CURRICULUM VITAE

Joseph R. Feinberg
Assistant Professor

Updated: April 2011

Georgia State University
Department of Middle Secondary Education
and Instructional Technology (MSIT)

Tel: 404-413-8403
Fax: 404-413-8063
E-mail: jfeinberg@gsu.edu

P.O. Box 3978
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

MAJOR FIELDS/RESEARCH INTERESTS

The original and significant scholarly work illustrated below contains three strands of research that are grounded in social studies education and united by experiential learning and constructivist theory. My three related and overlapping areas of research are instructional simulation games, service-learning, and citizenship education.

EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Educational Institutions:

Ph.D. in Social Science Education, The University of Georgia, 2003

• Dissertation: Debriefing in Simulation Games: An Examination of Reflection on Cognitive and Affective Learning Outcomes
• Dissertation Committee: Ronald L. VanSickle (Chair), John D. Hoge, Shawn M. Glynn, Lloyd P. Rieber, and Greg Trandel

Ed.S. in Social Science Education, The University of Georgia, 1997

M.A. in Sociology, The University of Georgia, 1994

B.A. in Sociology and Industrial Relations, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1991

Professional Experience:

2006 – present: Assistant Professor of Social Studies Education in the Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

• EDCI 9900: Critique of Educational Research
• EDCI 6600: Introduction to Secondary Teaching
• EDCI 7670 & EDCI 7680: Social Studies Practicum II & III
• EDSS 8420: Topics in the School Social Studies Curriculum
• EDSS 8550: Trends and Issues in Teaching Social Studies
• EDSS 7450: Theory and Pedagogy in Social Studies Education
• EDSS 6560: Principles of Social Studies Instruction
• PDS: University Site Coordinator (Meadowcreek High School)

2003 - 2006: Assistant Professor of Social Studies Education in the Specialty Studies Department, Watson College of Education, University of North Carolina Wilmington, Wilmington, NC.
• EDN 200: Teacher, School, & Society
• EDN 305: Exemplary Teacher Project I
• EDN 306: Exemplary Teacher Project II
• EDN 408: Instructional Methods Seminar, Social Studies
• EDN 409/509: Internship in the Secondary Schools
• EDNL 200: Field Studies
• LIC 521: Seminar on Secondary Learners

2001 – 2003: Teaching Assistant, Social Science Education, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA.
• ESOC 4350/6350: Social Science Curriculum in Secondary Schools
• ESOC 4360/6360: Methods of Teaching Social Science in Secondary Schools
• ESOC 4450: Practicum Experience for Pre-service Teachers
• ESOC 2450: Initial Practicum Experience for Pre-service Teachers

• Assisted professors with lectures and assessment of students
• Developed and presented lectures on multicultural curriculum and methodology; economics curriculum and methodology

1996 – 2000: Teacher, Campbell High School, Cobb County Schools, Smyrna, GA.
• Subjects: Economics and Government (3 years), U.S. History (3 years), World Geography (2 years), & Psychology (1 semester)
• Martin Luther King Humanitarian Award (February 2000)
• Cobb County Diversity Leadership (3 years)
• Cultural Awareness Club Sponsor (3 years)
• Octagon Club / Community Service Club Sponsor (3 years)
• International Festival Committee (3 years)
• Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Assembly Committee (3 years)
• School Improvement Committee (3 years)
• Class Advisor (4 years)
• Continuous Improvement Committee (3 years)

1995: Teaching Assistant, Social Science Education, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

• Assisted professors with lectures and assessment of students
• Developed and presented lectures in multicultural foundations of education

Research Experience:

1993 – 1994 Pre-Doctoral Trainee, Center for Research on Deviance and Behavioral Health, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

1991– 1993 Research Assistant, Yale University’s Program on Non-Profit Organizations, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC.

SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, and Reviews
(* denotes work with students)

Refereed Journal Articles:


The preceding publication is the result of successful collaboration with seven other social studies teacher educators from six universities. Each professor administered a simulated version of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Naturalization Test in his or her social studies methods course. Even though I led the manuscript revision process for publication purposes, Frans Doppen remained the first author because he coordinated the research project.


This Social Education article is the result of quality coursework from a graduate student, who took a doctoral level seminar with me during the spring 2009 semester. Ms. Juckett collaborated with me to rewrite her final paper and I successfully submitted the manuscript to Social Education.


I led the writing and journal submission for this publication in collaboration with Frans Doppen. This research was actually conducted after our Action in Teacher Education publication (see above). We simulated the USCIS Naturalization Test for urban and rural high school students and we collected data about their perceptions and knowledge of citizenship.

Chara Bohan and I analyzed primary source documents, surveyed the surviving authors of the Harvard Social Studies Project, and examined their previous writing to create this research. I had the honor of surveying and communicating with Fred Newmann, who is one of my inspirations for promoting experiential learning, authentic assessment, and higher levels of learning.


I contributed approximately one third of the writing for this peer-reviewed publication but Frans Doppen coordinated the research project and Chara Bohan edited the manuscript.


I conducted this research and interviews while on a Keizai Koho Center Fellowship to Japan in 2001. This project enhanced my passion to research service learning and other forms of experiential learning.


This research guided my interest in social justice and provided much of my inspiration to become a professor. Judith Blau is a world recognized sociologist.
Books:


This book is my investigation of the role of debriefing as a form of reflection in promoting affective and cognitive learning in simulation games. Instructional simulation games with debriefing potentially provide a means to engage students in thoughtful and worthwhile learning that is consistent with the contemporary goals of social studies education. The participants for this study were 238 high school students in state-mandated economics classes in Georgia public schools. Findings from this sample supported previous research results that indicated debriefing has a positive and immediate effect on cognitive learning.

Chapters in Books and Monographs:


Submitted Scholarly Writings:


External and Internal Awards:


In combination with the 2010 TEA grant (see below), I have facilitated fourteen focus group interviews to research/examine the TEA Fellows’ service-learning knowledge and desire to implement service-learning curriculum when they return to their countries. The majority of the focus groups are transcribed and we plan to complete a journal manuscript this summer.


I am collaborating with a colleague in math education to research the experiential learning benefits of extended and more authentic teaching internships in schools. We are also examining the Teacher Work Sample products for increased reflective and engaged practice when compared to traditional student teachers.


We plan to survey and observe teacher participants from DeKalb County to advance research on our model of co-instruction with education and history professors at GSU. A potential goal is to
examine the benefits of authentic and primary source history education combined with progressive pedagogy.


Submitted External Award:


HONORS, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

GSU College of Education, Green Contest Award (2008)

Istanbul Center Dialogue Trip to Turkey (2008)
Keizai Koho Center Fellow, Travel Fellowship to Japan (2001)

Martin Luther King Humanitarian Award, Campbell High School (2000)

Fulbright-Hays Scholar, Travel Seminar to Russia, Latvia, and Lithuania (1999)

SCHOLARLY PRESENTATIONS

(* denotes work with students)

Feinberg, J. R., & Doppen, F. H. (2010, November). Middle level students’ knowledge and notions of citizenship. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies, Denver, CO.


Alleman, J., Berson, M. J., Feinberg, J. R., Fitchett, P., Martin, L., & McCormick, T. (2010, November). Multiple methodologies: Applications of research in the social studies (Panel presentation with each researcher presenting separate papers and/or research). Presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Denver, CO.


Feinberg, J. R., & Doppen, F. H. (2009, November). High school students’ knowledge and notions of citizenship. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies, Atlanta, GA.


Feinberg, J. R., Berson, M. J., McCormick, T., Alleman, J., & Berson, I. (2009, November). Evolving an evidence base for effective social studies practice (Panel presentation with each researcher presenting separate papers and/or research). Presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Atlanta, GA.


annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies, Houston, TX.

Alleman, J., Berson, M. J., Feinberg, J. R., McCormick, T., Shumer, R., & Knighton, B. (2008, November). Developing informed practice with research in the social studies (Panel presentation with each researcher presenting separate papers and/or research). Presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Houston, TX.


Berson, M., Marks, M., Feinberg, J. R., Alleman, J., & McCormick, T. (2006, December). Making a difference in social studies by connecting research to practice (Panel presentation with each researcher presenting separate papers and/or research). Presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C.


Berson, M., Alleman, J., Feinberg, J. R., Marks, M., McCormick, T., & Wunder, S. (2005, November). Building a nexus between research and practice in the social studies (Panel presentation with each researcher presenting separate papers and/or research). Presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Kansas City, MO.


SERVICE

Evidence of Peer Recognition and Reputation:

Review Board for The Journal of Social Studies Research (2010- present)
Editorial Review Board of Social Studies, The Georgia Social Studies Journal (2010- present)
Editorial Review Board of Social Studies, Contemporary Issues of Technology and Teacher Education (2008-2010)
Chair/vice-chair, Research Community, National Council for the Social Studies (2009- 2010)
President, Georgia Council for the Improvement of the Social Studies (2008-2010)
Discussant for the annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly (2009)
Chair, Research Community, National Council for the Social Studies (2007- 2008)
Chair, Jean Dresden Grambs Distinguished Career Research in Social Studies Award (2007)
Vice-Chair, Research Committee, National Council for the Social Studies (2006-2007)

Service to Georgia State University:

NET-Q Coordinating Council (2009, fall – present)
Co-chair, Content Knowledge Committee (2007, spring – present)
Georgia State University World Affairs Council/Model UN Advisor (2006 – present)
PDS University Site Coordinator—Meadowcreek High School (2006, August – May 2009)
MSIT/ESOL Search Committee (2009/2010)
MSIT/Social Studies Search Committee (2009/2010)
PEF Executive Committee (2007- present)
Social Studies Ph.D. coordinator (2007-present)

MSIT Annual Faculty Evaluation Guidelines – contributor (2008, fall)

MSIT English Education Search Committee (2008, spring)

Annual Evaluation Committee—Language, Literacy, & Social Studies Education Division (2006, fall – 2007, winter)

Ad Hoc Awards Committee—Language, Literacy, & Social Studies Education Division (2007, fall – 2008, winter)

Ad Hoc Committee on Annual Evaluation—Language, Literacy, & Social Studies Education Division (2006, fall – 2007, winter)

MSIT/Social Studies Search Committee (2006/2007)

Social Studies TEEMS Program Coordinator (2006, August – 2007, summer)

Service to the Profession:

Reviewer for Social Education (2007-present)

Reviewer for annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly (2009-present)

Reviewer for Action in Teacher Education (2009-2010)

Mentor, College and University Faculty Assembly Mentoring Program (2008-present)


Reviewer for American Association for Teaching and Curriculum annual conference (2008-2009)

National Council for the Social Studies Atlanta Conference Planning Committee (2009)

Member, Exemplary Research in Social Studies Award (2009)


Reviewer for Georgia Council for the Social Studies annual conference (2008)
Judge, Georgia State Hearings for We the People...The Citizen and the Constitution (2007, 2008)

Member, Jean Dresden Grambs Distinguished Career Research in Social Studies Award (2008)

Member, Research Committee, National Council for the Social Studies (2004-2006)


Member, Publications Committee, National Council for the Social Studies (2001-2004)

NCSS and Texas Instruments Project (2002)—aligned Texas Instruments Social Studies Content to the NCSS Curriculum Standards

Judge for Georgia Regional Social Studies Fair (2001)

Community Service:

Volunteer Leader, Tutor, and Mentor for Homestreach (homeless shelter in Roswell, GA) through Project One-on-One/ Children’s Restoration Network (2009 - present)

Big Buddy (2005-2006)

Family Service’s Big Buddy Program Advisory Council (2005-2006)

Service to UNCW:

EDN 200 Course Coordinator (2004-2006)

EDN 200 Lab Coordinator (2005-2006)

NCATE Lead Writer and Contributor (2006)

Search Committee for elementary social studies position in Curricular Studies 2005 & 2006

Teaching Fellows Advisory Board (2004-2006)

UNCW Chancellor’s Calendar Committee (2005-2006)
UNCW Faculty Senate (2005-2006)
UNCW Faculty Leadership Center Advisory Board (2005-2006)
UNCW Public Service Committee (2005-2006)
UNCW Teacher Education Council (2005-2006)
UNCW JSO Advisor (2004-2006)
WSE Randall Library Representative (2003-2006)
WSE Scholarship Committee (2005-2006)
WSE Secondary Education Committee (2005-2006)
WSE Leadership Academy (2005-2006)

ADVISEMENT

Completed Dissertations: Committee Member


Dissertations in Progress: Committee Member

Erica DeCuir (in progress). Louisiana educational assessment program (LEAP): Foundations, rationales, and implications of high stakes testing in Louisiana (working title)


Doctoral Program: Committee Chair

Brett Hardin

Impact on Students:

In addition to the previously noted publications and presentations, the following presentations at the 2009 NCSS Annual Conference were made by six students as a result of my 2009 doctoral level seminar. The focus of the seminar was instructional simulation games.

- E. Juckett. "Gaming gerrymandering: Teaching Congressional redistricting through an online simulation."
- E. DeCuir. “Sure, simulations are fun, but are they learning? Designing assessments for classroom simulations.”
PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

American Association for Teaching and Curriculum (2007- present)
College and University Faculty Assembly (2000- present)
National Council for the Social Studies (2000- present)
International Society for Technology in Education (2008- 2010)
National Association for Professional Development Schools (2007-2008)
Phi Delta Kappa (2004-2007)

WORKSHOPS

2010 R. Freeman Butts Institute on Civic Learning in Teacher Education. Sponsored by the Center for Civic Education of Calabasas, California and Conducted by the Center for Social Studies & International Education of Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN.

2009 James F. Ackerman Colloquium on Technology and Citizenship, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

2008 Constitutional Issues for Social Studies Methods Professors through the Center for Civic Education and the University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.
2007    James F. Ackerman Colloquium on Technology and Citizenship, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
Flint
Amy Seely Flint

Georgia State University
College of Education
MSIT Department
33 Gilmer Street, SE Unit 6
Atlanta, GA 30303-3086
404.413.8838
aflint@gsu.edu

CHRONOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Ph.D.  University of California, Berkeley, 1997
       Education, Language, Literacy and Culture
       Major Advisor: Robert Ruddell

M.Ed.  University of California, Los Angeles, 1990
       Administration and Policy Studies

B.A.   University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, 1986
       Elementary Education

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCES
Associate Professor (with tenure)

Middle/Secondary Education and Instructional Technology Department

Georgia State University

2003-

Member of the Graduate School Faculty

Research interests include critical literacy; early literacy; beginning teachers’ theoretical orientations towards literacy instruction; and conceptions of stance and engagement in literacy events. Courses taught include Theoretical Models of Reading (EDRD 8310), Critique of Educational Research (EDCI 9900), Prospectus Writing (EDCI 9980), Early Literacy Development (EDRD 7260), Social, Cultural and Political Contexts of Early Literacy (EDLA 8020), Methods and Materials for Reading Instruction (EDRD 6600), Literacy Assessment for Individuals (EDRD 7650) and Trends and Issues-Critical Literacy (EDRD 8550).

Assistant/Associate Professor (with tenure)

Language Education Department

Indiana University

1997-2003

Member of the Faculty of the University Graduate School (Associate)

Responsibilities involved teaching elementary education undergraduate and graduate students, service to the university and community. Courses taught included Methods of Teaching Language Arts (E339), Methods of Teaching Reading (E340), Reading Methods II (E341), Advanced Methods in Teaching Reading at the Elementary Level (L545), Advanced Methods of Teaching Language Arts at the Elementary Level (L549), Topical Seminar in Language Education (L530), and Early Inquiry (L599).

Assistant Instructor

Language and Literacy Department

University of California, Berkeley

1993-1996
As assistant instructor, conducted weekly seminar for graduate students on the foundations of teaching language arts and social studies through an integrated perspective. As graduate student researcher, collaborated with principal investigator and a team to determine the relationship between teaching orientation and teaching effectiveness. Observed student teachers in the field, facilitated conferences with master teachers, conducted weekly seminars with student teachers. Conducted biweekly seminars for undergraduate students. Focused on critical reading, study skills, test preparation and presentations.

Consultant/Writer

Curriculum Design Institute

Oakland, CA

2003-

Created professional development materials for middle and secondary teachers in English/Language Arts.

Pearson Broadband Publishing

Scottsdale, AZ

2001

Reviewed various state standards in language arts and aligned these standards with components of an instructional product, Knowledge Box. Authored a White Paper on the ways in which technology facilitates literacy development and growth.

Professional Development Institute

Yorba Linda, CA

2001

Created content for an online training course.

Editor

Teacher Created Materials
Westminster, CA
1996-1999
Consulted with authors, editors, and project director. Edited strands of K-8 technology curriculum, and a primary teacher’s resource book in technology and mathematics.

Seminar Lecturer
Teacher Created Materials
Westminster, CA
1996-1998
Conducted day-long workshops for in-service teachers throughout the country on integrating basic skills in literature and phonics in an authentic classroom environment.

Curriculum Developer
Curriculum Design Institute
Oakland, CA
1996
Developed lessons for integrating technology into the already established language arts curriculum (K-8).

Elementary Teacher
Los Angeles, CA
Atlanta, GA
1986-1992
Grades taught include kindergarten, third, fourth and fifth. Served as Gifted and Talented Education Coordinator. Initiated an intramural physical education program for upper grade students.
RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS


Under Review


Fisher, T., Flint, A.S., Fredericks, T., Ureno, J. (in progress). Keeping the door open: Writer’s workshop as a curricular space for teachers and students to re-author themselves and re-figure their worlds. Elementary School Journal
TEACHING PUBLICATIONS


NATIONAL RESEARCH COMMISSION

National Commission of Excellence in Preparing Preservice Elementary Teachers to Teach Reading, International Reading Association, Principal Investigator 1999-2003

The Commission was a four-year effort devoted to the study of excellence in four-year undergraduate teacher preparation programs. The Commission initiated a number of studies, including an interview study of teachers’ perceptions of their reading instruction during their first year of teaching, a national survey, and case studies of exemplary teachers.

RESEARCH GRANTS

2010  Critical Literacy and Poetry Project, Georgia State University Research Initiative Grant ($10,000, unfunded)

2009  Becoming writers in schools and communities. Spencer Foundation ($30,000, unfunded)

2008  Anchor Action Research Grant, Professional Development Schools2 , College of Education ($1,000)

2008  Dean’s GRA scholarship, College of Education ($12,000 for Graduate Research Assistant)

2007  Anchor Action Research Grant, Professional Development Schools2 , College of Education ($2,000)

2001  Maris M. Proffitt Endowment, Indiana University, co-investigator Dr. Mitzi Lewison ($40,000)
2000  Educate Indiana Pre-Service and Professional Development Grant, Goals 2000, Indiana State Department of Education, co-investigator Dr. Mitzi Lewison. ($76,000)

2000  Faculty Grant-in-Aid of Research, Indiana University ($2,000)

2000  Maris M. Proffitt Endowment, Indiana University, co-investigator Dr. Mitzi Lewison ($15,000)

1999  Educate Indiana Pre-Service and Professional Development Grant, Goals 2000, Indiana State Department of Education, co-investigator Dr. Mitzi Lewison. ($25,000)

1998  Educate Indiana Pre-Service and Professional Development Grant, Goals 2000, Indiana State Department of Education, co-investigator Dr. Mitzi Lewison. ($30,000)

1998  The Women in Science Project, Office of Women’s Affairs, Indiana University, co-investigator Dr. Willliam Veal. ($5,000)

1998  Instructional Development Grant, Instructional Support Services, Indiana University ($1,500)

1996  Helen M. Robinson Grant for Dissertation Research, International Reading Association ($500)

RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS AND PAPERS

INTERNATIONAL

World Congress of Reading
2010  The intersection of critical literacy and poetry for English Language Learners. Presented at the bi-annual meeting in Auckland, New Zealand

2008  Becoming Writers in Schools and Communities. Presented at the bi-annual meeting in San Jose, Costa Rica

2006  Critical Literacy in Action: Examining models, practices, and understandings across diverse educational context. Symposium presented with Tasha Tropp Laman at the bi-annual meeting in Budapest, Hungary

Hawaii International Education Conference

2006  Identities and positioning in elementary literature discussions: A look across two classrooms. Co-presented with Beth Maloch at the annual meeting of the Hawaii International Education Conference, Honolulu, HI

Euro-International Systemic Functional Linguistics


International Association for Applied Linguistics

2003  Boys always have more power: Critical Conversations in a Primary Multi-age Classroom, Symposium presented with Mitzi Lewison and Katie Van Sluys at the annual meeting in Ghent, Belgium

NATIONAL

American Education Research Association


2004  Teacher Education Against the Grain: Democracy, Diversity, and Social Justice (Multiple Voices: Transforming our work with teachers and preservice teachers). Co-presented with Mitzi Lewison at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association Conference, New Orleans, LA.

College Reading Association

1999  Improving the education of reading professionals: The next millennium. Co-presented with Carmelita Williams, Deborah Eldridge, Denise Littleton, Rita Bean, and Cathy Roller at the annual meeting of the College Reading Association, Hilton Head, SC

International Reading Association

2009  Partnerships and Practica: Research based Recommendations. Invited symposium at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, Minneapolis, MN

2008  Learning Alongside Each Other: Creating Meaningful Professional Development. Co-presented with Katharine Kurumada, Susan Barwick, and Leron Sassar at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, Atlanta, GA

2002  Teacher Education Matters: Examining Meaningful Differences in Reading Teacher Preparation. Co-presented with members of the National Commission on Seeking Excellence in Reading Teacher Education at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, San Francisco, CA

2001  National Commission on Seeking Excellence in Reading Teacher Education: An Update. Co-presented with members of the National Commission on Seeking Excellence in Reading
Teacher Education at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, New Orleans, LA.


2000 The Evolution of Teacher Researchers: Moving From the Personal to the Political. Co-presented with Mitzi Lewison, Kevin Gallagher, and Kim Bethea at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, Indianapolis, IN.

2000 IRA/WLU CO-Sponsored Meeting: Teaching Holistically in a Standards Based Environment. Co-presented with Linda Cameron, Julie Enyeart, and Katie Van Sluys at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, Indianapolis, IN.

1999 The role of social positioning and interpretive authority in the meaning construction process: A juxtaposition of two studies. Co-presented with Mary Riordan-Karlsson at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, San Diego, CA.

1998 Examining teachers’ and learners’ stance[s] and interpretive authority during literature discussions in a fourth grade. Presented at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, Orlando, FL.

1997 The role of intertextuality and meaning construction in third grade classrooms: Linking learning to literacy through Charlotte’s Web. Presented at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, Atlanta, GA.

1996 Graduate programs and faculty in reading, fifth edition, publication series. Presented at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, New Orleans, LA.
Literacy Research Association (formerly National Research Conference)

2009  Not a One-Shot Deal: Generative Professional Development among Experienced Teachers. Presented at the annual meeting of the National Research Conference in Albuquerque, NM

2008  Changing “Yes, but” to “How can...”: Reframing Writing Identities among Preservice and Experienced Teachers. Co-presented with Mary Ariail at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL

2007  Navigating Tensions: Becoming Writing Teachers, Copresented with Katie Van Sluys and Tasha Tropp Laman, Annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX


2004  Partners in Practice. Co presented with Katie Van Sluys at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX

2003  Three Years in the Making: A cross-analysis of three beginning teachers’ literacy beliefs and practices. Co presented with Beth Maloch and Christine Leland at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Scottsdale, AZ

2002  Negotiating voice: The risky business of writing. Co presented with Marva Cappello at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL

2001  I never thought a first grader could teach me how to write: Examining Beliefs and Positions in Author’s Circles. Co-presented with Katie Van Sluys and Gloria Lo at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX.
2001 Creating critical spaces in classroom practice. Co-presented with Mitzi Lewison at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX.

2000 “Maybe you could put ‘To be continued...’”: Examining Interactions and Engagement During Author’s Circle. Co-presented with Katie Van Sluys, Debra East, and Gloria Lo at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Scottsdale, AZ.

2000 Interruptions and Transformations: Investigating Critical Literacy in Elementary Classrooms. Co-presented with Mitzi Lewison and Katie Van Sluys at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Scottsdale, AZ.

2000 Seeking excellence in teaching and teacher education: Building a research base. Co-presented with other members of the National Commission of Excellence in Preparing Preservice Elementary Teachers to Teach Reading, National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL.

1999 Understanding the complexities of teacher study groups: Investigating discourse and genre. Co-presented with Mitzi Lewison at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL.

1999 “When I tried to remember I would forget the part she just told me:” Examining engagement and stance for reluctant and struggling readers. Presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL.

1998 Converging and intersecting views: An investigation of stance in four classroom contexts. Co-presented with Mary Riordan-Karlsson, Paul Molinelli and Judith Lysaker at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.

1998 Teachers as researchers and inquirers: Examining discourse and authority in teacher study groups. Co-presented with Mitzi Lewison at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.
1997  Stance, intertextuality and interpretive authority: A study of meaning construction. Presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Scottsdale, AZ.

1996  Intertextuality and meaning construction in a third grade classroom: Spinning Charlotte’s Web. Presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Charleston, SC.

1995  A study of theoretical orientations, self-perceptions, and teaching effectiveness of elementary reading teachers. Co-presented with Robert Ruddell and Mary Riordan-Karlsson at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, New Orleans, LA.

1995  Theoretical perspectives on assessment of integrated curriculum. Co-presented with Dana Grisham, Richard Speaker, and Elizabeth Willis at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, New Orleans, LA.

National Association for the Education of Young Children

2003  Children Talk about Poverty: Teachers and Researchers Listen. Co presented with Judith Chafel, Kathleen Pomeroy, and Jane Hammel at the annual meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Chicago, IL

National Council of Teachers of English

2010  Where poems hide: Finding Reflective, Critical Spaces inside Writing Workshop. Roundtable presentation with Tasha Laman Tropp at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Orlando, FL

2009  Learning between the lines: Professional Development as Inquiry. Symposium presentation at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Philadelphia, PA
2007   Learning to be Writing Teachers: Examining Two Teachers’ Shifts in Identity around Literacy Practices, Presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, New York City, NY

2005   Multiple Languages, Multiple Literacies: Building Multilingual Literacy Communities. Co-presented with Katie Van Sluys and Maria Franquiz at a day-long workshop at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Pittsburg, PA

2005   “It Doesn't Say That in the Book”: Examining Critical Stances in Literature Discussions. Presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Pittsburg, PA

2003   New questions, new directions: Collaborative professional development and teacher research in the continued journey toward critical literacies. Co-presented with Mitzi Lewison, Katie Van Sluys, Lee Heffernan, and Rise Paynter, at the annual meeting of the National Council Teachers of English, San Francisco, CA

2002   Writing letters, cleaning bridges, and taking care of pets: Critical Literacy in a primary multi-age classroom. Co-presented with Jane Hammel at an all day workshop session titled, Critical Literacy at the annual meeting of the National Council Teachers of English, Atlanta, GA.


2000   Critical Literacy in Elementary Classrooms: Confronting Commonplace Beliefs, Expectations, and Pedagogy. Co-presented with Mitzi Lewison and Katie Van Sluys at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Milwaukee, WI.

1999   Study groups as a way to support collaboration and teacher research in language arts teaching and learning: Are they effective? Presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Denver, CO.
Teaching English as a Second Language

2009  Keeping the Door Open: Writer’s Workshop as a Curricular Space for Teachers and Students to Re-author themselves and re-figure their worlds. Co-presented with Teresa Fisher, Tammy Fredericks, and Jennifer Ureno at the annual meeting of the Teaching English as a Second Language, Denver, CO

Whole Language Umbrella

2009  Not a One-Shot Deal: Sustained and Localized Professional Development on Teaching Writing. Co-presented with Susan Barwick, Jeffrey Gentry, Katie Kurumada, Teresa Fisher, and Karla Zisook at the annual meeting of the Whole Language Umbrella, Columbia, SC

2008  Becoming Writers in Schools and Communities. Co-presented with Susan Barwick and Jeffrey Gentry at the annual meeting of the Whole Language Umbrella, Tucson, AZ


2006  Investigating literacy identities in reader/writer workshop. Co presented with Meadow Graham and JoAnna Fish at the annual meeting of the Whole Language Umbrella, Charlotte, NC

2004  New visions for teacher education and professional development schools. Co presented with Katie Van Sluys and Catherine Diersing at the annual meeting of the Whole Language Umbrella, St. Louis, MO

2002  Setting Up and Maintaining a Reading/Writing Workshop. Featured Speaker for the annual meeting of the Whole Language Umbrella Conference, Bethesda, MD

AWARDS
2009  Lifetime Membership Award, Whole Language Umbrella, National Council of Teachers of English

1996  Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor, University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING

Teaching Presentations and Workshops

2010-11  Writer’s Workshop in Grades K-5, Presented a two-part workshop at Jackson Elementary School, Atlanta, GA

2010-11  Guest lecture on Literate Lives. Presented an author talk to graduate students (TFA) at Georgia State University

2009  Guest lecture on Literate Lives. Presented an author talk to an undergraduate literacy methods course at Georgia State University

2003  Reading is Thinking: Strategies for Expanding Understandings of Text. Presented to Brooklyn Elementary Teachers, Martinsville, IN

2002  Silent Spaces and Study Groups: Creating Reading and Writing Workshops. Presented to Eastside Elementary teachers, Edinburgh, IN

2001-03  Critical Literacy in Action. Series of workshops presented to teachers in Monroe County Community School Corporation, Bloomington, IN.

1999  Classroom-based research workshop (week long) for participants in teacher study groups

1999  Literature Circles. Presented to a teacher study group in Gosport, IN.


1997  Ways of Writing. Presented to teachers in the Martinsville School Corporation, Martinsville, IN.


Courses Currently Taught at Georgia State University

EDRD 6600 – Introduction to Materials and Methods for Reading Instruction

EDRD 7260 – Early Literacy Development

EDRD 7650 – Individualized Literacy Assessment

EDRD 8310 – Theoretical Models and Process of Reading

EDRD 8550 – Critical Literacy (Trends and Issues course)

EDLA 4400 – Language Arts Methods

EDLA 8020 – Social, Political and Historical Contexts of Early Literacy

EDCI 7660 – Reading Specialist Practicum

EDCI 9850 – Prospectus Writing Course
EDCI 9900 – Critique of Educational Research

Cary Reynolds Writing Collaborative

2007-10

A professional development initiative involving over 15 teachers, grades K-6. Facilitated monthly seminars on literacy development, critical literacy, and writing workshop.

Educate Indiana Teacher Study Group Facilitator

1997-02

Four school collaborative involving over 50 teachers, grades K-6. Facilitated monthly seminars whereby teachers addressed issues and concerns related to literacy development, critical literacy, and action-based classroom research. Teachers received graduate level credit (L530) for attending meetings and workshops, national conferences, and/or conducting and documenting classroom-based research projects.

NATIONAL SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Elected Positions and Committees

2010-2016 Co-editor of Language Arts (publication by NCTE)

2005-06 Past President, Whole Language Umbrella, National Council Teachers of English

2003-05 President, Whole Language Umbrella, National Council Teachers of English

2003-05 Member of the Executive Committee, National Council Teachers of English

2001-03 President Elect, Whole Language Umbrella, National Council Teachers of English
1999-01       Executive Board Member for 3-year term, Whole Language Umbrella, National Council of Teachers of English

Invited Positions and Committees

2010-11       Member of the Studies and Research Program Development Committee, International Reading Association

2008-09       Co-chair of Area 3: Literacy Instruction for the National Reading Conference

1998-01; 2005-08    Student Research Award Committee Member, National Reading Conference

1995-97       Co-Chair of Graduate Students Special Interest Group, International Reading Association

Editorial Board Member

Yearbooks and other materials

2002- National Reading Conference Yearbook

1998-99   coursewise publishing inc.

Professional Journals

2009       Teacher Education Quarterly (guest reviewer)

2008-       Journal of Teacher Education
2008- Reading Horizons

2006-10 Language Arts

1997-2001 Reading Research Quarterly

Reviewer
Conference Proposals
2004-09 National Council of Teachers of English

2006- National Reading Conference

1999 American Educational Research Association, Section K: Teacher Research

Grants
2007-09 Reviewer, Nila Banton Smith Grant, International Reading Association

Georgia State University, College of Education

Committees and Leadership
2010- Faculty Affairs Committee

2008-10 Unit Chair, Language and Literacy, Middle/Secondary Instructional Technology
2009-10  Dean’s Advisory Committee

2006-08  College of Education Promotion and Tenure committee

2006-  Middle/Secondary Education and Instructional Technology Promotion and Tenure Committee

2004-06  Student Affairs Committee, Secretary

2003  Review Committee for EPRS 7900

Student Advising
Dissertation Major Advisor:
2011 Karla Zisook
2010 Katharine Kurumada
2009 Alda Blakeney
2007 Meadow Graham

Advanced to Candidacy
Azusa Callaway (defending 2012)
Nicole Manry (defending 2011)
Debbie East (defending 2011)

Coursework Phase: Nicole Maxwell, Megan Nason, Tarika Sullivan, Kamania Wynter, Natasha Thorton, Linda James, Annmarie Jackson, Danielle Hilaski, Sanjuana Rodriguez
Dissertation committee member:

2010  Ellen Hurst, Anissa Vega, Tammy Fredericks,

2009  Price Webb, Shih Chih Kuo,

2008  Kim Coady

2006  JoAnna Fish, Yessim Ozbarlas,

Indiana University, School of Education and Language Education Service Activities

2001-03  Co-coordinator of Elementary Education Program for Language Education Department

2000-03  Graduate Program Council Committee

2000-03  Admissions Committee for Language Education

1999-01  Armstrong Award Committee

1998-01  Teacher Education Council

1998-02  Policy Council (substitute)

1997-01  Elementary Education Program Adoption, Team Praxis

Student Advising

Dissertation committee (chair): Chi-Chuan Yang
Dissertation committee (co-chair): Debra East

Dissertation committee (member): Vicky Yeh, Julie Enyeart, Katie Van Sluys

Dissertation committee (minor advisor): Ming Fang

Service Presentations

2000 The landscape is changing: Teaching in a new environment with distance education. Presented at Preparing Future Faculty Conference, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

1999 Strategies and tips for preparing for interviews and job talks. Panel presentation at Preparing Future Faculty Conference, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

1998 Sand castles and friendships: Connecting meaning through literature discussions. Presented at the annual meeting of the Indiana Reading Association, Indianapolis, IN.

1998 Many voices among us: Examining interpretive authority in literacy events. Presented at the Indiana University Summer Reading Conference, Bloomington, IN.

1997 Emerging and submerging voices: The influences of stance and interpretive authority on meaning construction. Presented at the Literacy Forum in the School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

1997 I’m nothing like him: Understanding stance and interpretive authority. Presented at the annual meeting of the California Reading Association, San Jose, CA.

Academic and Professional Association Memberships

American Educational Research Association

International Reading Association
National Council of Teachers of English

National Reading Conference

Whole Language Umbrella
Fox
DANA L. FOX

Curriculum Vita

Georgia State University
Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology
671 College of Education
30 Pryor Street
Atlanta, GA  30303
Office: 404.413.8383; FAX: 404.413.8063; dfox@gsu.edu

CHRONOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Ph.D. in English Education, University of Missouri, 1991

Dissertation: From English Major to English Teacher: Case Studies of Student Teachers and Their First Year of Teaching English.

Dissertation Chair: Ben F. Nelms.

1992 Award for Outstanding Scholarship on Teacher Education (Award for Dissertation Study), Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities.


M.S.Ed. in English, University of Central Arkansas, 1984

B.S.Ed. in English, University of Central Arkansas, 1979

One of only five seniors recognized by the faculty as Outstanding University Student in 1979, for a combination of academic and scholastic excellence, exceptional leadership ability, and extraordinary service to the university.

MAJOR FIELDS / RESEARCH INTERESTS

- English education / language and literacy education; the process of learning to teach secondary English; policy in English education; cultural authenticity and accuracy in children’s and young adult literature; mentoring and scholarly writing in academia; gender and literacy; and qualitative case study design and methods.

CHRONOLOGY OF EMPLOYMENT

8/08-presents CHAIR, DEPARTMENT OF MIDDLE-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Responsible for general direction of the work of the department; responsible, in consultation with the faculty, for formation and execution of department policies; serve as representative of the department in all official communications with college and university administrators and students; provide leadership for faculty mentoring and professional development in teaching, research, and service; oversee annual budget of ~$5 million; supervise course scheduling; conduct faculty and staff evaluations; recommend faculty appointments, reappointments, promotions; facilitate department leadership team meetings and department meetings; prepare annual report on teaching, research, and service work of the department; complete annual review of the nature, scope, and quality of the chair’s work for the dean; participate in executive
management group meetings in the College of Education; responsible to academic dean of the college.

5/07-present   SENIOR FACULTY ASSOCIATE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

The mission of the Office for Advancement of Women is to provide information on the status of women and to assist unit, college, and university administrators in their development, adoption, and implementation of policies, procedures, and programs that advance female faculty and staff into senior ranks and senior leadership positions. Activities undertaken by the Advancement of Women Office are coordinated by a Senior Faculty Associate, selected by the Provost, who devotes half of her time to the office.

5/04-present   ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH EDUCATION - LANGUAGE AND LITERACY EDUCATION (with Tenure), Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. Graduate and undergraduate teaching, research, and service; courses and seminars taught include Topics in Middle Grades Language Arts, Concepts and Methods in Language Arts for Middle Childhood Education, Children’s and Young Adult Literature, Principles of English Instruction, Theory and Pedagogy in the Teaching of English, Language and Literacy Development, Theoretical Models and Processes of Literacy, Seminar in Teaching and Learning, Practicum I, Practicum II-III, Qualitative Case Study Research, Academic Writing, Critique of Educational Research, and Research Seminar (Dissertation Prospectus).

4/04-8/06   COORDINATOR, TEEMS English Education M.Ed. Degree Program, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

5/02-8/04   GRADUATECOORDINATOR, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. Chaired the three-year APACE Academic Program Review Process.

8/00-4/04   ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH EDUCATION - LANGUAGE AND LITERACY EDUCATION, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. Graduate and undergraduate teaching, research, and service; courses and seminars taught include Concepts and Methods in Language Arts for Middle Childhood Education, Literature for Middle-Secondary Education, Principles of
English Instruction, Theory and Pedagogy in the Teaching of English, Language and Literacy Development, Theoretical Models and Processes of Literacy, Seminar in Teaching and Learning, Practicum I, Practicum II-III, Qualitative Case Study Research, and Academic Writing. Note: I chose to accept this position, even though I was already a tenured Associate Professor at University of Arizona.

8/97-8/00 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF LANGUAGE, READING AND CULTURE (with Tenure), College of Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ. Graduate and undergraduate teaching, advising, and research; courses and seminars taught include Essentials of Reading and Writing, Reader-Response Theories and the Teaching of Literature, Literature for Adolescents, Teaching of Literature, Intensive Writing Workshop, Southern Arizona Writing Project, Seminar in Writing Across the Curriculum, Teaching the Writing Process in a Language Arts Curriculum K-12, Exploring the Writing Process, Gender and Literacy, Teacher Research, Qualitative Methods in Education, and Language Research Methodology in Education (Topic: Case Study Research in Education).

8/92-5/97 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF LANGUAGE, READING AND CULTURE, College of Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ. Graduate and undergraduate teaching, advising, and research; courses and seminars taught include Essentials of Reading and Writing, Reader-Response Theories and the Teaching of Literature, Literature for Adolescents, Teaching of Literature, Intensive Writing Workshop, Southern Arizona Writing Project, Seminar in Writing Across the Curriculum, Teaching the Writing Process in a Language Arts Curriculum K-12, Exploring the Writing Process, Gender and Literacy, Teacher Research, Qualitative Methods in Education, and Language Research Methodology in Education (Topic: Case Study Research in Education).

8/92-5/95 CO-DIRECTOR, Southern Arizona Writing Project. Helped with coordination of all activities for the Southern Arizona Writing Project including workshops and conferences by and for classroom teachers. Visited SAWP teacher consultants at school sites. Taught invitational and open-enrollment summer institutes.

9/91-8/92 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH EDUCATION, Department of Language Education, University of Georgia, Athens, GA. Taught undergraduate and graduate courses and advised undergraduate and graduate English Education majors. Supervised student teachers. Courses and seminars taught include English Language Study for Teachers, English Curriculum in

8/90-7/91 ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, Missouri Writing Project. Coordinated all activities for the Missouri Writing Project including workshops and conferences by and for classroom teachers. Kept records of the Project’s daily operations and managed annual budget. Worked with the Project’s Director in absentia Ben F. Nelms.

8/90-7/91 INSTRUCTOR OF ENGLISH EDUCATION, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO. Taught undergraduate and graduate English Education courses and advised undergraduate and graduate English Education students. Supervised student teachers in English Education. Served as Faculty Advisor for the University of Missouri Council of Teachers of English. Courses and seminars taught include Teaching of Composition, Language Study in the Secondary Schools, Literature for Adolescents, Alternatives to Traditional Writing Assessment K-12, and Elementary Language Arts Curriculum.

8/89-8/90 ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AND COORDINATOR OF FIELD EXPERIENCES, College of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO. Coordinated the placement of all student teachers, instructional aides, observers, and practicum students in public schools across the state. Maintained and enhanced the relationship between the College of Education and the public and private schools utilized in the field experiences program. Evaluated college transcripts. Assisted in monitoring students on academic probation. Conducted orientation meetings for parents and new students during Summer Welcome. Developed an Advisors’ Newsletter prior to each registration period. Guest lectured in selected “Advisory Seminars” and “Supervision of Student Teaching” graduate courses.

8/87-8/90 GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT, Departments of English and Curriculum and Instruction, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO. Courses and seminars taught include Teaching of Composition, Teaching the Writing Process, Freshman Composition, and Literature for Adolescents (Spring 1988).

8/88-5/89 INSTRUCTOR, Department of English, Columbia College, Columbia, MO. Courses taught include Technical Writing and Freshman Composition II: Introduction to Literature.
6/88-7/88 MISSOURI WRITING PROJECT INSTRUCTOR, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO. Taught four-week, 6 credit hour writing institute for teachers K-12 (with Don Zancanella). Stressed study of current theory and research in the teaching of composition, encouraged demonstration by teachers of their most successful classroom practices, and taught various writing genres/forms.

8/84-7/87 DIRECTOR OF THE WRITING CENTER, Department of Communication Arts, University of Arkansas at Monticello, Monticello, AR. Trained and supervised peer tutors, led workshops for students and faculty, kept records of Writing Center’s daily operations, and managed annual budget.

8/84-7/87 WRITING INSTRUCTOR, Department of Communication Arts, University of Arkansas at Monticello, Monticello, AR. Courses taught include Fundamentals of English, Freshman Composition I, Freshman Composition II, Vocabulary Building, and Technical Writing.

6/84-7/84 INSTRUCTOR, Department of English, University of Central Arkansas, Conway, AR. Courses taught include Basic Composition.

8/83-5/84 GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT, Department of English, University of Central Arkansas, Conway, AR.


HONORS, AWARDS, AND PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION

2009 Slated Nominee, Vice President, National Council of Teacher of English (one of three national nominees slated by an elected nominating committee to run for the Vice Presidency of NCTE, a four-year commitment if elected, including service as Vice President Elect, Vice President, President, and Past President: www.ncte.org).
2007  Distinguished Program in Teacher Education Award, Georgia Association of Teacher Educators. Plaque and cash prize presented to the TEEMS English Education MAT Degree Program Faculty (Drs. Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, Ewa McGrail, and Michelle Zoss).


2007  Invited to serve for a three-year term on the National Council of Teachers of English Editorial Review Board. NCTE Editorial Board members are invited to serve on the basis of their substantial contribution to the profession and their record of service to NCTE. Composed of 12 members, the NCTE Editorial Board provides strategic oversight for the NCTE Books Program. NCTE publishes, on average, 15 professional books a year for teachers of English and the language arts at the elementary, middle, secondary, and college levels. These books deal with current issues and problems in teaching, research findings and their application to classrooms, ideas for teaching all aspects of English, and other topics.

2007  Invited to serve as a member of the Editorial Review Board for the Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy (for second term). Published eight times a year by the International Reading Association, JAAL is a peer-reviewed publication created to provide a scholarly research and practice-based forum for teachers, researchers, and others committed to improving classroom instruction for literacy learners ages twelve and older.


2006  Outstanding Faculty Teaching Award, College of Education, Georgia State University. Award presented at the College of Education Honors Day Ceremony, April 27, 2006.
2006  Professor of the Year Award, Georgia Council of Teachers of English (statewide award). Received a plaque and cash prize presented at the Georgia Council of Teachers of English Conference at Callaway Gardens, GA, February 17-18, 2006.

2006  Received a special citation and recognition for serving as Chair of the 2005 Conference on English Education Leadership and Policy Summit. Citation presented at the National Council of Teachers of English Conference, Pittsburgh, PA.

2005  Invited Chair, Conference on English Education (CEE) Leadership and Policy Summit (National Council of Teachers of English). The CEE Summit, a gathering of 75 leaders and award-winners in the field of English education, was focused on the past, present, and future of teacher preparation and professional development for English language arts education. For an overview of the initial outcomes, see http://www.ncte.org/cee/2005summit and the July 2006 issue of English Education.

2005  Invited to serve on an National Council of Teachers of English / International Reading Association Task force for a National Clearinghouse on Literacy Coaching. For more information, see http://www.literacycoachingonline.org/

2005- Present  Appointed as an invited member of the Board of Directors, United States Board on Books for Young People. Invited by the President of the National Council of Teachers of English, Patricia Lambert Stock. See http://www.usbby.org/index.htm

2002  Invited to join the National Council of Teachers of English CoLEARN Research Team, a group of 25 accomplished researchers from across the U.S. CoLEARN is NCTE’s professional development and teacher research program for elementary, middle, and senior high school educators that began its first year in schools across the country in Fall 2002.

2000- Present  Appointed as Co-Editor of English Education, the official journal of the Conference on English Education of the National Council of Teachers of English, for a five-year term. This editorial appointment was made in December 1999 following a national search and interviewing process and continued through July 2005.
1998  Nominee, Faculty Teaching Award, College of Education, University of Arizona.

1998  National Council of Teachers of English Affiliate Journal Award, “Finalist” Award presented to Arizona English Bulletin and Dana L. Fox, Editor. One national award winner and two finalists were named.

1997  Faculty Graduate Mentoring Award, College of Education, University of Arizona. Received a $500 prize and plaque presented at the College of Education Honors Convocation.

1997  Nominee, Faculty Research Award, College of Education, University of Arizona.

1997  Nominee, Faculty Teaching Award, College of Education, University of Arizona.

1997  Nominee, Faculty Service Award, College of Education, University of Arizona.

1997  National Council of Teachers of English Affiliate Journal Award, “Finalist” Award presented to Arizona English Bulletin and Dana L. Fox, Editor. One national award winner and two finalists were named.

1996  Conference proposal entitled, “Exploring Cultural ‘Texts’: Case Studies of Students and Teachers in Multicultural Classrooms,” (written by D.L. Fox) featured as Exemplary Proposal by NCTE’s Standing Committee on Research.

1996  National Council of Teachers of English Affiliate Journal Award, “Finalist” Award presented to Arizona English Bulletin and Dana L. Fox, Editor. One national award winner and two finalists were named.

1996  Nominee, Faculty Teaching Award, College of Education, University of Arizona.
1995  Nominee, Faculty Teaching Award, College of Education, University of Arizona.

1995-  Appointed as Co-Editor of The New Advocate, a national journal focused on literature for
2000  young people and the use of children’s and adolescent literature in classrooms. This
appointment was made following a national search and interviewing process.

1994  Nominee, Faculty Teaching Award, College of Education, University of Arizona.

1993  Wakonse West Conference on College Teaching Participant. Designed to inspire,
rejuvenate, recognize, and reward outstanding faculty committed to excellence in teaching.

1992  Lilly Teaching Fellowship, The University of Georgia. One of ten junior faculty from the
entire university selected for this award. Initiated by a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc., this
highly-competitive program provides opportunities for junior faculty to significantly enhance
their professional development as teaching scholars. Fellows select senior faculty to serve as
mentors and meet regularly during the academic year for presentations, seminars, and off-
campus retreats. Each fellow receives a $2,000 grant to implement an instructional
improvement project.

1992  Nominated and Approved for Membership in the National Conference on Research in
Language and Literacy (NCRL).  

1992  Outstanding Scholarship on Teacher Education Award (Award for Dissertation Study).
Presented by the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land
Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities. In 1992, ten national winners were named;
each received a $500 prize. The purpose of this award is to encourage, honor, and disseminate
research on teacher education produced at member institutions (over 100 major colleges and
schools of education in the US).
1992  Finalist, National Council of Teachers of English Promising Researcher Award Competition in Commemoration of Bernard O'Donnell. Presented by NCTE, awards are given for articles which their authors have based on their dissertations.

1992  Article of the Year Award for “Building a Reading Community: ‘Intertextuality’ and the Adult Reader” (October 1991), Teaching English in the Two-Year College, an NCTE publication. The award consisted of a framed citation and a $250 prize.

1991  Superior Graduate Achievement Award, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Missouri.

1990  Bob G. Woods Graduate Scholarship, University of Missouri.

1988  Phi Delta Kappa Graduate Scholarship, University of Missouri.

1989  Phi Delta Kappa Graduate Scholarship, University of Missouri.

1989  Graduate Student Teaching Award, Department of English, University of Missouri.


1987  Finalist, Teacher of the Year Award, University of Arkansas at Monticello.

1982  Rotary Foundation Graduate Fellowship, University College-Cork, Ireland. Fields of emphasis: English and Anglo-Irish Literature.
DOCTORAL STUDENT MENTORING

During the time that I have held faculty appointments at both the University of Arizona and Georgia State University, twenty-eight (28) doctoral students for whom I have served as mentor have successfully completed their Ph.D. degrees. Of those 28 individuals, 14 accepted appointments as university professors (many are now tenured; one is now an Associate Dean), while 14 serve in advanced leadership positions in public school systems. Currently, one (1) student is completing the dissertation under my direction/co-direction.

Note: I have also mentored numerous other doctoral students by serving as a member of their doctoral and dissertation committees. In addition, I have mentored numerous Ed.S., M.Ed., M.A.T., and B.S.E. students.

Georgia State University (2000-present)

Students for Whom I Served as Doctoral Advisor and/or Dissertation Chair / Co-Chair

Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning
College of Education

Michelle Mercier
(dissertation in progress)
The Lived Experience of Children’s Musical Identity Formation: A Phenomenological Exploration

Mary Cynthia Thompson
(dissertation completed Fall 2010)
Examining the Dimensions of an Urban English Teacher Education Program: Perceptions of Teacher Preparation and Influence on Student Achievement

Elise Eskew
(dissertation completed in Spring 2010)
Toward an Integrated Theory of Musical Worth and Pedagogical Value: An Analysis of the Personal Perspectives and Commissioned Choral Works of Emma Lou Diemer, Alice Parker, and Gwyneth Walker

Rebecca Calder
(dissertation completed in Fall 2009)

The Writing Experiences of Urban Adolescents: A Multicase Study

Todd Snead
(Co-Chair, dissertation completed in Fall 2009)

An Ethnographic Investigation of the Interactions between the Musical Lives of Adolescents and School Music Culture

Bernadette Butler Scruggs
(Co-Chair, dissertation completed in Fall 2008)

Learning Outcomes in Two Divergent Middle School String Orchestra Classroom Environments: A Comparison of a Learner-Centered and a Teacher-Centered Approach

Kim Coady
(dissertation completed in Fall 2007)

No Writer Left Behind: Examining the Reading-Writing Connection in the Reading First Classroom through a Teacher Study Group

Jo Anna Fish
(dissertation completed in Fall 2007)

Teachers Establishing Language Arts Instruction in a Performance-Standards Environment: A Collective Case Study in Second Grade
Charnita West
(dissertation completed in Fall 2007)

Culturally Relevant Professional Development: An Examination of Race, Practice, and Self through an African-American Teacher Study Group

Judy Romanchuk
(dissertation completed in Spring 2007)

Exploring the Epistemological Views of Advanced Student Writers during the Research Paper Process

Ellah Sue McClure
(dissertation completed in Fall 2006)

Six Middle-School English Language Arts Teachers’ Beliefs about Grammar and Their Teaching of Grammar While Participating in a Professional Learning Community

Anne Blanchard
(dissertation completed in Spring 2005)

Four Eleventh-Grade English Teachers’ Attitudes about Writing and Their Teaching of Writing in the Context of a Statewide Direct Writing Assessment

Nadine Lawrence-Guthrie
(dissertation completed in Spring 2005)

Two African American Teachers’ Beliefs about and Practices with African American Language and Its Influence on Literacy

Renee Mallard
(dissertation completed in Spring 2005)
The Experience Revealed: Six Case Studies of "Georgia Teacher Alternative Preparation Program" First-Year Teachers


Students for Whom I Served as Doctoral Advisor and/or Dissertation Chair / Co-Chair

Ph.D. in Language, Reading and Culture (LRC)

Ph.D. in Teaching and Teacher Education (TTE)

College of Education

Anita Fernandez (Co-Major Advisor; Graduated May 2001; LRC)

Dissertation Title: Autobiography as a Method for Preservice Teachers to Analyze Their Expressed Beliefs of Multicultural, Anti-Racist Education: Three Case Studies

Maya Eagleton (Major Advisor; Graduated December 1999; LRC)

Dissertation Title: Websites under Construction: Making Meaning through Hypermedia Composition in a Seventh-Grade Language Arts Classroom

Archer Israel (Co-Major Advisor; Graduated December 1999; LRC)

Dissertation Title: Peer Collaboration in Writer’s Workshop in the Elementary Classroom

Gloria Kauffman (Co-Major Advisor; Graduated December 1999; LRC)

Dissertation Title: Elementary Students’ Beliefs about Themselves as Learners within an Inquiry-Based Curriculum

Karen Onofrey (Co-Major Advisor; Graduated December 1999; LRC)
Dissertation Title:  Learning and Laughing through Adolescent Literature:  Adolescents’ Use of Humor as a Vehicle for Understanding

Wendy Black (Co-Major Advisor; Graduated May 1999; LRC)

Dissertation Title:  Discourse Analysis of Retrospective Miscue Analysis Sessions:  Talking about the Reading Process with a 4th Grade Reader

Debbie Smith (Major Advisor; Graduated May 1999; LRC)

Dissertation Title:  Mexican American Adolescent Male Gang Members’ Literacy Experiences within and outside of School

Dajian Wang (Major Advisor; Graduated May 1999; LRC)

Dissertation Title:  How Chinese Students Learn English Vocabulary through Reading:  Two Case Studies

Cathie Fallona (Co-Major Advisor; Graduated May 1998; TTE)

Dissertation Title:  A Practical Argument Study of Teacher Manner

Rochelle Pozner (Co-Major Advisor; Graduated May 1997; TTE)

Dissertation Title:  Female Physicians’ Perceptions of Their Professional Roles:  What’s Gender Got to Do With It?

Monica Taylor (Major Advisor; Graduated May 1997; LRC)

Dissertation Title:  Three Case Studies of Mexican American Female Adolescents:  Identity Exploration through Multiple Sign Systems

Holly Johnson (Co-Major Advisor; Graduated December 1997; LRC)
Dissertation Title:  Reading the Personal and the Political: Exploring Female Representation in Realistic Fiction with Adolescent Girls

CheongSook Chin (Major Advisor; Graduated August 1996; LRC)

Dissertation Title: Korean ESL Students’ Perceptions about Themselves as Readers and about Reading in English

Darlene Maxwell (Co-Major Advisor; Graduated May 1996; TTE)

Dissertation Title: Moving Toward Intuitive Knowledge: How Do Practicing Teachers Make Use of Intuitive Knowledge in the Classroom?

Elizabeth Noll (Co-Major Advisor; Graduated May 1995; LRC)

Dissertation Title: Constructing Meaning through Multiple Symbol Systems: The Perceptions of Lakota Adolescents about the Roles and Uses of Literacy in Their Lives

PUBLICATIONS / CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Scholarly Books and Monographs


Fox, D.L. (Ed.). (in progress). Teacher study groups as authentic professional development: Research, theory, and practice.


Chapters in Scholarly Books and Monographs


Articles in Refereed Journals and Yearbooks


Articles in Refereed Journals and Yearbooks (submitted and in progress)

Fleischer, C., & Fox, D.L. (invited, in progress). Who are the members of the Conference on English Education? English Education.


Articles in State and Local Journals


SCHOLARLY PRESENTATIONS


Fox, D.L. (2003). Academic writing in English education. Speaker, Senior Seminar in English, Department of English, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Fox, D.L. (2003). What’s new in children’s and young adult literature? Speaker, Georgia Read-Write Now Conference, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Fox, D.L. (2002). Invited Senior Scholar for the L. Ramon Veal Seminar for Research in Progress. National Council of Teachers of English Fall Convention, Atlanta, GA.


Fox, D.L. (2002). Invited participant, CoLEARN Research Academy, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Fox, D.L. (2002). Academic writing and publishing in language and literacy education. Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Fox, D.L. (2002). What’s new in children’s and young adult literature? Speaker, Georgia Read-Write Now Conference, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Fox, D.L. (2001). Publishing in English Education and English Journal. Speaker, Senior Seminar in English, Department of English, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Fox, D.L. (2000). Academic writing and publishing in language and literacy education. Speaker, Saturday Doctoral Seminar, Language and Literacy Education, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Fox, D.L., & Alvermann, D. Tools and resources for adolescent literature and literacy. International Reading Association Forum on Adolescent Literacy, Tucson, AZ.


Fox, D.L. (1999). Women’s issues in promotion and tenure. One of four panelists invited to conduct a workshop for women faculty and administrators at the University of Arizona, sponsored by the Provost and Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.


Representations of educators’ beliefs and knowledge. National Reading Conference, New Orleans, LA.


Fox, D.L., & Thompson, B. (1993). Content and practice in the teacher education classroom: Teacher educators as teachers. Sixth Annual LRC Colloquy, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.


Fox, D.L. (1992). Weaving the web of meaning: The process of collaborative learning. 21st Annual Conference on Teaching the English Language Arts, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

Fox, D.L. (1992). Reading and writing to learn: Template for a lesson. Children’s Literature Conference, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.


GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

Federal or National Grants and Contracts

Fox, D.L. (2009-2014). DeKalb County Schools-Georgia State University Mathematics and Science Education Transition-to-Teaching Project Proposal. ($2,014,184 over five-year period: 2009-2014). Role: Consultant and co-author; PI for subcontract of $618,100. Project goals: To enable qualified paraprofessionals in DeKalb Co. Schools to earn a B.S.E. degree in middle level mathematics and science education and initial teacher certification. (Subcontract funds one faculty position annually in MSIT from 2009-2014.)

Fox, D.L. & Flint, A.S. (2009-2012). Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology-Gwinnett Co. Schools Reading Endorsement Tuition Return Project. ($330,695 for year one of three-year project, 2009-2012). Role: Co-Director and Co-PI. Project goals: To enable qualified teachers in Gwinnett Co. Schools to complete MSIT’s nine-credit-hour Reading Endorsement courses so that they may become highly qualified in reading. (Project funded three full-time faculty positions and one half-time faculty position in MSIT, as well as equipment and expenses.)

Fox, D.L. (2008-2011). University System of Georgia Board of Regents STEM Initiative. ($435,000, with $145,000 annually.) Project goals: Various initiatives for teacher production in
STEM fields, including faculty salaries and FOCUS serving learning project. Role: Department Chair, Co-PI with oversight of funding allocations.


State and Local Grants and Contracts


Fox, D.L. (1995). Association for Women Faculty Professional Development Travel Grant, University of Arizona; 100% effort; $400 (2/95). Only one travel grant was awarded across the entire University of Arizona women faculty community. Funding to attend the Ethnography in Education Research Forum, Center for Urban Ethnography, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.


Fox, D.L. (1993). Foreign Travel Grant; 100% effort; $526 (3/93). Office of International Programs, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ [awarded in February 1993]. Funding to attend the
Fifth International Convention on Language in Education, University of East Anglia, Norwich, England, in order to present an invited/refereed co-authored paper.


Fox, D.L. (1992). Designing a case-based curriculum for English education; 100% effort as PI; $2,000 (2/92-7/92). Office of Instructional Development, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

Fox, D.L. (1992). Teaching and learning with cases; 100% effort as PI; $2,000. Lilly Teaching Fellows Program, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

Fox, D.L. (1990). Dissertation Travel Research Award; 100% effort; $500. The Graduate School and Office of Research, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

Fox, D.L. (1990). Walter Scott Monroe Graduate Research Fellowship; 100% effort as PI; $1,500. College of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

Fox, D.L. (1986). Faculty Development Grant; 100% effort as PI; $4,993. Dept. of Communication Arts, University of AR at Monticello, Monticello, AR.

SERVICE: CITIZENSHIP

Extramural Service: Editorships

2000-05 Co-Editor (with Cathy Fleischer), English Education
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(five-year term, by invitation after a national search)

1995-00  Co-Editor (with Kathy G. Short), The New Advocate
          (five-year term, by invitation after a national search)

1988-90  Assistant Editor, English Journal

1995-98  Editor for Regular Column on “New Teachers” in English Journal
          (by invitation of the editor, Leila Christenbury)

1995-99  Editor, Arizona English Bulletin

1995-97  Editor, Arizona Reading Journal

Extramural Service: Editorial Board Memberships and Editorial Reviewing

2007-present  Invited Member, National Council of Teachers of English Editorial Board
      for NCTE Book Publishing Program

2003-present  Member, Editorial Review Board, National Reading Conference
      Yearbook

1999-present  Manuscript Reviewer, Research in the Teaching of English

1995-present  Manuscript Reviewer, English Education

2007-09  Invited Member, Editorial Review Board, Journal of Adolescent & Adult
         Literacy

1998-06  Book Manuscript Reviewer, National Council of Teachers of English

1996-00  Member, Editorial Review Board, Journal of Literacy Research

1995-00  Manuscript Reviewer, Teaching and Teacher Education

1992-00  Manuscript Reviewer, Elementary School Journal

1995-98  Invited Member, Editorial Review Board, Journal of Adolescent & Adult
         Literacy

1997-98  Reviewer of Content of Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy
Member, Editorial Review Board, National Reading Conference Yearbook

Member, Editorial Advisory Board, National Reading Research Center

Book Proposal and Manuscript Reviewer, Teachers College Press

Book Proposal and Manuscript Reviewer, Prentice-Hall

Manuscript Reviewer, English Journal

Manuscript Reviewer, English Journal

Manuscript Reviewer, Review of Educational Research

Chapter Reviewer, Handbook of Research on Teaching, (4th edition)

Manuscript Reviewer, National Reading Research Center Publications

Manuscript Reviewer, Bilingual Research Journal.

Extramural Service: Conference Program/Proposal Reviewing

Program Proposal Review, National Council of Teachers of English.

Program Proposal Reviewer, National Reading Conference.


Intramural Service: Departmental Committees

Georgia State University, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology

Member, MSIT Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Member, MSIT Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Member, Search Committee for Clinical Assistant Professor, Language and Literacy Education, MSIT.

Member, Ad Hoc Committee on Annual Faculty Evaluation Policy.
2006-08 Peer Review Committee, Annual Faculty Evaluation, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education.

2006-07 Facilitator, Writing Support Group for Faculty.

2001-07 Inviting/Securing Keynote Speakers, Georgia Read-Write Now Conference.

2007-08 Coordinator, Ph.D. Program in Teaching and Learning (Concentration: Language and Literacy Education)

2007-08 Co-Coordinator, Professional Standards Week, Division of Language, Literacy, and Social Studies Education.

2004-06 Coordinator, TEEMS English Education M.Ed. Degree Program.

2002-04 Graduate Coordinator, MSIT.

2002-04 Chair, Academic Program Review Process (APACE), MSIT.

(Chaired three-year process of Academic Program Review for MSIT, compiled data for and wrote APACE report for MSIT, planned and coordinated seven external reviewers’ two-day visit to campus, and, using final reports from both external and internal reviews, coordinated MSIT Action Plan Process.)

2002-present Member, English Education Program Committee.

2000-02 Member, Middle Childhood Program Committee.

2002-05 Member, Educational Specialist Program Committee.

2000-present Member, Language and Literacy Program Committee.

2002-03 Member, Search Committee for Assistant Professor, Language and Literacy Education and English Education, MSIT.

2002-03 Member, Search Committee for Assistant Professor, Middle Childhood Education, MSIT.

2002-03 Member, Search Committee for Temporary Assistant Professor, MSIT.

2001-02 Member, Search Committee for Assistant Professors in Language and Literacy Education.
2000-01 Member, Search Committee for Assistant Professor in Science Education.

2002-06 Member, MSIT Advisory Committee.

various Acting Department Head, Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University.

University of Arizona, Department of Language, Reading and Culture

1999-00 Member, LRC Annual Performance Evaluation Peer Review of Tenured/Tenure-Eligible Faculty Committee.

1999-00 Member, LRC Annual Performance Evaluation Peer Review of Non-tenure-Eligible Faculty Committee.

1999-00 Member, LRC Curriculum Committee.

1996-98 Member, LRC Curriculum Committee.

1995-96 Member, LRC Advisory Committee.

1995-96 Alternate, LRC Personnel Committee.

1995-96 Co-Chair, LRC Joint Curriculum and Student Affairs Committee.

1992-96 Member, Student Affairs Committee.

1993-96 Chair, SAC Subcommittee on Graduate Student Financial Aid.

1994-95 Chair, LRC Annual Peer Review of Non-tenure Eligible Faculty.

1993-00 Member, Organizing Committee, LRC Conference on Children’s and Adolescent Literature.

1995-00 Co-Chair, LRC Conference on Children’s and Adolescent Literature.

1993-00 Program Proposal Reviewer, Conference on Literature and Literacy for Children Literature and Adolescents, University of Arizona.

1995-96 Chair, Children’s Literature Program Committee.

1992-93 Chair, LRC Ad Hoc Committee on Doctoral Advising Forms.
various Acting Department Head, Department of Language, Reading and Culture, University of Arizona.

University of Georgia, Department of Language Education
1992-93 Program Proposal Reviewer, 21st Annual Conference on Teaching the English Language Arts, University of Georgia.

1991-92 Member, UGA Secondary English Education Committee.

1991-92 Member, UGA Conference Planning Committee, 21st Annual Conference on Teaching the English Language Arts.

Intramural Service: College Committees

Georgia State University, College of Education
2009-10 Member, Dean’s Triennial Review Committee, GSU College of Education
2007-08 Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee, GSU College of Education
2007-08 Member, Dean’s Advisory Committee, GSU College of Education

2007-08 Chair, Strategic Planning Process, GSU College of Education
2007-08 Coordinator, GSU College of Education Strategic Planning Retreat, Loudermilk Center, Georgia State University

2006-07 Member, Search Committee for Dean, GSU College of Education.
2006-07 Member, Faculty Affairs Committee, GSU College of Education.
2006-07 Chair, Committee on Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty, GSU College of Education.
2005-07 Member, Committee on Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty, GSU College of Education.
2004-05 Chair, PEF Curriculum Committee, GSU College of Education/
College of Arts and Sciences.

2001-03 Member, PEF Curriculum Committee, GSU College of Education/College of Arts and Sciences.

2003-05 Appointed Member, Dean’s Advisory Committee, GSU College of Education.

2003-05 Ad Hoc Committee of Academic Affairs Committee (for Strategic Plan Initiatives), GSU College of Education.

2001-04 Teacher Support Specialist Ad Hoc Committee, GSU College of Education.

University of Arizona, College of Education

1999-00 Search Committee, Assistant Professor in English Education (Department of Teaching and Teacher Education, UA College of Education).

1999-01 Departmental Representative (elected position), College Council, UA College of Education.

1997-98 Departmental Representative (elected position), College Council, UA College of Education.

1997-98 Chair, UA COE Study Group on Faculty Renewal and Development.

1995-97 Academic Programs Committee, UA College of Education.

1996-97 Member, UA College of Education Summer Research Support Grant Review Committee.

1994-95 Departmental Representative (elected position), College Council, UA College of Education.

1994-95 Member, Information Gathering Subcommittee of the College Council.

1994-95 Member, Qualitative Data Analysis Subcommittee for the Dean’s Review,
College Council.

1994-95  Alternate, Awards and Recognition Committee, UA College of Education.

1992-93  Member, UA College of Education Collaboration Task Force Committee.

University of Georgia, College of Education

1991-92  Publicity Committee Chair, International Qualitative Research in Education Conference, UGA College of Education.

Intramural Service: University Committees

Georgia State University

2010-11  Member, Honors College Dean Search Committee, Georgia State University

2007-08  Member, Diversity Committee, Georgia State University

2007-08  Member, Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Information Management System, Georgia State University

2007-08  Staff Steering Committee, Advancement of Women, Georgia State University

2007-08  Faculty Steering Committee, Advancement of Women, Georgia State University

2002-08  Member, GSU Writing Across the Curriculum Committee (WAC).

2003-04  Member, Internal Peer Review Subcommittee, APACE Academic Program Review, Georgia State University.

2003-05  Member, Committee for Preparation of GTAs, Georgia State University.

University of Arizona

2000  Elected Member, University of Arizona Committee on Academic Freedom
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and Tenure

1992-00 Member, University of Arizona Association of Women Faculty
1997-98 Member, Intercollegiate Writing Committee
1995-96 Member, University of Arizona Campus Library Council
1994-95 Chair, Small Grants Review Committee, University of Arizona
1994-95 Project Advisor for Amie Lynn Pullum and Jennifer Roy, Multicultural Education in Pima County Public Schools, Undergraduate Research Grant Program, University of Arizona
1994-95 Participant, Provost’s First-Year Experience Symposium, University of Arizona
1992-93 Member, Composition Board Conference Planning Committee, University of Arizona
1992-93 Reader, Upper-Division Writing-Proficiency Exam, University of Arizona

SERVICE: OUTREACH

National/International Outreach: Leadership in Professional Organizations

08-09 Invited to serve as a strand leader in the “Effective Assessment and Accreditation of English Education Programs” thematic strand group of the Conference on English Education Conference, Chicago, IL. Ongoing facilitation of the thematic strand group’s work via online listserv and wiki discussion and collaborative writing.

07-08 Invited Member, Conference on English Education Task Force on Political Action in Educational Reform.
07-08  Invited to serve as a co-convener for the “English Educators in Teacher Education Reform” thematic strand group of the Conference on English Education Summit II (National Council of Teachers of English) at Lake Forest College in Lake Forest, IL. Ongoing facilitation of the thematic strand group’s work via online listserv and wiki discussion and collaborative writing.

07-08  Invited to serve as Area Co-Chair for National Reading Conference Program: Area 9, Text Analysis and Children’s/Adolescent/Young Adult Literature.

05-07  Invited Member of the Board of Directors, United States Board on Books for Young People.

05-06  Chair, Conference on English Education Leadership and Policy Summit, Atlanta, GA.

05-06  Appointed Member, Conference on English Education Website Redesign Task Force.

05-06  Invited Member, Joint NCTE / IRA Task Force on Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse, National Council of Teachers of English and International Reading Association.

00-05  Ex-Officio Member, Conference on English Education (CEE) Executive Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English.

03-05  Chair, CEE Cultural Diversity Grant Committee, National Council of Teachers of
04-05 Chair, Richard Meade Award Committee, National Council of Teachers of English.

02-04 Appointed Member, Richard Meade Award Committee, National Council of Teachers of English.

97-01 Elected Member, Conference on English Education (CEE) Executive Committee (slated by nominating committee and elected by full membership of the CEE of NCTE), National Council of Teachers of English.

99-01 Secretary, Conference on English Education (CEE) Executive Committee, National Council of Teachers of English. Elected position.

99-00 Appointed Member, Richard Meade Award Committee, National Council of Teachers of English.

97-99 Appointed Member, CEE Cultural Diversity Grant Committee, National Council of Teachers of English.

98-99 Chair, CEE Cultural Diversity Grant Committee, National Council of Teachers of English.

6/95- Elected Member, Conference on English Education (CEE) Nominating Committee (slated by committee and elected by full membership of the CEE of NCTE), National Council of Teachers of English.
95-98 Member, Standing Committee on Gender Issues and Literacy (appointed position), International Reading Association.

95-96 Member, Albert J. Kingston Award Ad Hoc Committee (appointed position), National Reading Conference.

2/95 Participant: NCTE Region Eight Affiliate Leadership Conference, Phoenix, AZ.

94-97 Field Council Representative, Region Two (Standing Committee, appointed position), National Reading Conference.

National/International Outreach: Participation in Professional Organizations

Active Member: National Council of Teachers of English

- National Reading Conference
- National Conference on Research in Language and Literacy
- International Reading Association
- American Educational Research Association
- Association of Teacher Educators
- National Society for the Study of Education
- Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development

National/International Outreach: Various Roles

03-10 Invited to serve as promotion and Tenure External Reviewer for Assistant Professors and Associate Professors in seven institutions (six national and one international)
07-08 Invited to serve as reviewer for The Literacy Hub, a program initiated by the International Reading Association to assist policy makers and program developers in the Middle East and Northern Africa as they develop innovative literacy programs.

06-07 Host, Visiting Professor Dr. Cheong Sook Chin (Associate Professor, Inje University, South Korea)

3/03 External Reviewer, Academic Program Review, Department of Secondary Education, Arizona State University West, Phoenix, AZ.

8/02- NCTE’s CoLEARN Research Team. Appointment to national research team for NCTE’s professional development program.

8/03 NCTE Co-Sponsored Speakers’ Bureau. Ongoing appointment to national speakers’ bureau for the National Council of Teachers of English.

10/03 Teachers as writers: Sharing our stories through professional publication.

Invited Keynote Address, Mississippi Council of Teachers of English, Jackson, MS, October 24-25, 2003.

10/03 Renewal, respect, and resolve: Teaching English language arts in difficult times.


2/95 Reading texts/reading lives: What we can learn from the voices of adolescent readers. Invited Keynote Address, Focus on Literacy Forum: Integrating Teaching and Learning. University of North Carolina, Wilmington, NC.
Teacher Education Consultant, SYNERGY Project: School/College Yearlong

Network: Exchanging Roles for Georgia Youth, Athens, GA. Project Principal Investigators: Sally Hudson-Ross and Patti McWhorter.

Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Consultant, Wilbur Mills Educational Cooperative, White County, AR.

Case Methods in Teacher Education Consultant, Rice University, Houston, TX.

Middle School Language Arts Consultant, Clayton State Teacher Education Project, Clayton State College, Morrow, GA. Conducted a presentation on incorporating language arts into the curriculum and met regularly with four middle school language arts teachers and four college faculty in order to facilitate the planning/design of the curriculum for a B.S. degree in teacher education.

Writing Consultant, The Lyndhurst Literacy Project, Chattanooga Public Schools, Chattanooga, TN. Conducted a workshop entitled “Facilitating the Writing Workshop in the Middle School”; visited and observed classrooms; interviewed participating teachers.

Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Consultant, Secondary Health Educators Curriculum Workshop, University of Central Arkansas, Conway, AR.


Local/State Outreach: Leadership in Professional Organizations

Invited Member, Statewide Language Arts Advisory Committee, State
Invited Member, statewide panel of experts from Georgia’s Colleges and Universities that provided review and critique of new K-12 Georgia Performance Standards. This group was commissioned by the University System of Georgia Board of Regents.

Member, Organizing Committee, Georgia Read-Write Now Conference, Atlanta, GA.

Invited Member, Statewide Standards Setting Committee, Middle Grades Language Arts, Praxis II, State of Georgia.

Member, Executive Committee, Arizona English Teachers Association.

Editor, Arizona English Bulletin, a professional journal of the Arizona English Teachers Association of the National Council of Teachers of English.

Note: During my editorship of the AEB, the journal received NCTE’s Affiliate Journal Award in 1996, 1997, and 1998. Three issues of AEB that I edited were peer reviewed and featured in the 1998 NCTE Catalog of Publications.

Editor, Arizona Reading Journal, a professional journal of the Arizona Reading Association of the International Reading Association.

Member, Board of Directors, Tucson Teachers Applying Whole Language.

Member, Board of Directors, Tucson Area Reading Council.

Participant: Arizona Reading Association Leadership Conference, Bisbee, AZ.
Local/State Outreach: Membership in Professional Organizations

Member:
- Georgia Council of Teachers of English
- Georgia Reading Association
- Georgia Association of Teacher Educators

Local/State Outreach: Various Roles

07-08  Writing Consultant and Workshop Leader, Gwinnett County Schools, GA.

05-06  University Site Coordinator for North Springs High School, Professional Development Schools Grant Project, Georgia State University.

05-06  University Advisory Council, North Springs High School Charter Development Process, Atlanta, GA.

8/02   Portfolio Consultant, Blessed Trinity High School, Atlanta, GA.

4/02   Consultant, Peachtree Urban Writing Project, Atlanta, GA.

10/01  Participant, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, GA.

11/01  Writer’s Workshop Speaker, Inman Middle School, Atlanta, GA.

6/00   Reading Consultant, Tucson Unified School District, Tucson, AZ.
2/98    Writing Consultant, Catalina Foothills High School, Catalina Foothills School District, Tucson, AZ.

2/96    Reading Consultant, LaCima Middle School, Amphitheater School District, Tucson, AZ.

2/96    Reading Consultant for Secondary Content Area Teachers, Amphitheater School District, Tucson, AZ.

1/95-5/95    Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum Consultant, Naylor Middle School, Tucson Unified School District, Tucson, AZ.

2/95    Teachers-as-Writers Consultant, Southern Arizona Writing Project, Sierra Vista Public Schools, Sierra Vista, AZ.

1/94-4/94    Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Consultant, Gridley Middle School, Tucson Unified School District; Gale, Soleng Tom, Henry, and Steele Elementary Schools, Tucson, AZ.

1/93-5/93    Beginning Teacher Study Group Consultant, Pueblo High School, Tucson Unified School District, Tucson, AZ.

1/93    Developing Teacher Portfolios, Townsend Middle School, Tucson, AZ.
Harmon
Stephen Webb Harmon

Georgia State University    Box 3976    Atlanta, GA    30303
swharmon@gsu.edu

Education

1992    Doctor of Education    Instructional Design and Development,
        Department of Instructional Technology, College of Education
        The University of Georgia, Athens GA

1988    Master of Education    Instructional Design and Development;
        Department of Instructional Technology, College of Education,
        The University of Georgia, Athens GA

1984    Bachelor of Arts    English Literature
        Department of English,
        Furman University, Greenville, SC

Professional Experience

August 2008 - Present    Director of Learning Technologies    College of Education
                            Georgia State University

Chair, Division of Learning Technologies
College of Education
Georgia State University

October 2001 –
August 2006

Director of Educational Technology College of Education
Georgia State University

June 2000 - Present  Associate Professor of Instructional Technology
College of Education
Georgia State University

September 1996 –
June 2000

Assistant Professor of Instructional Technology College of Education
Georgia State University

September 1991 - August 1996  Assistant Professor of Instructional Technology
University of Houston – Clear Lake

January 1987-
August, 1991  Graduate Assistant
The University of Georgia

1985-1987  4th Grade Teacher
Salaam Language School,
Assiut, Egypt
1984-1985 Production Assistant
Thompson-Mitchell & Associates, Atlanta, GA

Scholarly Contributions

Refereed Publications
(† denotes work with students)


Refereed Chapters


Jones, M.G. & Harmon, S.W. (2009). Instructional Strategies for Teaching in Synchronous Online Learning Environments (SOLE). In H. Yang, & S. Yuen (Eds.) Collective Intelligence and E-Learning 2.0: Implications of Web-Based Communities and Networking. (pp. 78-93), Hershey, PA, IGI Global publications.


Referred Proceedings


Non-Refereed Publications


Sponsored Projects (funded)

External Awards


Thompson, W., Calandra, B. Harmon, S.W. Puvirajah, A., (2010) After School Allstars - Project APPLI: Activities to Promote Project-based Learning and Inquiry, State of Georgia Department of Human Services, ($697,915) (co-PI) (Continuation of previous grant)

Thompson, W., Calandra, B. Harmon, S.W. Puvirajah, A., (2009) After School Allstars - Project APPLI: Activities to Promote Project-based Learning and Inquiry, State of Georgia Department of Human Services, ($697,915) (co-PI) (Continuation of previous grant)

Thompson, W., Calandra, B. Harmon, S.W. Puvirajah, A., (2009) After School Allstars - Project APPLI: Activities to Promote Project-based Learning and Inquiry, State of Georgia Department of Human Resources, ($697,775) (co-PI)


Harmon, S.W. (2001). External Evaluator for InterMath: Technology and the Teaching and Learning of Middle Grades Mathematics, an NSF grant to the University of Georgia. ($55,000). (PI)

Harmon, S.W. (2000). Sustainable African Development through Instructional Technology (SADIT). Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia ($8,000). (PI)


Internal Awards

MacDonald, D., & Harmon, S.W. (2008). Education in a virtual world. Georgia State University. ($37,500.00)


Sponsored Projects (under review)

Sponsored Projects (unfunded)


Professional Presentations

National/International


†Harmon, S.W., Rosenberg, E. & Mogilski, M. (2007). eLearning in Corporate Settings. Invited presentation at the annual conference of WCET. Atlanta, GA.


Harmon, S.W., (1989, February). University of Georgia College of Education Information System. Invited speaker at the Computer Assisted Interactive Video (CAIV) Showcase, at the Annual Conference of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Dallas, TX.


Regional


Palumbo, D. & Harmon, S.W. (1991). Hypermedia and Knowledge Construction. Presentation at the annual conference of the Texas Association for the Improvement of Reading (TAIR), Houston, TX.


Audio Visual Media


Project Experience

The American Association for the Advancement of Science. Reviewer. Reviewed Grant Applications for the Research Competitiveness Program.

American Society for Training and Development (ASTD). Judge. Judged the annual competition for the eLearning Excellence Award.

U.S. Department of State/International Research and Exchange Boards (IREX). Teaching excellence and achievement program (TEA). Consultant. Designed, developed and delivered three weeks of professional development activities on the effective use of technology in education for a group of 20 international scholars from around the world.
CARE USA. Consultant. Designed and developed an interactive eLearning course on Personal Safety and Security for use with CARE personnel worldwide.

Education for Development and Democracy Initiative/USAID/The University of Botswana. Consultant. Work with faculty and Administration of the University of Botswana to infuse technology into their higher education systems in order to facilitate the national development goals.

The University of Durban-Westville/USAID. Consultant. Worked with faculty and administration at this historically disadvantaged South African university to design a graduate program in Instructional Technology/Telematics.

Radiant Systems, Inc. Consultant. Worked with senior management to conduct an initial needs assessment and devise a strategic plan for the rollout of a new product.


Project InterMath. Program Evaluator. Designed and conducted formative and summative evaluations of this five year NSF project developed to improve middle school mathematics teaching and learning through instructional technology.

Epic Learning. Advisor. Served on the advisory board for this company that provides online course support and management tools.


Humancode, Inc. Consultant. Reviewed Humancode's design process and suggested modifications.
SACS. Program Evaluator. Conducted a substantive change evaluation of two programs at Barry University for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Conducted a reaccredidation evaluation of Old Dominion University. Conducted a substantive change evaluation of the Tennessee Board of Regents Online Degree Program. Conducted a substantive change evaluation of two programs at Texas Wesleyan University. Conducted a Site Review of the University of Tennessee – Chattanooga.

State of Georgia. Program Evaluator. Conducted an accreditation program evaluation of programs in multimedia and computer graphics design at The Art Institute of Atlanta for the State of Georgia's Nonpublic Post Secondary Education Commission.


AT&T. Performance Consultant. Engaged in all aspects of the design, development, implementation and evaluation of a large scale Performance Support System for Call Center representatives.

United States Air Force Academy. Contractor. Engaged in the design, development and production of a student-centered performance support system intended to foster a collaborative learning environment for students enrolled in the core introductory engineering course.


Allyn & Bacon Publishing Company. Reviewer. Review and Beta test texts in the area of instructional design.
KUHT-Houston/University of Houston System. Consultant. Worked with Houston public television and administrators in the UH system to plan and design an interactive distance learning capability as part of a new center for public broadcasting facility.

Interactive Educational Technology Consultant/Program Evaluator. Worked with electronic and software engineers, linguists and speech therapists to evaluate a new voice recognition technology serving as the basis for a computerized speech therapy program.

Autonomous Universidad de Guadalajara (UAG). Consultant. Designed and conducted workshops in instructional design and in authoring computer-based training with representatives of the UAG instructional support center.

United States Air Force Academy. Consultant/Evaluator. Consulted with a team of instructional designers, subject matter experts and faculty on the design of a course to teach cadets elements of aviation engineering. Evaluated a prototype of Airpower, an interactive hypermedia computer-based training system, designed to teach the history of military aviation.

United States Army — SEDCOM, Instructional Designer/Developer. Designed and developed a prototype hypermedia interface for ARES (Army Executives for Software), a prototype computer-based training program designed to instruct the General Officer’s Corp about today’s computerized Army.

Leightworks/Sears, Instructional Designer. Developed content outlines and screen designs for a computer-based training course for all Sears employees in the “Sears Brand Central” area.

Supportware Inc. Instructional Designer, Research Consultant. Founding partner in a software development start-up company. Created the company’s instructional design and development plan, research agenda, and human interface guidelines. Designed and developed prototype software and research tools.
United States Air Force Academy. Consultant. Consulted with instructional developers at the Air Force Academy on the creation of an interactive hypermedia computer-based training system, to teach the history of military aviation.


Apple Computer Inc. Developer. Developed the standards for all printed material produced by Apple Training Support.


State Botanical Gardens of Georgia. HyperCard Programmer. Designed user interface and programming for a level III interactive videodisc system to increase teachers' understanding of ecological support systems.

Integrated Design Systems. HyperCard Programmer. Programmed an online instructional design system to be used by instructional designers who are developing sales and marketing courses for Apple Computer, Inc.

National Low Income Housing Information Service. Instructional Developer.

Designed and developed an online library system.

National Low Income Housing Coalition. Instructional Developer.
Designed and conducted a one-day workshop on using the Macintosh computer.

Thompson-Mitchell & Associates. Instructional Developer. Designed and developed an online cataloging system for instructional films and videotapes.

The University of Georgia. Project Manager. Directed an instructional development team which produced a level III interactive videodisc information system for the College of Education for the university's Alumni Weekend. The system has since been presented at the national conventions of the Association for the Development of Computer-based Instructional Systems (ADCIS) and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT); as well as the Sunbelt Regional Agricultural Exposition; and has been used for demonstration purposes by the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.


Thompson-Mitchell & Associates. Instructional Designer. Revised the leader's guide and student workbook of a course used by PYA Monarch Inc. to train marketing representatives.

MetaMedia Systems. Instructional Designer. Designed interactive exhibits for the National Science Center for Communications and Electronics.

Other Professional Experience

Board of Directors, Enable, USA. (Enable USA is an organization working to end the abduction and human trafficking of children in Colombia.)

College Representative AACTE
University Representative EDUCAUSE


President (2005-2006). Research and Theory Division, Association for Educational Communications and Technology

Reviewer, Association Liaison Office of USAID. Reviewed applications for U.S. Middle-East University Partnerships Program.

National Leadership Institute on Evaluation. (Assisted in interpreting the provisions of the “No Child Left Behind Act” dealing with scientific research.)


Associate Director, Middle East Center for Peace, Justice, and Education. (1999-2006)

Founding Editor, Instructional Technology Research Online (InTRO). (This is a WWW site dedicated to Instructional Technology (http://www.gsu.edu/intro)


Member, Helen M. Aderhold Learning Center Design Committee. (Served to make sure this 42 million dollar classroom building provided for best practices in technology-enhanced learning.)


Member; Board of Directors Phi Delta Kappa. Clear Lake Chapter (1993)


Dissertations Chaired to Completion


Chitiyo, Rodwell (2006). Integration of Instructional Technology by University Lecturers in Secondary School Teacher Education Programs in Zimbabwe: An Exploratory Study

Ma, Yuxin (2005). Exploring faculty perceptions of a case library as an online teaching resource.


Honors and Awards

Georgia State University Instructional Innovation Award Recipient 2011

Phi Beta Delta Honor Society for International Scholars

Phi Kappa Phi National Honor Fraternity.

Kappa Delta Pi National Honor Society in Education.

Phi Delta Kappa National Honor Society in Education

Outstanding Students of America (1989).
University-wide Assistantship Recipient (1989-90).


The Quaternion Club, Leadership, Scholarship, & Service Honor Society, Furman Univ.

Faculty Research Support Fund - Univ. of Houston-Clear Lake.

Students for Disability Awareness Faculty Honoree - Univ. of Houston-Clear Lake

Professional Affiliations

Association for Educational Communications and Technology

American Educational Research Association

Association for the Advancement of Computers in Education

Southwest Educational Research Association

Society of International Chinese in Educational Technology

EDUCAUSE

International Society for Technology in Education

International Interactive Communications Society

Phi Kappa Phi

Kappa Delta Pi

Phi Delta Kappa
Jett
Christopher C. Jett, Ph.D.

Curriculum Vitae

____________________________________________________________________________

Office Address:

Georgia State University
College of Education
Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology
P.O. Box 3978
Atlanta, GA 30302-3978
Phone: (404) 413-8438
Email: mstccjx@langate.gsu.edu

Home Address:

11101 Jefferson Square Ct.
Decatur, GA 30030
Phone: (678) 849-9079
Email: c_jett@yahoo.com

____________________________________________________________________________

EDUCATION

Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

Doctor of Philosophy in Teaching and Learning with a concentration in Mathematics Education, August 2009, Major Professor: Dr. David W. Stinson

Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tennessee

Master of Science in Mathematical Sciences, August 2005
Bachelor of Science in Mathematics, May 2003
AWARDS AND FELLOSHIPS

Graduate:

• Urban Graduate Teaching Collaborative Fellowship ($90,000) – Georgia State University, 2006–2009 (plus full tuition remission)

• Outstanding Doctor of Philosophy Student Award – Department of Middle-Secondary and Instructional Technology (Mathematics Education), Georgia State University, 2009

• Outstanding Graduate Teaching Assistant – Department of Middle-Secondary and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, 2006–2007

• Excellence in Promoting Student Learning Award – Center for Teaching & Learning, Georgia State University, 2007

Undergraduate:

• Packard Scholar – Tennessee State University, 1999–2003

• George W. Gore Honors Award – Tennessee State University, 2003

• Ronald McNair Model Scholar – University of Tennessee at Knoxville, 2002

• Ronald McNair Best Quantitative Gain – University of Tennessee at Knoxville, 2002


• Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society

• Alpha Kappa Mu Honor Society

• Who’s Who Among America’s College Students, 2001–2003

• Dean’s List – Tennessee State University, 1999–2003

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY (Higher Education)
2009–Present  Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA

Position: Clinical Assistant Professor

College of Education: Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology:
Middle Level Education Unit

Responsibilities include: serving as the university liaison and coordinator for the DeKalb County School System’s Mathematics and Science Transition to Teaching grant initiative; teaching mathematics and education courses for prospective middle school teachers at the undergraduate and graduate levels; supervising field and student-teaching experiences for middle and secondary preservice mathematics teachers; advising undergraduate and graduate students; and conducting research.

2006–2009  Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA

Position: Urban Graduate Teaching Assistant

College of Education: Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology:
Mathematics Education Unit

Responsibilities included: teaching and co-teaching mathematics (and science) education courses; partnering with provisionally certified teachers to develop culturally relevant curriculum materials; supervising field and student-teaching experiences for middle and secondary preservice mathematics teachers; attending research seminars and workshops related to pursuing a career in academia; and serving as an assistant to the middle childhood mathematics education alternative preparation program coordinator (responsibilities included: conducting information sessions, scheduling and conducting prospective student interviews, scheduling workshops, and handling inquiries for current and prospective students).

2006–2009  Georgia Perimeter College, Clarkston, GA

Position: Adjunct Mathematics Instructor

Department of Mathematics, Computer Science, and Engineering

Responsibilities included: teaching remedial and college-level mathematics courses. (While teaching remedial mathematics courses, I was instrumental in assisting students to exit the
Learning Support mathematics sequence and equipping them with the foundational mathematics skills to excel in college-level mathematics courses.

Position: Mathematics Instructor

Responsibilities included: teaching mathematics concepts to students who were experiencing difficulties with mathematics and with school in general. (While at ClubZ, I was instrumental in motivating and encouraging students in urban spaces to perform well in mathematics as well as developing curriculum for and teaching various mathematics preparatory courses (i.e., ACT and SAT preparatory courses).

RESEARCH

Publications:

Jett, C. C., McNeal-Curry, K., & Vernon-Jackson, S. (under review). Let our students be our guides: McNair scholars speak about diversity and to teacher education. Urban Education.


Jett, C. C. (in press). “Many are called, but few are chosen”: The role of spirituality and religion in the educational outcomes of “chosen” African American male mathematics majors. Journal of Negro Education.


Presentations:


Projects:

African American Male Students and Undergraduate Mathematics: Gaining Access and Obtaining Success (2008–2009), Doctoral Advisory Committee: Drs. David Stinson (chair), Joyce King, Lou Matthews, and Brian Williams, examined the (undergraduate) schooling experiences of four successful African American male students who were currently pursuing graduate degrees in mathematics or mathematics education.

A Multicultural Teacher Education: The Development of Effective Culturally Responsive Educators (2008–2009), PI: Dr. Kezia McNeal, studied McNair scholars in a summer achievement program, interviewing nine scholars regarding their educational experiences with teachers from diverse backgrounds.

TEACHING

Teaching Assignments:

Georgia State University:

EDCI 3220: Understanding and Supporting Middle School Learners
EDCI 3250: Introduction to Secondary Mathematics and Science Education
EDCI 6660: Introduction to Secondary Instruction (TA)
EDCI 7660: Practicum I
EDCI 7670: Practicum II
EDCI 7680: Practicum III

EDMT 3350: Topics in Middle Grades Mathematics

EDMT 6560: Principles of Mathematics Instruction (TA)

EDMT 7530: Mathematics Concepts for Middle Childhood Education

Georgia Perimeter College:

Math 0097: Beginning Algebra

Math 0098: Intermediate Algebra

Math 1111: College Algebra

Math 1113: Pre-calculus

Math 2008: Foundations of Numbers and Operations

Tennessee State University:

Math 1110: College Algebra

Math 1830: Business Calculus

SERVICE

Community:

Jett, C. C. (2010, April). Securing a position in academia. Invited guest speaker at the McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program session at Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Jett, C. C. (2010, January). Invited guest speaker at the Youth Motivation Day at Alonzo Crim High School, Atlanta, GA.

Jett, C. C. (2008, October). Pursuing a career in mathematics (education). Invited speaker at the mathematics session at Clark-Atlanta University, Atlanta, GA.

McNeal, K., Jett, C. C., & Vernon-Jackson, S. (2006, October). Getting into graduate school and obtaining a Ph.D. Invited panel at the McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program session at Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

University:

College of Education:

- Professional Education Council, Graduate Student Representative, 2007–2009

Department:

- Advanced Degree Committee, 2010–2011
- Social Studies Education Search Committee, Member, 2009–2010
- Committee on Culture, Climate, and Equity, Member, 2008–2009
- Collaborative Mathematics Education Research Group (CMERG), Member, 2005–Present; President, 2007–2008

Profession:

Membership:

- American Educational Research Association (AERA)
- Mathematical Association of American (MAA)
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)
- Georgia Council of Teachers of Mathematics (GCTM)
• Benjamin Banneker Association (BBA)

Assistant Editor:

Journal of Urban Mathematics Education (JUME), 2010

Responsibilities include: Working closely with the Editor-in-Chief during the copyediting and formatting stage of production; reviewing journal manuscript submissions; and managing the thesis abstracts section.

Recognition by scholarly and professional associations:

**Junor Clarke**
CURRENT CURRICULUM VITA

NOVEMBER 18, 2011

Name: PIER A. JUNOR CLARKE
Title: Clinical Associate Professor

Department: Middle/Secondary Education and Instructional Technology
Office Address: Georgia State University, P.O. Box 3978, Atlanta, Georgia 30302-3978
Office Phone: 404-413-8411
Office Fax: 404-413-8063
Email Address: pier.junorclarke2@gmail.com
Graduate Faculty Status: 2004-2011

EDUCATION

2003 PhD
University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Major: Mathematics Education

1991 M.A. City University of New York, City College, New York, USA
Major: Mathematics Education

1982 B.Sc. University of Guyana, Turkeyen, Guyana
Major: Mathematics /Physics
ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

2010 - present  Clinical Associate Professor, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

2005 - present  Coordinator, Master of Arts in Teaching/ Initial Teacher Preparation (TEEMS) Secondary Mathematic Education Program Degree, Georgia State University

2003 - 2010  Assistant Professor, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

2001 - 2002  Teaching Assistant (TEPA)/Supervision, Initial Teacher Preparation - Elementary Level, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

2001 - 2007  Consultant, Ask A Teacher E Learning & Development Project, Canada

1993 - 2003  Grades 5-12 Mathematics Courses, Math Plus Learning Center, Eglinton, Toronto, Canada


HONORS, AWARDS, AND RECOGNITIONS

*Items are cross-listed under Presentations and Professional Meetings

2010  *Invited to facilitate a one day workshop: “Using APA Guidelines to Format Your Master’s Thesis” at the University of Guyana, Turkeyen, Guyana, South America.

2010  *Invited to serve as External Examiner on two M.Ed. theses at the University of Guyana,
Turkeyen, Guyana, South America.

2010 Invited as a guest reviewer for The Teacher Educator, USA. (Cross-listed under Editorial / Reviewers’ project)

2009 *Invited to serve as External Examiner on one M.Ed. theses at the University of Guyana, Turkeyen, Guyana, South America.

2009 Invited as a guest reviewer for Comparative Education Review Journal, Chicago, USA. (cross-listed under Editorial/Reviewers' project)


2009 *Invited to speak at the University of Guyana, Berbice Campus, Guyana, South America, with Peter Wintz, on Reflective Secondary School Mathematics Teaching.

2008 Co-Founder and co-editor of the Journal of Urban Mathematics Education (JUME), Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA. (cross-listed under Editorial/Reviewers’ project)

2008 *Invited to facilitate a three-day workshop on Enhancing Teacher Quality – National Centre for Educational Resource Development (ETQ-NCERD) Summer Institute 1, Kingston, Georgetown, Guyana, South America with Dr. Brewley-Corbin.
2006  *Invited to facilitate a one-day workshop on Becoming a Critical Mathematics Teacher to teacher educators from both Mico & Shortwood Teachers’ College, Kingston, Jamaica.

2005  *Invited to facilitate a one-day workshop on the Reflective Teaching Model to teacher educators at Shortwood Teachers’ College, Kingston, Jamaica.

2005  *Invited to facilitate a one-day workshop on the Reflective Teaching Model to teacher educators at Mico Teachers’ College, Kingston, Jamaica.

2005  *Invited to facilitate a one-day workshop on the Use of the Graphing Calculator in Mathematics Education, to preservice mathematics teachers at Cyril Potter’s College of Education, Turkeyen, Guyana.


RESEARCH INTERESTS

My research interests focus on developing high quality teachers with mathematics knowledge for teaching in secondary urban classrooms and their impact on student learning in the United States of America and the English-speaking Caribbean.

GRANTS, AWARDS, AND FUNDED RESEARCH

External Awards [$759,791]

Quality Grants Program, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, ($48,921). [Role: Equal contributing developer and investigator].


A travel award to present at UREAG/Comparative and International Education Society, ($250).

Internal Awards [$42,195]


Junor Clarke, P.A. (February, 2006). The Effects of the reflective teaching model in the Caribbean,
University Underrepresented Minority Faculty Mentoring Program, GSU, ($800).

Junor Clarke, P.A. (February, 2006). The Effects of the reflective teaching model in the Caribbean,
International Project Funding at GSU, ($1,995).

Junor Clarke, P.A. (May - June 2005). The Reflective Teaching Model Teacher-Educators’ Workshop,
International Project Funding at GSU, ($2,000).


RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

REFEREED PUBLISHED JOURNAL ARTICLES


REFEREED PUBLISHED BOOK CHAPTERS


REFEREED PUBLISHED PROCEEDINGS


REFEREED PUBLISHED ABSTRACTS


high quality mathematics teachers: A collaborative approach to teacher development. Abstract published in Reconceptualising the Agenda for Education in the Caribbean, and presented School of Education Biennial Conference, University of the West Indies, p. 677, St. Augustine, Trinidad & Tobago, West Indies.


DISSERTATION


MASTER’S THESIS

ARTICLES UNDER PEER REVIEW


SCHOLARLY WORK IN PREPARATION


RESEARCH PROJECTS IN PROGRESS

Junor Clarke, P.A. & NET-Q Research TEAM. (2010-present). Facilitator and Mentor of the Teacher-Intern-Professor (T.I.P.) Model, which is an integral part of the program for ten NET-Q mathematics scholars.

Network for Enhancing Teacher Quality (NET-Q) project is to increase the quality and number of highly qualified teachers who are committed to high needs schools (urban metro-Atlanta and rural Georgia settings). Project objectives and activities include:

(a) Enhancing pre-baccalaureate teacher preparation programs;
(b) Enhancing post-baccalaureate teacher preparation programs; and
(c) Creating teacher and leadership residency programs for post-baccalaureate candidates, along with complementary priorities (comprehensive induction/mentor program, enhanced professional development school partnerships, and the development of faculty knowledge).

Pre- and post-baccalaureate teacher, leader preparation programs and complementary initiatives focus on developing knowledge and skills related to teaching special education, English Language Learners (ELL), technology, and literacy across the content areas. A unique feature of this program is its partnership with two Historically Black Colleges to increase teacher recruitment from underrepresented groups.


The purpose of this three-year mixed methods study is to examine the expertise, experiences, and concerns of three different groups of mathematics education students: those students entering the initial teacher preparation (ITP) program also known as TEEMS program with an undergraduate/graduate degree, those provisionally licensed by the state, and those initially trained by Teach for America (TFA). In particular, this study will investigate the ITP mathematics education (ITP-ME) students’ reasons for wanting to become teachers, their educational
backgrounds, their experiences with technology, their concerns and attitudes about teaching and teaching mathematics. Thirty students will participate in this study.


The purpose of this three-year mixed methods study is to examine the expertise, experiences, and concerns of three different groups of TEEMS English education students: Those students entering the program with an undergraduate degree, those provisionally licensed by the state, and those initially trained by Teach for America (TFA). In particular, this study will investigate the TEEMS English education students' reasons for wanting to become teachers, their educational backgrounds, their experiences with technology, and their concerns about teaching. Forty students will participate in this study.


The purpose of this study is to discover how pre-service teachers at the elementary and secondary levels combine pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge, and research methods from action research courses to inform their teaching and learning practices and professional growth and development.


This research is aligned with a National Science Foundation funded project, the Robert Noyce Urban Mathematics Educator Program (UMEP). The overall goals of the UMEP is to increase the number of high-quality secondary mathematics teachers who seek jobs in urban school districts and are committed to remaining in urban school environments. The purpose of this research is to examine the connects and disconnects between university classrooms that prepare UMEP teachers and urban/secondary mathematics classrooms.
PRESENTATIONS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS
State, National and International


(TI-NSPIRE CAS instruments). Presentation at Georgia Mathematics Conference (GMC), Rock Eagle, Eatonton, Georgia.


Junor, P. A. (March 2004). Caribbean teachers exploring with technology in their instructional
practices. Paper presented at Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA.


INVITED WORKSHOPS AND INSTITUTES

Invited National


Invited International


EDITORIAL/REVIEWER’S PROJECTS

2010 – present Editorial Review Board, Reviewer, The Teacher Educator [International]

2009 Guest proposal reviewer, Comparative Education Review Journal [International]

2009 Invited External Examiner, University of Guyana, Master’s Degree Program, Turkeyen, Guyana, South America.

State University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.

Stinson, D., Junor Clarke, P.A., Manley, O.I., Matthews, L., Thomas, C. (2009) (Co-Editor). Mathematics Teacher Educators as Cultural Workers: A Dare to Those Who Dare to Teach (Urban?) Teachers, Volume 2(2), Georgia State University, Georgia, USA.


2006-2011 Content Advisory Committee Member: Georgia Assessment for Certification of Educators (GACE) - BASIC Skills

2005-2010 Proposal Reviewer, Psychology of Mathematics Education of North America (PME-NA) [International]

2005-2008 Grant Proposal Reviewer, Proposal Development Grant, College of Education, GSU, Atlanta, Georgia


Kinuthia
WANJIRA KINUTHIA

Associate Professor, Learning Technologies Division
Middle-Secondary and Instructional Technology Department

P.O. Box 3978, Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30302-3978

Office: (404) 413-8246
Fax: (404) 413-8063
E-mail: wkinuthia@gsu.edu

EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Ph.D. - Dec. 2003 University of South Alabama, Mobile, Alabama
   Degree: Ph.D. in Instructional Design and Development
   Dissertation: An Exploratory Study of Faculty Participation in Web-Based Instruction at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

M.Ed. - June 1999 Ohio University, Athens, Ohio
   Degree: Master of Education in Computer Education and Technology
   Masters Research Project: How Computers Enhance the Lives of Individuals with Disabilities

M.A. - June 1999 Ohio University, Athens, Ohio
   Degree: Master of Arts in International Affairs
   Graduate Certificate in Womens’ Studies

B.Sc. - May 1996 Kutztown University, Kutztown, Pennsylvania
   Major: International Business and Management
Minor: International Studies

1990-1992  Attended the University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya
Coursework in the Faculty of Arts

2007  The Grant Institute
Certificate - Grants 101: Professional Grant Proposal Writing

2007  Colorado State University – Continuing Education
Certificate - Success Project Management
Certificate – Program Monitoring and Evaluation

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Mat 2010 to Present: Associate Professor
Middle-Secondary and Instructional Technology Department, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA
Research, teaching, and service in the area of instructional design and technology. Teaching includes both undergraduate and graduate courses and focuses on preparing students to work in corporate and teacher education environments. Research focuses on aspects of socio-cultural perspectives on e-learning, and the use of educational technologies in teacher education, both locally and internationally.

August 2003 to May 2010: Assistant Professor
Middle-Secondary and Instructional Technology Department, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA
Research, teaching, and service in the area of instructional design and technology. Teaching includes both undergraduate and graduate courses and focuses on preparing students to work in corporate and teacher education environments. Research focuses on aspects of socio-cultural
perspectives on e-learning, and the use of educational technologies in teacher education, both locally and internationally.

March 2001 to August 2003: Instructional Designer

Bender Shipbuilding and Repair Co., Mobile, AL

Designed and developed instructional content for skilled craftsmen deployed through computer and web based training. Conducted needs and task analysis, formative and summative evaluations. Analyzed content, establish learning objectives, write assessment items. Determined instructional strategies, and conducted media analyses. Researched pertinent information and collaborated with to develop course material including training manuals, reference guides, student material, instructor guides, and instructional aids.

September 2000 to February 2001: Instructional Designer

Lockheed Martin Training Operations, Pensacola, FL

Designed and developed instruction (facilitator and participant manuals, presentations, job aids) delivered via computer and web-based training for adult learners. Analyzed instructional content, established learning objectives, and developed assessment items. Developed instructional analysis and strategies, course outcomes, and storyboards. Edited and evaluated instructional material for content, accuracy, consistency, format and layout. Collaborated with subject matter experts and instructional development teams.

August 1999 to May 2003: Senior Instructional Designer and Doctoral Assistant

College of Education, Online Learning Lab, University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL

Coordinated, managed, and supervised lab activities. Designed and developed e-learning courseware, training materials, and instructional documentation. Assisted faculty and staff with issues related to e-learning. Developed and maintained instructional web resources. Extensively used Learning Management Systems (eCollege, Blackboard, and WebCT).

August 1999 to May 2003: Teaching Assistant

College of Education, Online Learning Lab, University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL
Managed and assisted in the teaching of online courses, web enhanced courses, and on campus courses using eCollege and Blackboard. Prepared and delivered workshops and short-term courses on technological applications in instructional media for faculty, staff, and students.

January 2000 to August 2000: Desktop Publisher and Editor
King Advertising, Mobile, AL
Conducted library and Internet research for publication “The Urban Connection.” Designed page layout, content, and graphics. Edited the monthly publication.

March 1997 to June 1999: Graduate Assistant and Editor
Ohio University, Center for International Studies, Athens, OH
Peer-reviewed, designed, and edited quarterly publication “Toguna” for Department of African Studies. Administrative assistant responsibilities included organizing center activities.

June 1998 to June 1999: Computer Instructor Intern
ATCO Inc., Athens, OH
Designed and developed computing lessons. Provided computer instructions to persons with disabilities (word processing, graphic software, Internet, educational multimedia).

November 1996 to January 1997: Intern Oxfam
America, Boston, MA
Assisted with projects that promote international health and education programs. Coordinated organization’s activities. Administrative assistant duties. Corresponded with members and prepared reports.

PUBLICATIONS
PUBLISHED

* Invited by publisher. Edited three books so far as part of the series (see titles below). Titles “Cases’n’Places” and “Educational Technology in Practice” each have an accompanying facilitator guide.

Published Books


Book Editing in Progress


Published Peer-Reviewed Articles


Published Invited Article


Published Peer-reviewed Book Chapters


(Eds). (p. 163-180). Bridging the knowledge divide: Educational technology for development. Information Age Publishing Inc., Charlotte, NC.


Published Invited Book Chapter


FORTHCOMING

Peer-reviewed Articles under Review

Publications in Preparation

Articles in Preparation


Book Chapter in Preparation


PUBLISHED PEER-REVIEVED PROCEEDINGS AND ABSTRACTS


Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunications 2005 (pp. 3193-3198). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.


PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND ABSTRACTS


Kinuthia, W. (2002). The Empowered Learner at the Center of Instructional Design. Poster presented at the University of South Alabama’s 9th Annual Research Forum, Mobile, AL.

RESEARCH PROJECTS AND TECHNICAL REPORTS

July 2007 to April 2008  CLAD/IDRC Sponsored Project on e-Learning in the Caribbean

Marshall, S (2008). Latin American Center for Development Administration (CLAD) and International Development Research Center (IDRC) project. A sub regional study resulting in a comprehensive 120-page report, producing a diagnoses and analyses on the development and potentialities of e-learning for public servants where ICT are used in the English-speaking Caribbean. Assisted in collecting data for the project.

May 2006 to April 2008 Instructional Technology-based Teacher Education: Cross-Cultural Collaborations in Senegal and South Africa


April 2007 to Dec 2007  CCEEG

Marshall, S. & Kinuthia, W. (2007-2008). Deliverables include a web portal, two online courses, and report on e-governance. Project is part of a UNESCO funded Caribbean Center of Excellence for E-Governance (CCEEG) initiative that is being implemented by the Caribbean Centre for Development Administration (CARICAD). Collaborative Project.

June 2007 to Dec 2007  Non-Formal Distance Education via CMCs in the Caribbean

Jan 2005 to May 2007  Teacher Electronic Performance Support System (TEPSS) PT3 Funded Grant

(Calandra, B., Kinuthia, W. et al.) Design, development, and evaluation of online support system for novice teachers and their mentors to expand technology integration support throughout student teaching and teacher induction phases. Collaborative Project.

Dec 2004 to March 2005  Safe Driving Course


Dec 2004 to March 2008  E-Portfolio Development: A Collaborative Teaching Approach

(Junor-Clarke & Kinuthia W.) Ongoing collaborative teaching and research project that seeks streamline the e-Portfolio develop process for students in the Mathematics teacher education program. Collaborative Project.

May 2005 to Dec 2006  Assessment of ICT in African Higher Education

(Kinuthia, W & Dagada, R.) Research explored the types of Information and Communication Technology in African higher education and their application in teaching and learning. Study focuses on South Africa.

June 2005 to July 2006  Developing Pedagogical Technology Integration Content Knowledge: PT3 Funded Grant

(Dias, L., Kinuthia, W., et. al.) This research examined the effects of case-based instructional strategies on the development of Pedagogical Technology Integration Content Knowledge (PTICK) in alternative teacher preparation students.

May 2004 to August 2004  Enhancing Education through Technology (Ed Tech)
(Kinuthia, W.) No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB): Title II, Part D,

Prepared comparative report for the Georgia Department of Education on assessing technology literacy and how states integrating technology based on requirements of Title II Part D.


(Kinuthia, W.) Simple Charts vs. Embellished USA TODAY Charts: A Study of Elements of Graphs That Have an Effect on The Learning and Retention of Graphical Data.

April to May 2002 Program Assessment and Evaluation

Maysville Math Initiative (MMI), Mobile, Alabama

Program evaluation and assessment in the Mobile County Public School System. Interacted with, and collected data from students and educators in participating pilot and control schools (consultant on project).

GRANTS AND GRANT-FUNDED PROJECTS

Funded Grants

Kinuthia, W. (2009). Conference Presentation at the Global Education Forum. Dubai, UAE. Funding from Minority Faculty Mentoring Grant. $800.00


Kinuthia, W. (2006). Invited Presentation to Teacher Education Professional Development Workshop on Technology Integration City University, Hong Kong. Funding from Minority Faculty Mentoring Grant. $800.00


Kinuthia, W. (2004). Faculty development seminar. University System of Georgia’s Chancellor’s Award. $1,000.00

Kinuthia, W. (2004). Faculty development seminar. College of Education International Education Program, Georgia State University. $1,800.00

Grant Application Submitted

Grant Applications Not Funded


Kinuthia, W. & Harmon, S. (2006). Response to Request for Proposals to enhance research Advancement of Women Faculty Scholarship Mentoring Grant Pilot Project, Georgia State University. Role: Principle Investigator. Submitted for $6,000.

Internet-Based Long-Term Professional Development of Education Policy-Makers and Administrators. Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development. Role: Grant co-author. Submitted for $429,086.


Courses Taught at Georgia State University

IT 2010 – Computers for the Information Age
IT 2210 - Integrating Technology into the Elementary Classroom
IT 3100 – Educational Technology in Africa and the Diaspora
IT 7100 - Design of Performance and Instructional Systems
IT 7150 - Analysis of Performance and Instructional Systems
IT 7360 - Technology for Educators
IT 8050 - Evaluation and Assessment of Online Learning
IT 8150 - Managing Instructional Technology Projects
IT 8500 - Advanced Instructional Design
IT 8420 - Topics in Instructional Technology (Socio-cultural influences in instructional design and technology)
IT 8660 - Internship in Instructional Technology

Courses Taught as a Teaching Assistant at the University of South Alabama

ISD 600 - Learning Tools
ISD 610 - Trends and Issues in Instructional Design and Development
ISD 613 - Instructional and Learning Strategies
ISD 650 - Computer-Based Training
ISD 651 - Technology-Based Training I

Workshops, Short-Term Courses, and Seminars Conducted (University of South Alabama)

Basic Computer Skills
Course development using eCollege, eCompanion, and Blackboard

Shooting and Digitizing Video
Digital Imaging

Sound Recording and Editing
Web Development

PowerPoint and Portable Document Formats Online Instruction

Motivating Online Learners

Alternate Assessment and Evaluation of Online Student Online Performance

Accessibility and Online Learning

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATION

• Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT)
• American Educational Research Association (AERA)
• Association for the Advancement of Computers in Education (AACE)
• American Evaluation Association (AEA)
• Comparative and International Education Society (CIES)
• Professors of Instructional Design and Technology (PIDT)
• SANTEC network of educational technology practitioners (Board Member)
• Southern Center for International Studies (SCIS)
• University System of Georgia Africa Council (USGAC)
• Society of International Chinese in Educational Technology (SICET)

SERVICE AND COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Georgia State University

• College of Education, Office of International Programs Committee (2007-present)
• Ad Hoc Committee on Bylaws: MSIT department, Spring 2008
• Urban Graduate Research Collaborative committee: Spring 2008
• College of Education, Office of International Programs Ad Hoc Committee (2004)
• Academic Affairs Committee (AAC): College of Education (2005-2007)
• Honors Committee: MSIT Department (2005-2006)
• Department International Point Persons (DIPP): MSIT Department (2005-2006)
• Ad-hoc Committee: College of Education, Office of International Programs (2004)
• Worldquest. Academic international competition for Metro Atlanta high schools (2006-2007)
• Dissertation Committees: Chairing six Dissertation Committees. Dissertation committee member on six additional committees
• Study Abroad Proposals (2008)

Instructional Design and Technology Profession

• Editorial Board Member: International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication
• Board Member: SANTEC network of educational technology practitioners (2006-2008)
• Review Board Member: British Journal of Educational Technology
• Review Board Member: Educational Media International
• Programme Development Committee. External committee member: University of the West Indies, Masters of Education, Instructional Technology curriculum

• AERA (IT-SIG) Young Researcher Award – Submissions reviewer (2008)

Peer-Reviews Activities

• Conference proposals:
  o eMerge (2008)
  o American Education Research Association (2003; 2007)
  o Association for Educational Communications and Technology (2004, 2008)

• Book chapters:
  o Information Technology and Indigenous People (2005)
  o Globalized E-Learning Cultural Challenges (2005)
  o Encyclopedia of Developing Regional Communities with Information and Communication Technology 2004
  o Bridging the Knowledge Divide: Educational Technology for Development.

• Journals:
  o Prospects: UNESCO Journal- Invited to peer review several articles (2007)
  o Educational Media International – Ongoing since 2006
  o British Journal of Education Technology – Ongoing since 2006
  o International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication- Ongoing since 2005
SELECTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

• Georgia State University (2003-2008)
  o Workshops offered by the Instructional Technology Center
  o Workshops offered by the University Educational Technology Services
  o Faculty sessions offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning
  o University Research Services and Administration
• One day workshop in Mixed Methods Analysis. Sponsored by MSIT Department (2008)
• One-day workshop Seven Revolutions using the Epsilon learning environment in 2007 at Georgia Perimeter College, organized by the University System of Georgia.
• Certificate for completion of three-day workshop offered Grant Institute and held at Georgia Tech. 2007
• Online semester-long courses in continuing education at the Colorado State University, Division of Continuing Education in 2007.
  o Successful Project Management
  o Program Monitoring and Evaluation
• Several two-day workshops in 2004-2006 by the University System of Georgia for the Certificate in Africa Studies Project (CIASP) in Columbus and Athens Georgia.

_____________________________________________________________________________

COMPUTER AND TECHNICAL ABILITIES

Windows and Macintosh Operating Systems (Hardware and Software) Video and Audio Equipment, Camtasia Suite, Corel Suite, Microsoft Office Suite, MS Project, Macromedia and Adobe Suite, PaintShop Pro, PrintMaster Deluxe, Trainorsoft, Quark XPress, Ulead Suite, Real Products, CoolEdit, Inspiration, Course Management Systems (eCollege, WebCT, Blackboard), SPSS, Nvivo, EndNote, Webpage design, open source software and open educational resources (Moodle, Open Office etc).

_____________________________________________________________________________

SERVICE, AWARDS & HONORS, RECOGNITION, AND VOLUNTEER WORK
• Phi Beta Delta Honor Society for International Scholars 2007 to present
• Missionaries of the Poor – Kingston, Jamaica 2004 to present
• Humanitarian collections for internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Kenya 2008
• Bender Shipbuilding - Excellence in Instruction Design Award 2003
• Volunteer- SITE Conference 2003
• 1st Annual Diabetes Walk-a-thon, Mobile, AL 2002
• U. of South AL. - Nominated Educational Leadership Student of the Year 2002
• Ohio University- Organizing Committee African Cultural Night 1998
• Kutztown University- President’s Award in Multicultural Leadership 1996
• Kutztown University Secretary- International Students Union 1996
• Help Age Kenya - Recognition for highest funds raised 1986
• Help Age Kenya - Recognition for highest funds raised 1983
Lewis
TISHA Y. LEWIS, Ph.D.

College of Education – MSIT

P.O. Box 3987
30 Pryor Street
Atlanta, GA 30302

Work: 404.413.8391
Cell: 202.425.8190
Fax: 404.413.8063

tlewis31@gsu.edu

Office: COE, Room 661
Email: tishayL@yahoo.com

Present Rank: Assistant Professor, Reading Education
Tenure Status: Tenure Track
Department: Middle-Secondary Education and Instruction Technology
Unit: Language and Literacy

University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY


Dissertation Chair: Peter Johnston, Professor, Reading Department

Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY

Master of Arts, Reading Specialization

Brooklyn College, City University of New York, Brooklyn, NY

Master of Science, Television/Radio Programming and Management
Virginia Union University, Richmond, VA
Bachelor of Arts, Journalism, Cum laude

RESEARCH INTERESTS


CHRONOLOGY OF EMPLOYMENT

August 2010 – Present  ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, READING EDUCATION
Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA
Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology
Graduate teaching, research, and service; courses taught in Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Reading/Literacy (face-to-face/Georgia On My Line GOML); Supervision of School Literacy Programs

May 2010  INSTRUCTOR
Northside Primary School, Grand Cayman, CI
Taught reading comprehension to fifth graders. Invited by Willi Range, principal

August 2009 – May 2010  ADJUNCT PROFESSOR
American University, Washington, DC
Department of Education, Teaching and Health
Graduate teaching to Teach for America (TFA) students; courses taught in Methods, Materials and Management in Secondary Education I & II. Invited by Sarah Irvine Belson, Ph.D., dean, School of Education, Teaching & Health

July 2009; July 2010  LECTURER
Howard University, Washington, DC
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Graduate and undergraduate teaching; course in Content Area Reading and Writing II and Improvement in Reading in Secondary Schools. Invited by Kenneth Anderson, Ph.D., assistant professor and coordinator, Reading Education

January – May 2009;  ADJUNCT PROFESSOR
August – December 2008;  Trinity University, Washington, DC
June 2008  Department of Education
Graduate teaching; courses in Children’s Literature/Adolescent Literature and Culture/Reading Materials; Literacy Issues in Urban Education. Invited by Deborah Litt, Ph.D., associate professor, School of Education

June 2007  INSTRUCTOR
Howard University, Washington, DC
Center for Academic Reinforcement’s Pre-College Summer Program
Undergraduate teaching in English; Life Skills; Time Management. Invited by Valarie Lawson, Ph.D., director, Center for Academic Reinforcement

Organized, directed, and managed the overall site program at the Meade Street site location; supervised 22 students and two Program Assistants; managed administrative and operational processes; developed and implemented Fall and Summer reading curriculums to children ages 6-16 in compliance with the District of Columbia Public School standards; assisted in the overall enrichment programs to facilitate learning and motivation to students, families and staff; maintained and wrote program activity reports for funders; provided testing and benchmark assessment strategies, individualized plans and parent surveys; developed partnerships with local and national funders; assisted with the school’s newsletter, The Fishnet, to local and national funders; judged, assisted and coached students with The Fishing School’s First Annual Spelling Bee

June 2005 – August 2006  INSTRUCTOR/READING SPECIALIST

Bloomfield College, Bloomfield, NJ

Center for Academic Development

Designed, implemented and taught undergraduate course Developmental Reading and Writing I; provided instruction and advisement on study skills, including note-taking, time management, vocabulary improvement, test preparation and test taking skills, improvement of fluency, reading comprehension and information retention; coordinated and implemented reading and vocabulary workshops for the Equal Opportunity Program (EOP) department and students; provided testing, diagnosis and prescriptive analysis for students exhibiting reading difficulties and supervised remedial instruction for students; participated in placement testing, tutor preparation, workshops
August 2005 TEACHING ASSISTANT

University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY

Department of Reading

Assisted professor and facilitated (face-to-face/online) graduate student discussion groups for course, Literacy and Society

July 2002 INSTRUCTOR

University of Ghana, Legion, Ghana-Accra, West Africa

Institute of Adult Education

Taught basic English skills and remedial reading strategies to 15 adult education students from the Ghana Literacy Center program

July 2002 INSTRUCTOR

Greater Bright Early Childhood Development Center, Ghana-Accra, Africa

Taught phonics and reading strategies to 10 second grade elementary school children through a metacognitive and multisensory approach to reading

August 1999 – June 2001 TITLE I READING/WRITING SKILLS TEACHER

NYC Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY

Taught remedial reading and writing strategies through a metacognitive and multisensory approach to reading to over 90 nonpublic school children in grades 1-7; assessed and scored assessment measures
January – May – 1999 CLINICIAN

Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY

Center for Educational and Psychological Services (CEPS)

Assessed, tutored and provided trial teaching for five clients in reading, decoding, comprehension, spelling, writing, mathematics, phonemic awareness, and cognitive function using various assessment tools for Practicum courses in Psychoeducational Assessment of Reading and Intervention with Reading and School Subject Difficulties; submitted anecdotal summaries and case reports

HONORS, AWARDS, AND DISTINCTIONS________________________

2011 Finalist for the 2011 International Reading Association Outstanding Dissertation Award, International Reading Association

2010-2013 Recipient of the Literacy Reading Association/National Reading Conference Scholars of Color Transitioning into Academic Research (STAR) Mentoring Program $600 Award/year

http://www.nrconline.org/newsletters/NRCNewsletter2010fall.pdf

2008 Recipient of the J. Michael Parker Award, National Reading Conference. Award recognized significant contributions to Adult Literacy research $500 Award

http://www.nrconline.org/awards/jmichaelparker.html

2008 Recipient of the Ethnicity, Race and Multilingualism Scholarship, National Reading Conference $200 Award


2008-2010 Recipient of the Cultivating New Voices Among Scholars of Color Program, National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) Research Foundation $600/ year
2008 Awarded the Graduate Student Organization (GSO) Travel Grant, University at Albany, State University of New York $500 Funded

http://www.albany.edu/~gso/grants_results/grants_result_travel_08_spring.htm

2008 Awarded the Dissertation Research Fellowship Awards Program, University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY $1,000 Funded

2007 Awarded the Graduate Student Organization (GSO) Research Grant, University at Albany, State University of New York $250 Funded

http://www.albany.edu/~gso/grants_results/grants_result_research_07_fall.htm?seection=GSO+Quick+Links+%3E%3E&Input=Go!

2007 Awarded Reading Department Travel Grant, University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY $350 Funded

2005 Awarded the Graduate Student Organization (GSO) Distinguished Service Award, University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY
2003 Recipient of the Initiatives for Women (IFW) Gloria R. DeSole Award, University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY $1,000 Funded


2001-2005 Awarded the Ph.D. Reading Fellowship: Cochrane Fellowship Award, University at Albany,

State University of New York, Albany, NY $10,000/year

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Lifetime Summary

Scholarly Books, Monographs, Themed Issues – 1

Monographs – 1

Book Reviews – 2

Chapter in Scholarly Books – 1

Vignette in Scholarly Books – 1

Article for Refereed Journals (under review) – 1

Article for Yearbook (under review) – 1

Creative Projects – 1

Children’s book (in progress) – 1

Scholarly Presentations at Conferences – 15

National – 15

Invited Scholarly Presentations: Classroom, University, and Community – 8
Invited International Presentation – 1

Grants: Funded – 3

SCHOLARLY BOOKS, MONOGRAPHS, THEMED ISSUES


BOOK REVIEWS


CHAPTER IN SCHOLARLY BOOK


VIGNETTE IN SCHOLARLY BOOKS

ARTICLE FOR REFEREED JOURNALS


ARTICLE FOR REFEREED JOURNALS (IN PROGRESS)

Lewis, T. Y. (in progress). “This is pretty much an average day. This is what we do”: Texting and IMing between a Mother and Son in Digital literacy Spaces.


ARTICLE FOR REFEREED YEARBOOK


INVITED PUBLICATIONS

Lewis, T. Y. (under review). Key points for family literacy, community, and classrooms implications in digital literacy research. What’s the IDEA, a publication of The National Association for Multicultural Education, Georgia Chapter, 3(3), pp.

DISSERTATION

ARTICLE FOR ONLINE NEWS SERVICE


SCHOLARLY PRESENTATIONS


Lewis, T. Y. (2009, December 2). “This is pretty much an average day. This is what we do”: Texting and IMing between a Mother and Son in Digital literacy Spaces. National Reading Conference. Albuquerque, NM.


INVITED SCHOLARLY PRESENTATIONS: CLASSROOM, UNIVERSITY, AND COMMUNITY_______________________________________________________________


Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures “Revealing Cultures 2005”
Research Symposium for Graduate Students, University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY.

University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY.


INVITED INTERNATIONAL PRESENTATIONS


ADVANCED RESEARCH TRAINING

2010 Georgia State University College of Education, Advanced Training Program
Education Research Design and Methods, Faculty Certificate Program
ACCOMPLISHMENTS

2011 Featured on Georgia State University’s College of Education News Website “New COE faculty member earns spot in mentoring program”
http://education.gsu.edu/main/6143.htm

2010 Developed undergraduate reading course, EDRD 3400 “Reading the World of 21st Century Texts” for College of Education

2005 Panelist for the First Annual New Graduate Student and Graduate Teaching Assistant Orientation on Graduate School Survival Strategies, moderated and facilitated by Special Assistant to Associate Provost, Office of Graduate Retention, Recruitment and Intercultural Relations, University at Albany, State University of New York

2004 WCDB 90.9FM (University at Albany, State University of New York’s College Radio Station) Host/Coordinator, “Linking Poetic Expression with Literacy and Technology,” introducing High School/College Students, Members of the Community and Gospel Artists/Poets to read their original works live on-air during the month of April for National Poetry Month on The Healing Room broadcast
2002   Letter of citation from the Institute of Adult Education, University of Ghana, Legion, Ghana-Accra, Africa for teaching Basic English and remedial reading to 15 adult education students from the Ghana Literacy Center program

INVITED GUEST SPEAKER________________________________________________________________________


Popular Culture in Literacy Classrooms K-12 class, Department of Language and Literacy Education, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS MEMBERSHIP/AFFILIATIONS________________________

- American Educational Research Association
- The National Association for Multicultural Education, Georgia Chapter
- National Conference on Research in Language and Literacy
- National Council of Teachers of English
- National Council of Teachers of English, Assembly for Research
- Literacy Research Association/National Reading Conference
- Literacy Research Association/National Reading Conference Multilingual and Transcultural Literacies Innovative Community Group
- National Reading Conference Adult Literacy Study Group
- International Reading Association
• Kappa Delta Pi, International Honor Society in Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION COMMITTEE MEMBER (IN PROGRESS)___________

2010 Dru Tomlin “All the School’s a Stage: Examining School Administrators’ Communicative Lives Through Dramaturgical Metaphors”

2010 Heather Lynch “The literacy practices of one video gamer”

DOCTORAL ADVISEES_______________________________________________________

Kelli Dozier

SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION/COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS____________

• Georgia State University, Urban Literacy Clinic Search Committee – Language and Literacy Unit (2011)
• Ph.D. Applicants Subcommittee Team, Middle Secondary and Instructional Technology – Language and Literacy Unit (2010)
• Coordinator, New Scholars Alliance, New Faculty Mentoring Group of Georgia State University Faculty (2010 – Present)
• Presentation Chair, “Race Matters,” Literacy Research Association/National Reading Conference, Fort Worth, December 1, 2010 (2010)
• Guest Reviewer, Language Arts Journal (2010)
• Literacy Research Association/National Reading Conference Co-Chair for Area 7 Committee (Social, Cultural, and Political Issues of Literacy Practices In and Out of School) (2010 - present)
• Presentation Chair, “Engaging Students in Multiple Forms of Literacy,” National Reading Conference, Albuquerque, New Mexico, December 2, 2009 (2009)
• Project Consultant on Colleague’s Dissertations (2009)
• Mentor, SisterMentors/Eduseed (2006-2009)
• Vice President, Graduate Student Literacy Forum (2004-2005)
• President, Graduate Student Literacy Forum (2002-2004)
• Grant Reviewer, Graduate Student Organization (2002-2003)
• Mentor, Liberty Partnership Program, Center for Women in Government and Civil Society (2002)

GRADUATE COURSES TAUGHT

Spring 2011       EDRD 7600       Georgia State University
Theory/Pedagogy in the Study of Reading/Literacy
(face-to-face/Georgia On My Line)

Spring 2011       EDRD 8610       Georgia State University
Supervision of School Literacy Programs

Spring 2010       EDU 542       American University
Methods, Materials and Management in Secondary Education II

Fall 2009         EDU 540       American University
Methods, Materials and Management in Secondary Education I

Summer 2009       EDUC 372       Howard University
Content Area Reading and Writing II
Summer 2009  EDCI 652  Trinity University
Literacy Issues in Urban Education

Fall 2008  EDCI 652  Trinity University
Literacy Issues in Urban Education

Summer 2008  EDTE 624  Trinity University
Children's Literature

EDTE 641
Adolescent Literature and Culture

EDTE 321
Reading Materials

Fall 2005  ERDG 610  University at Albany (SUNY)
Literacy and Society

UNDERGRADUATE COURSES TAUGHT ________________________________

Summer 2010  EDUC 160  Howard University
Improvement in Reading in Secondary Schools
Lomax
CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Edward Carl Lomax

Address: 107 Creek Cove Lane
Ellenwood, GA 30294

Phone: (678) 418-2739
E-mail: edlomax@earthlink.net

Education

* University of Pittsburgh, Doctor of Philosophy in Library Science, 1999
  Dissertation Title: An Investigation of the Information-Seeking Behavior of Medical Oncologists in Metropolitan Pittsburgh Using a Multimethod Approach
* University of Pittsburgh, Master of Science in Library Science, 1992
* Drexel University, Bachelor of Science in Humanities-Communications, 1991

Employment History

Academic Appointments

Assistant Professor, Library Media Technology Program, College of Education, Division of Learning Technologies, Department of Middle/Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA August 2003 - present
Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL 1998 – August, 2001

Visiting Instructor (Resident Librarian), Library of the Health Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL 1992 - 1993

Previous Positions (Selected)

* HTML Programmer, Spica Design Group, Wilmington, Delaware, January 2002-April 2003

* Research Assistant, Clinical Multimedia Laboratory, Center for Biomedical Informatics, University of Pittsburgh, January 1998 - June 1998

* Research Fellow, Center for Biomedical Informatics, University of Pittsburgh, January 1994 - January 1998

* Resident Librarian, Library of the Health Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago, August 1992-1993

* Graduate Student Assistant, Department of Library Science University of Pittsburgh, September 1991- August 1992

* Analyst/Programmer (Library Clerk IV), W. W. Hagerty Library, Drexel University, December 1989 - September 1991

* Manager (Library Clerk III) W. W. Hagerty Library, Drexel University, September 1988-December 1989


* Microcomputer Laboratory Consultant, Warren D. Fake Library, Hahnemann University, April 1986- September 1991

* Library Clerk III, W. W. Hagerty Library, Drexel University, October 1983 – December 1986
Professional Society Membership

* Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE)
* American Society for Information Science and Technology (ASIST)
* International Association of School Librarianship (IASL)

Research Interests

* Information use and information-seeking behavior
* Information-seeking in multimedia information systems
* Evaluation of information systems

Professional Service

Consultancies (Selected)

Bradley Agency, Albany, NY 2003
- HTML Programming, Web site design

Chartered Property and Casualty Underwriters Society, Northeastern New York Chapter, Albany, NY 2002
- HTML Programming, Web site design

New Beginnings Learning Center, Pittsburgh, PA 1997
- Computer Laboratory: Technical Support
- L.P. Hill Library: Library Automation

- Radiological Society of North America Annual Meeting: InfoRAD: Online Searching

Editorial Appointments

Reviewer for:
Information Processing and Management (2000-2002)
Association for Educational and Communications Technology (2006-present)
International Association of School Librarianship (2008)
American Society for Information Science and Technology (2008)

Advisory Committees/Review Groups

Institute of Museum and Library Services:
National Institutes of Health: Center for Scientific Review
Special Emphasis Panel ZRG1 SSS-9, 2000 – 2002

Committees
Georgia State University, College of Education

Academic Affairs Committee, 2003-2004

Research and Advanced Graduate Program Committee (MSIT), 2005-2007

Advanced Graduate Degree Program Committee (MSIT), 2008-2009

Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty (MSIT) 2009-2011

Parliamentarian, 2006-present

University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library and Information Science


Information Technology Competency Committee, 2000-2001

University of Illinois

Search Committee for Assistant Undergraduate Librarian for Multicultural Services. 2000-2001

Teaching Responsibility

Library Media Technology Program – Georgia State University

Courses

ELMT 2100: Information Literacy for the Digital Age [Fall ’07]

ELMT 7020: Selection of Print and Non-Print Resources [Sum ’05]; [Sum ’06]; [Sum 08; Fall ’08]; [Fall ’09]

ELMT 7130: Selection and Use of Reference Sources [Spr ’04]; [Sum ’07]; [Spr ’09]; [Sum ‘10]; [Spr ‘11]
ELMT 7140: Cataloging and Classification of Information Resources [Fal ’03; Spr ’04; Sum ’04; Fall ’04; Spr ’05; Fal ’05; Spr ’06; Fall ’06; Fall ’07; Spr ’08; Fall ’08]; [Sum ’09; Fall ’09]; [Spr ‘10]

ELMT 7150: Technology in the 21st Century Media Center [Fall ‘10]

ELMT 7200: Computers in Library Media Management [Fall ’04; Spr ’05; Fall ’05; Spr ’06; Fall ’06; Spr ’07; Fall ’08; Sum ’09]; [Spr ‘10]; [Spr ‘11]

ELMT 7370: Principles of Instructional Collaboration [Fall ’09]; [Spr ‘10]

ELMT 8200: Computers in Library Media Management [Spr ’04]

ELMT 8550: Trends and Issues in Information Science [Sum ’05]; [Fall ’07]

ELMT 8870: Advanced Research Seminar in Information Science [Spr ’07]

EDCI 8400: Dynamics of Teaching, and Curriculum [Sum ’08]

EDCI 8900: Educational Inquiry [Fall ‘10]

EDCI 8990: Scholarly Inquiry [Spr ’08]

IT 2010: Computer Skills for the Information Age [Fall ‘10]; [Spr ‘11]

Graduate School of Library and Information Science – University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Courses

LIS 315: Introduction to Networked Information Systems
http://leep.lis.uiuc.edu/spring01/LIS315A/index.html[Spring 2001]
http://leep.lis.uiuc.edu/spring00/LIS315FO/index.html[Spring 2000]

LIS 390: Information, Libraries, and Society
http://leep.lis.uiuc.edu/fall00/LIS390A/index.html[Fall 2000]
http://www.lis.uiuc.edu/course/fall1998/lis390/lis390lomax.html[Fall 1998]

LIS 415A: Library Automation
http://www.lis.uiuc.edu/course/fall1999/lis415a/[Fall 1999]


Letters, Abstracts, Non-journal Articles


Presentations

Panels/Symposia

“Social Tagging in the K-12 Context” Metropolitan Atlanta Library Association (MALA) and Special Library Association (SLA) Spring Meeting, March 2008.


Session Chair: "Current Issues in Medical Informatics", American Medical Informatics Association Annual Fall Symposium, November 2000.

Session Chair: "Brain Mapping and Image Databases", American Medical Informatics Association Annual Fall Symposium (Formerly SCAMC), October 1996.
Papers


Lomax, E. Sirochman, R. “An Investigation of the Interaction Between the School Library Media Center and the Student in Middle or Secondary School: The Impact of Information Literacy Programs on the Information Literacy of Students in the DeKalb County School System. Presented at the Georgia Conference on Information Literacy, Georgia Southern University, October, 2005

Lomax E. Sirochman, R. “An Investigation of the Interaction Between the School Library Media Center and the Student in Middle or Secondary School: The Impact of Information Literacy Programs on the Information Literacy of Students in the DeKalb County School System. Presented at the International Association of School Librarianship 34th Annual Conference, Hong Kong University, Hong Kong, July, 2005
Poole, J., Lomax E. "Building Effective Information Literacy Programs in the Era of Edutainment.” Presented at the Georgia Council of Media Organizations (COMO) XVI Annual Conference, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, October, 2004.


Poster Demonstrations


Visiting Professorships and Invited Presentations (Selected)
"An Investigation of the Information Seeking Behavior of Medical Oncologists in Metropolitan Pittsburgh", Invited Lecture, Spring Colloquium Series, Department of Community Health, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, March 4, 1999.


Visiting Instructor (Resident Librarian), Library of the Health Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL 1992-1993.

Honors and Awards

* Pre-Doctoral Research Fellowship in Medical Informatics, National Library of Medicine, 1994-1998

* Academic Resident Librarian, Library of the Health Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago, 1992-1993

* Jay Daily Award, School of Library and Information Science, University of Pittsburgh, 1992
Manley
Curriculum Vita

Ollie Irons Manley
127 Durham Lakes Parkway
Fairburn, Georgia 30213
(770) 964-6195
(404) 5026082
oimanley@bellsouth.net

Education

College: Spelman College
Atlanta, Georgia
B.S. May, 1970
Major Area: Biology and Chemistry

Graduate School: Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia
Ed.S. December, 1984
Empirical Study: A Study of the Impact of Peer Tutoring on Student Achievement in Chemistry
M.A.T. March, 1974
Major Area: Science Education

Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia
Ph.D. May, 1994

Major Area: Educational Leadership/Curriculum and Instruction


Professional Development:

Mays Lecture Series November 3, 2009

Georgia Academy of Science April 4, 2009

Online Teaching April 16, 2009

ECHO 360 March 31, 2009


WEAVE Online Assessment February 9, 2009

Live Text Seminar January 12, 2009

Georgia On My Line Monthly Web Conferences – on-going

Georgia Science Teachers Annual Conference – Athens, GA
February, 2008
Georgia Academy of Science – Jacksonville, Florida March, 2008


National Science Teachers Conference March, 2008

Health and Wellness: Maintaining a Healthy Life Style – Athens, GA June, 2008

Writing Across the Curriculum – Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA June-August, 2008


LiveText Workshop – Georgia State University December, 2008

Setting Up and Managing Your Vista Course August, 2007

Copyright Dos and Don’ts – Online Course Preparation August, 2007

Teaching with VISTA August, 2007

Outcome Assessment – Online Classes September, 2007

Facilitating Online Learning North Georgia College and State University October – December, 2007

1995
Current Employment

Clinical Assistant Professor – Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 8/08 - present

Research Interest

Holistic science with emphasis on integrating science into all disciplines
Teaching strategies in science for diverse populations
Instructional supervision

Papers and Publications


Manley, O. (2002). The Impact of A Six-Week Writing Program on Students’ Performance in Science. Unpublished manuscript, Clark Atlanta University, Curriculum Department, Atlanta.


Manley, O. (1984). Establishing A Need for Peer Tutoring for Inner City Students in Chemistry. Unpublished manuscript, Georgia State University, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Atlanta.

Presentations and Workshops

2011 Science Instruction that Promotes Literacy National Science Teachers Association Annual Meeting

2011 Cultural Change in Higher Education: Faculty Perceptions of Teaching in an Online Graduate Degree Program Eastern Educational Research Association Annual Conference
2011  Faculty Perceptions of Teaching in a Graduate Online Degree Program. Georgia Academy of Science Annual Meeting

2010  Promoting Instructional Immediacy in an Online Course. Georgia Academy of Science Annual Meeting

2010  Teaching Science in a Virtual High School
       Georgia Science Teachers Association Annual Conference

2010  Facilitating Discourse in an Online Course
       Eastern Educational Research Annual Meeting

2010  Thematic Based Science Teaching
       National Science Teachers Association Annual Conference

2009  Students’ Perceptions of the Impact of Synchronous and Asynchronous Communication in an Online Course. Georgia Academy of Science

2009  Interdisciplinary Professional Learning Experiences for Middle and Secondary Teachers Using the PRISM Model

2009  Project Based Mathematics Education in a Networked Environment.

2008  Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Electronic Teaching Modules. Florida and Georgia Joint Meeting of the Academies of Science

1999
2008 Professional Learning Experiences for Middle and Secondary Teachers Using PRISM - An Inquiry Model. Georgia Science Teachers Annual Conference

2008 Using Technology to Design Teaching Modules in Mathematics and Science. Georgia Science Teachers Annual Conference


2007 The Quality of Science Teaching as Perceived by Teachers at an Urban Charter School. Georgia Academy of Science Annual Conference

2007 Endorsing Literacy. Georgia Science Teachers Annual Conference

2006 Teaching With Technology. Georgia Science Teachers Annual Conference

2006 Using Technology to Teach Environmental Science. Environmental Alliance of Georgia Annual Conference
2006  Evaluating the effectiveness of a science education course for pre-service teachers.  
Georgia Academy of Science Annual Conference

2005  A Case Study of K-12 Students and Pre-service Science and Mathematics Teachers’ Perceptions of A Service Learning Project in Science Education.  Georgia Academy of Science Annual Conference

2005  Teaching Strategies to Enhance the Teaching of the Georgia Science Performance Standards.  Georgia Science Teachers Association Annual Conference

2004  Synergistic Science: A Wholistic Approach to Infuse Environmental Education into the Science and Math Curriculum  
Environment Education Alliance of Georgia Annual Conference  
Lake Black Shear, Georgia

2004  Using Multiple Intelligence to Differentiate the Elementary Science Curriculum  
National Science Teachers Association Conference  
Atlanta, GA

2004  The Impact of a Peer Tutoring Program on Student Achievement in Chemistry in an Urban High School  
Georgia Academy of Science  
Rome, Georgia

2003  Infusing Technology into the Science Curriculum  
UNCF Fellows Institute  
Atlanta, GA
2002  Best Practices for Teaching Science

Benjamin Banneker Charter School
Kansas City, Missouri

2001  Best Practices for Teaching Science

Tekoa Charter School, Inc.
Port Authur, Texas

2001  High Expectations for Students’ Success

Benjamin Banneker Charter School
Kansas City, Missouri

1994  Afrocentrism and the Implications for Teaching Science

Clark Atlanta University Education Symposium

1993  A Study of Afrocentric Curriculums from Selected School Districts

Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development

1990  Using Peer Tutoring to Teach Chemistry

National Science Teachers Association

Using Household Products to Teach Science

National Science Teachers Association
1983 Assertive Discipline
C.L. Harper High School
Atlanta, Georgia

1986 Engineering and Science Strategies in the Classroom
South Eastern Consortium for Minorities in Engineering
University of South Florida
Orlando, Florida

1985 Study Skills Seminar
1983 Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

1982 Computer Science In-Service
C.L. Harper High School
Atlanta, Georgia

Grants

2007 Freshmen Learning Community Grant $2000.00
Develop Instructional Materials for GSU 1010

2004 Service Learning Grant $3000

2003 United Negro College Fund Grant for Infusing Technology
Service

College of Education
Served search committee for the selection of a clinical assistant professor in the Early Childhood Education

MSIT Department:
Served on search committee for the selection of a clinical assistant professor in science

Served on Annual Evaluation Committee for Clinical Faculty

Professional Organizations:
Secretary Science Section
Georgia Academy of Science

Member

National Science Teachers Association
Georgia Science Teachers Association
Georgia Academy of Science

Peer Reviewer
Georgia Journal of Science

Section Editor
Journal of Urban Mathematics
Other Organizations:  
Board of Directors Benjamin Banneker Charter Academy of Technology – Kansas City, Missouri  
Member North Georgia United Methodist Church Conference – Atlanta, GA  

Evidence of Student Achievement:  

Four GOML students completed the exit portfolio successfully.  

Two students from EDCI 8400 presented papers at the Georgia Academy of Science Annual Meeting  

Two students had abstracts published in the Georgia Journal of Science
Georgia State University
College of Education ~ Executive Associate Dean of Academic Programs

Office Address: Georgia State University
Dean's Office
COE 1029
30 Pryor Street
Atlanta, GA

Email Address: mstjem@gsu.edu

Home Address: 1474 Meadowcreek Court
Atlanta, GA 30338

Phone: 404 413 8104 (Office)
770 698 0898 (Home)

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree Earned/Major</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>Ph.D. Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Louisiana University</td>
<td>Professional Improvement Program</td>
<td>1981-1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree Elementary Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. Elementary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University present</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2003 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Associate Dean</td>
<td>2010-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2008

Department Chair 2006 –

Associate Professor

1997-2003

Assistant Professor 1994-1997

Texas A&M University Assistant Professor 1991-1994

Assistant Department Head 1993-1994

Northern College, Aberdeen, Scotland Research Fellow 1992-1993

Texas A&M University Visiting Assistant Professor 1989-1991

Louisiana State University Instructor 1987-1989

Louisiana State University Graduate Assistant 1986-1987


(Experience in Grades K-8)

Northeast Louisiana University Supervisor of Student Teachers 1984-1986

2008
DOCTORAL STUDENT MENTORING

Georgia State University

34 Ph.D. Graduates – Dissertation Chair

89% Ph.D. Completion Rate – Doctoral Committee/Dissertation Chair

4 Ph.D. Doctoral/Dissertation Committees – Currently Chairing

44 Instances of Students (or former students) as Coauthors on Publications

94 Instances of Students (or former students) as Coauthors on Presentations

Texas A&M University

2 Ph.D. Graduates – Dissertation Chair

100% Ph.D. Completion Rate – Dissertation Chair

9 Instances of Students (or former students) as Coauthors on Publications

21 Instances of Students (or former students) as Coauthors on Presentations

HONORS

Recipient of the GSU COE Faculty Research Award, 2006

Nominee for GSU Outstanding Faculty Award, 2002
Recipient of the National Reading Conference Early Career Achievement Award, 1999

Texas A&M University "Center for Teaching Excellence" Scholar, 1992-93

Recipient of the West Monroe High School Distinguished Alumni Award, 1991

Finalist in the National Council of Teachers of English Promising Researcher Award Competition, 1990

Recipient of the National Reading Conference Student Research Award, 1989


PUBLICATIONS


inherent in large scale implementation” in C. Bohan, & J. E. Many, (Eds.), Clinical teacher education: Reflections from an urban professional development school network.

Information Age Publishing.


http://coefaculty.valdosta.edu/lschmert/gera/current_issue.htm (14 pages)


Many, J. E. (1996). When the literary experience is a difficult experience: Implications of reader response theory for less proficient readers. Reading Writing Quarterly, 12, 123-134.


Many, J. E., Fyfe, R., Lewis, G., & Mitchell, E. (1993). What children do when they are asked to do research: Examining pupils' approaches to project work. Education in the North, 1, 55-64.


Submitted Manuscripts


GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS

External Awards


Many, J. E. (2007). Center for the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium: Year IX. Board of Regents. Funding: $ 15,000 (Role: Center Director).


Many, J. E. (2006). Center for the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium: Year VIII. Board of Regents. Funding: $ 72,568 (Role: Center Director).

Many, J. E. (2005). Center for the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium: Year VII. Board of Regents. Funding: $ 72,568 (Role: Center Director).

Many, J. E. (2004). Center for the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium: Year VI. Board of Regents. Funding: $ 72,568 (Role: Center Director).

Many, J. E. (2004). An Examination of Preservice Reading Endorsement Teachers’ Use of Instructional Scaffolding. Reading Instruction Research Mini-grant, Center for the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium. Funding: $ 5,000 (Role, Primary Investigator).

Many, J. E. (2002). Center for the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium: Year IV. Board of Regents. Funding: $80,000. (Role: Center Director).

Many, J. E. (2001). Center for the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium: Year III. Board of Regents. Funding: $80,000. (Role: Center Director).

Many, J. E. (2000). Center for the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium: Year II. Board of Regents. Funding: $180,000. (Role: Center Director).


Many, J. E. (1999). Understanding the effectiveness of Hands on Atlanta Schools: Year III. Hands on Atlanta. Funding: $13,693. (Role: Principal Investigator)


Many, J. E. (1999). Development of the University System of Georgia Summer Reading Institute (continuation). Board of Regents. Funding: $5,500. (Role: Lead Faculty)

Many, J. E. (1998). Development of the University System of Georgia Summer Reading Institute. Board of Regents. Funding: $10,000. (Role: Lead Faculty)


Dubinsky, E. (Primary Investigator), Bevis, J., Gagliano, R., Hart, L., Henneike, F., Johnston, H., Many, J. E., Patterson, R., Smith, L., & Vanko, D. (Co-Pi’s) (1997). Integrating pedagogical and curriculum theory with teaching practice throughout all mathematics and sciences courses in the College of arts and sciences and evaluating and disseminating the results. National Science Foundation; Funding: $100,000. (Role: Team member responsible for design and supervision of qualitative evaluation of the project).

Many, J. E. (1992 - 1993). Bicentennial Research Fellow, Northern College, Aberdeen Scotland. This fellowship provided for office space, supplies and materials, school contacts, and peer collaboration during my year long ethnography in Scotland. No dollar amount was associated with this fellowship.

Internal Awards

Feinberg, J., & Many, J. E. (2007). Urban professional development community schools: Establishing the literature review for an IES development grant. COE proposal development grant for GRA support, College of Education, Georgia State University. ($4,000)


Many, J. E. (1998). Teaching preservice middle-grade geachers to teach reading: A field-based model for learning how to meet the needs of struggling readers. Proposal submitted to the Georgia State University Instructional Improvement Grant Program; ($2,100).
Many, J. E. (1997). A Georgia State University Literacy Clinic: The First Steps. Seed money for new research initiatives, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. ($4,000).

Many, J. E. (1997). Linking assessment and instruction: reflecting what we are learning in what we do. Scholarship of Teaching Grant, Center for Teaching and Learning, Georgia State University. ($2,000).

Dubinsky, E. (Primary Investigator), Bevis, J., Gagliano, R., Hart, L., Henneike, F., Johnston, H., Many, J. E., Patterson, R., Smith, L., & Vanko, D. (1996). Integrating pedagogical and curriculum theory with teaching practice throughout all mathematics and sciences courses in the College of arts and sciences and evaluating the effects Phase 1: Mathematical sciences courses. Research Team Grants, Georgia State University. ($12,500). (Role: Team member responsible for design of qualitative research components).

Many, J. E. (1996). Personal beliefs and professional practice: An exploration of first year teachers' epistemological perspectives and their reflections on their teacher preparation. Seed money for Year Two of a research initiative to improve P-16 education, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. ($6,000)

Many, J. E. (1995). Preservice teachers’ professional experiences: Understanding the influences of teachers as readers and epistemology of reading instruction. Seed money for new research initiatives, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA. ($3,600)


External Proposals

Many, J. E. (2002). Peachtree Charter Literacy team collaborative project:
Working together to meet the literacy needs of a diverse student population. Proposal submitted to the Gozietta Foundation. Requested funding $ 271,632.60.


Recreating Colleges of Teacher Education Grants Program. (1996). Proposal submitted to Bell South Foundation (Consortium director/primary investigator: Edith Guyton); Requested funding $444,380. (Role: Consortium Member)

Many, J. E. (1994). Reading and writing to learn: Exploring literacy in a middle-school interdisciplinary settings. Proposal submitted to the Spencer Postdoctoral Fellowship Program; Requested funding $40,000.


Internal Proposals


PRESENTATIONS

National/International Presentations


Many, J. E., Ariail, M., & Fox, D. (Proposal Accepted). Language arts learning in the middle grades. Round table presentation as part of an alternative format session focusing on the Handbook of Research on Teaching the English Language Arts at the International Reading Association, Orlando, FA. (2011, May)


Many, J.E. (2008, May). Examining literacy teacher preparation in Georgia. Paper presented as part of a workshop: An analysis of field experiences in literacy for teacher preparation programs in Georgia, Pre-K through 12 at the Annual Convention of the International Reading Association, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (2007, December). An introduction to the project: How a state-wide research agenda was established. Paper presented as part of the symposium: Learning about literacy and the teaching of reading: A state wide examination of literacy teacher preparation at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.

teaching of reading: A state wide examination of literacy teacher preparation at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.

Many, J. E. (2007, December). What can we learn from state-wide collaborative research on literacy teacher preparation? Paper presented as part of the symposium: Learning about literacy and the teaching of reading: A state wide examination of literacy teacher preparation at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.


Many, J. E. and the members of the USG Reading Consortium (2005, November). Understanding the impact of a state-wide reading consortium on literacy teacher educators. Paper presented to the College Reading Association, Savannah, GA.


Alvermann, D., Many, J. E., Henderson, S., Kaste, J. & Young, J. (2002, December). Being a friend and a mentor at the same time: Pooled case comparison. Paper presented to the National Reading Conference, Miami, FA.


Many, J. E. (1999, December). Are we teaching what we say we are? Matching Rhode Island beginning teacher standards to pre-service elementary teachers’ portfolios. Symposium presented to the National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL. (Role: Chair/discussant)


Many, J. E., Dowdy, J. K., & Hough, R. A. (1998, December). Developing an evaluation model to meet the needs of diverse stakeholders. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.


Many, J. E. (1998, August). How is gender salient in the educational experiences of classrooms and communities and in our lives as literacy educators? Poster-symposium presented at NCTE’s Third International Conference for Global Conversations on Language and Literacy, Bordeaux, France. (Role: Chair/Organizer)


Regional/State Presentations


Many, J. E. (2005, February). Teaching kids how to do research: What middle school teachers need to know. Georgia Middle School Association Conference. Savannah, GA.

Many, J. E. and the members of the USG Reading Consortium (2004, November). How to re-examine reading teacher education programs in light of national standards: One state’s reading consortium’s approach. Panel discussion presented to the Southeast Regional International Reading Association annual conference, Savannah, GA.

Many, J. E., & Members of USG Reading Consortium (2004, March). The reading endorsement: Sharing the wealth with undergraduate programs. Session presented to the Georgia Association of Teacher Educators annual conference, Young Harris, GA.


Many, J. E., & Members of USG Reading Consortium (2003, November). Reading endorsement courses through the university system of Georgia’s reading consortium: A connection to scientifically based reading research. Session presented to the Georgia Association of Teacher Educators annual conference, Savannah, GA.


Roberts, E., Many, J. E., and members of the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium. (2001, April). Reading endorsement courses via WebCT and institutes. Symposium for the Georgia Association of Teacher Educators, Callaway Gardens, GA.


Many, J. E. (2000, September). What do middle school teachers need to know and be able to do?: A look at preservice and in-service programs. Presentation as part of a panel discussion, “The Middle School Reading Panel” at annual conference of the Georgia Association of Curriculum and Instructional Supervisors, Athens, GA.

Many, J. E. (2000, June). Reading and Writing Strategies in the Content Area. Presentation to the University System of Georgia Reading Forum, Atlanta, GA.


Many, J. E. (1993, October). Bringing the text to life! Helping less proficient readers create literary experiences. Paper presented at the meeting of the Sam Houston Area Reading Council, Conroe, TX.


Many, J. E. (1990, November). Get your students personally involved! The aesthetic approach to literature. Paper presented at the meeting of the Sam Houston Area Reading Council Fall Conference, Huntsville, TX.


Many, J. E. (1989, October). Keys to effective classroom management. Paper presented at the meeting of the Sam Houston Association of Reading Educators and the Texas State Reading
Association's State Conference for Beginning Teachers and Teacher Education Students, Huntsville, TX.


Invited Seminars/Inservice Presentations


Many, J. E. (2005, September). Early comprehension instruction: Reading is thinking. Invited presentation to Georgia’s Reading First Preservice Teacher Conference, Atlanta, GA.


Many, J. E. (2004, January). ESOL Programs in the College of Education. Presentation to the State Legislature Reception, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (2002, August). Professional Development in Reading. Presentation to the Governor’s Education Coordinating Council, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (2001, June). Publishing narratives from the classroom. Presentation to the Advanced Writing Institute of the Peachtree Urban Writing Project, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (2001, June). How you can help your students do research. Presentation to the GSU Summer Reading Institute, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E., & Wallace, F. (2001, April). Reflections on teaching and learning in an online course environment. Presentation for Teaching and Learning with Technology EXPO, Georgia State University. Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (2001, February). Bored with your students’ research reports?

Let’s discuss their process, possible products, and how you can help! Invited presentation for the spring conference of the Georgia Council of the International Reading Association. Lawrenceville, GA.
Many, J. E. (2000, October). Teaching assessment and instruction for at risk readers using distance technology: Adapting my teaching for a new learning environment. Invited presentation for Georgia State University’s College of Education Faculty Teaching with Technology EXPO. Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (1999, October). Understanding qualitative methodology: The importance of member checking, triangulation, and peer debriefing. Invited seminar presentation to Dr. Karen Koelner-Clark’s MSIT Departmental Ed.S. Critique of Educational Research class, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Many, J. E. (1999, September). Helping teachers meet the reading needs of Georgia’s children. A workshop developed for the Professional Standards Commission and presented to representatives from Georgia school systems and RESAS. Presented in collaboration with Reading Consortium members and teachers from the 1999 Georgia State University summer institute. Macon, GA.


Many, J. E. and colleagues and students from MSIT and Walden Middle School (1999, January). Focusing on collaborative efforts to improve education in Georgia. Invited presentation representing the College of Education at the GSU Legislative Reception, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (1998, Spring). My evolution as a researcher. Invited seminar, presented to EDCI 896, MSIT departmental seminar, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (1998, June). Reading and writing from sources. Invited presentation to the Peachtree Urban Writing Project Summer Institute, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (1997, Fall). Reading and writing strategies across the content areas. Invited in-service presentation, Coan Middle School, Atlanta, GA.


Many, J. E. (1997, Spring). Introduction to qualitative methodology. Four invited seminars, presented to Dr. Wayne Urban’s EPY 982: Methods of inquiry doctoral seminar, Department of Educational Policy Studies, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (1997, April). The prospectus and dissertation. Invited roundtable discussion, GSU Doctoral Fellows’ Meeting, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (1997, April). Understanding qualitative methodology: The importance of member checking, triangulation, and peer debriefing. Invited seminar presentation to Dr. Lynn Stalling’s MSIT Departmental Research Seminar, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Many, J. E. (1996, October). Reading and writing strategies in the content areas. Invited inservice presentation, Cousins Middle School, Covington, GA.


Many, J. E. (1996, June). When the literary response is ‘I like the book - it is funny’: Where do we go from here? Invited speaker, Peachtree Urban Writing Project, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (1996, May). Ethnography and literacy: Tales from a Scottish classroom. Featured speaker, meeting of the Alpha Upsilon Alpha Reading Honor society, Atlanta, GA.


Many, J. E., Howard, F. M. & Hoge, P. T. (1996, March). Preservice teachers’ perceptions of themselves as readers and of reading instruction. MSIT Department’s brown bag research chat presentation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (1996, March). Approaches to literature based instruction. Invited inservice presentation to the faculty of Holy Innocent’s Episcopal School, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (1996, February). Emergent literacy. Invited inservice presentation to the faculty of Peachtree Road United Methodist Church, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (1996, February). The importance of member checking, triangulation, and peer debriefing in qualitative research: A reflection on my own research. Invited seminar presentation to Dr. Stalling’s GSU Ethnography class. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Many, J. E. (1995, March). Reading strategies across the content areas. Invited inservice presentation to the faculty of Pinkneyville Middle School, Gwinnett County, GA.

Many, J. E. (1994, April). Restructuring teacher education. Invited presentation to teacher education faculty, Prairie View University, Prairie View, TX.


Many, J. E. (1992, July). Integration of curriculum and expertise: The Jane Long Middle School/TAMU Story. Invited presentation to the Middle School Task Force, College Station, TX.

Many, J. E. (1992, July). Texas A&M/Jane Long Middle School: A school/university partnership in evolution. Invited presentation to TAMU Principal's Center, College Station, TX.

Many, J. E. (1992, June). Developing school/university partnerships. Two day working inservice sessions with faculties at Laredo State University and cooperating public schools, Laredo, TX.


Many, J. E. (1991, November). Responding to literature: Alternatives to the basal approach to literary works. Invited presentation to the Texas Student Education Association District III Convention, Houston, TX.


Many, J. E. (1990, April). Rosenblatt and the response-based teaching of literature: A dialogue with Dr. Joyce Many. English teaching Scholar/Loan students' seminar, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Many, J. E. (1990, April). Aesthetic and efferent stances in children's responses to literature. Instructional Resources Laboratory seminar, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.


Many, J. E. (1983, October). How I meet individual needs in teaching reading. Demonstration lesson followed by lecture and discussion, Lakeshore Elementary School and Northeast Louisiana State University, Monroe, LA.

REPORTS


TEACHING PRODUCTS


PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

National Level

Member, AACTE Committee on Research and Dissemination 2010-2013

Editorial Board, Journal of Teacher Education 2010-2013

IRA Jeanne S. Chall Fellowship Committee 2010- present

Member, Publications Committee, National Reading Conference 2003 - present

Proposal reviewer, National Reading Conference 1995-present

Editorial Board, Reading Research Quarterly 1995-present

Editorial Advisory Review Board, National Reading Conference Yearbook 1991-present

Editorial Board, Journal of Adult and Adolescent Literacy 2007 – present


Elected Member, Board of Directors, National Reading Conference 2005-2007

Appointed Member, Board of Directors, National Reading Conference 2001-2004

Chair, Field Council, National Reading Council 2001 - 2004

Guest reviewer, Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities 2004

Outside Dissertation Evaluator, Clemson University 2004

Co-Chair, Field Council, National Reading Council 2000 – 2001

Member, National Advisory Committee: Praxis Reading Specialist Test 2000 - 2001

Member, Publications Committee, National Reading Conference 1999 - 2000

Member, Student Research Award Committee, National Reading Conference 1997- 2000

Guest Reviewer, Research in the Teaching of English 2000

Guest Reviewer, Review of Educational Research 2000

Field Council Region Two Representative, National Reading Conference 1995 – 2000

Guest reviewer, Research in the Teaching of English 1996-1999

Guest Reviewer, Reading Horizon 1999

Field Council Representative for Georgia, National Reading Conference 1995-1999


Guest reviewer, Reading Research Quarterly 1994

Secretary-Treasurer, AERA Literature Special Interest Group 1990-1993

Guest reviewer, Research in the Teaching of English 1992


Proposal reviewer, National Reading Conference 1990-1992

Guest reviewer, National Reading Conference Yearbook 1989-1990

Regional/State/Local Level

Center Director, University System of Georgia Reading Consortium 1999 - 2009

Member, University System of Georgia Reading Consortium 1998 - 2009

Georgia Department of Education Reading Advisory Board 2007 – 2009

Parent Volunteer – Room mother, Austin Elementary School 2008-2009

Guest Editor, Georgia Journal of Reading, Themed Issue: Literacy and Literacy Teacher Education in Georgia Fall 2007

Director-Instructor, The Dojo American Karate Center, Summer Camp Program 2000-2005

Member, Georgia’s Reading Leadership Team 2002 - 2003

Member, Reading First Grant, Subcommittee for Proposal revision 2002 - 2003

Member, Curriculum Committee Peachtree Charter Middle School 2002 – 2003
Member, PSC Reading Task Force
2003

Established The Literacy Lens, A Journal of the USG Reading Consortium 2002

Member, Reading Task Force, (for Reading First Grant) 2002

Group Leader, The Dojo American Karate Center China Tour 2002

Chair, Curriculum Committee Peachtree Charter Middle Sch. (parent representative) 2001-2002

Parent Volunteer – Room mother, Austin Elementary School 2001-2002

Volunteer Teacher, Walden Middle School Reading Lab February - March. 1999

Conference Director, Georgia Write Now Conference 1997 -1999

Member, Metro Atlanta P-16 Community Council 1997

Member, The Atlanta School Strategic Planning Committee 1996 – 2001

Grant proposal reviewer, Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia 1996

“Connecting Teachers and Technology” Course Development Proposals

Judge, “Reflections”, Shiloh High School Creative Writing Competition 1995-1996
Editorial board, Reading Education in Texas 1991-1992

Member, BISD Language Arts Program Evaluation Committee 1991

Consultant, GTE Institute on Children's Literature and Literacy 1990

State President, Association of Professional Educators in Louisiana (APEL) 1987

Vice Chairperson, State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education's Louisiana Educational Assessment and Testing Commission 1986-1988


APEL Representative, Committee United for Education 1984-1986

APEL Representative, State Superintendent's Teacher Sharing Committee 1984-1986

Chairperson, School Building Level Committee - Lakeshore Elementary School 1984-1986

University/College/Department Level

Member, PEF Assessment Committee 2003- present
GSU College of Education Institutional Representative to AACTE 1997 - present

Departmental Representative, PDS Steering Committee 2007 - 2008

Departmental Coordinator, NCATE 2003- 2008

Chair, MSIT Promotion and Tenure Committee 2004 -2006

Member, MSIT Promotion and Tenure Committee 2003 - 2006

Member, Language and Literacy Unit 1994 - 2006

Member, Middle Childhood Faculty Committee 1994– 2006

Member, COE Student Appeals Committee 2005

Coordinator, Language and Literacy Education Unit 2002 – 2005

Member, MSIT Department Advisory Council 2002 - 2005

Member, COE Faculty Appeals Committee 2001 - 2004

Presidential Appointee, GSU University Senate 2003 - 2004
Member, ECE Faculty Search Committee 2003 - 2004

Member, Middle Childhood Faculty Search Committee 2003 - 2004

Chair, ESOL Initial Certification Program Committee 2002 - 2003

Co-chair, Language and Literacy Education Search Committee 2002- 2003

Member, COE Dean’s Faculty Advisory Council 2001 - 2003

Member, MSIT Promotion and Tenure Committee 1997 - 2002

Member, Professional Education Council 1999 - 2002

Member, GSU University Web Instructional Support Planning Team 2001

Member, University Advisory Board - GSU Center for the Study of Adult Literacy 1994-2001

Member, Search Committee MSIT Department Chair 2002

Member, Search Committee for MSIT Language and Literacy Education Position 2001-2002

Member, Search Committee for MSIT Mathematics Education Position 2000-2001
Literacy Associate, Center for the Study of Adult Literacy 1997-2001

Member, PEC Curriculum Committee 1996-2001

Member, MSIT Department Advisory Council 1995-2000

Unit coordinator, MSIT Language and Literacy Faculty 1995-2000

Chair, Search Committee for Language and Literacy Education Position 1999-2000

Chair, MSIT APACE Self-Study Committee 1998–1999

Member, COE Dissertation Review Committee 1997-1999

COE Representative to the University Strategic Planning Committee 1997-1998

Graduate coordinator, MSIT Department 1997-1998

Ad-hoc Member, GSU Professional Education Council 1996-1998

Member, MSIT Department Semester Conversion Sub-committee 1995-1997

Member, COE Committee to Develop Guidelines for Qualitative Dissertations 1996-1997
Member, GSU College of Education Semester Conversion Committee 1995-1996

Member, GSU Search Committee, Language and Literacy Tenure Position 1995-1996

Member, MSIT Honor’s Day nomination committee 1996

Member, GSU Search Committee, MSIT Department Chair 1995

Chair, MSIT Honor’s Day nomination committee 1995

Member, GSU Search Committee, Non-tenure track Special Education Faculty 1994-1995

Assistant Department Chair, TAMU Department of EDCI 1993-1994

Project Director, TAMU Program for Teachers of Middle Grade Students 1993-1994

Project Director, TAMU Program for Teachers of Young Learners 1993-1994

Chair, TAMU Faculty Representative Council 1993-1994

Departmental representative, TAMU College of Education Faculty Advisory Council 1993-1994

Secretary, TAMU College of Education Faculty Advisory Council 1993-1994

Member, TAMU Search Committee Bilingual/LLC position 1994
Member, TAMU Search Committee Interdisciplinary positions 1994

Chair, TAMU - LLC Committee on Unit Integration and Curriculum 1992

Member, TAMU Search Committee Bilingual/ESL position 1991-1992

Participant, Accelerated Schools Training - Jane Long Middle School Team 1991-1992

Member, TAMU Middle School Task Force 1990-1992

Participant, TAMU Teacher Education Research Group 1990-1991

Participant, TAMU Undergraduate Minority Mentors Program 1990-1991

CURRENT PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE)

American Educational Research Association (AERA)

International Reading Association (IRA)

Alpha Upsilon Alpha (The Honor Society of IRA)

Georgia Reading Association
National Reading Conference (NRC)

National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)

National Conference of Research in Language and Literacy (NCRLL)
Martin-Hansen

LISA M. MARTIN-HANSEN
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SCIENCE EDUCATION
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY
4448 Leonora Drive
Tucker, GA  30084
678-534-1697 (h)
678-756-1910 (m)

EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Ph.D., Science Education, 2001
The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA
Emphasis in Curriculum and Instruction with a Concentration in the Nature of Science

Dissertation: The Changes in Open Inquiry Understandings and Teaching Among Pre-Service Secondary Science Teachers During Pre-Service School Practica and Student Teaching.

M.S., Science Education, 1998
The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA
Additional graduate work resulted in secondary science education licensure in earth sciences, general science and physical science (high school)

B.A. in Middle School/Jr. High Education, 1989
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA
Minor in General Science with student teaching experiences at both elementary (5th grade) and secondary levels (10th grade earth science).

Iowa Teaching Certification

Master Teacher Level

- K-6 Elementary Education
- K-6 Science
- Middle School Endorsement: (grades 5-9) Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies
- 7-12 Earth Science
- 7-12 General Science
- 7-12 Physical Science

PROFESSIONAL

EXPERIENCE  Associate Professor of Science Education (tenured), Georgia State University, College of Education, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology Department, Atlanta, Georgia, 2009-2011.

Assistant Professor (tenure-track), Georgia State University, College of Education, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology Department, Atlanta, Georgia, 2004-2009
• Science Education Unit Chair (2006-2007, 2010-2011)
• Science Education MAT Coordinator (2007-2010)
• STEM Coordinator for the College of Education (2009-2010)

Guided science education unit activities (development and assignment of faculty teaching schedules, communication with College of Education administration and College of Arts and Sciences department chairs and faculty, data reporting for unit). Guided doctoral, masters, and undergraduate students in science education. Conducted and reviewed program development activities including the creation, implementation, and revision of MAT, M.Ed., Ed.S., and Ph.D. programs; advised at graduate levels; taught courses; served on and directed doctoral committees; revised and developed new courses and programs in collaboration with other faculty members in science education and Arts and Sciences (a chemistry course for secondary science teachers; integrated physical science course for middle school teachers; collaboratively taught geosciences course); served on department, college and university committees; initiated, collaborated, and directed grant initiatives with Colleges of Education and Arts and Sciences; Program Coordinator for NCATE Science Education Folio 2006 (Fully accredited) MAT and Ed.S. Programs.

Assistant Professor of Science Education, Drake University, School of Education, Department of Teaching and Learning, Des Moines, Iowa, 2001-2004.

• Director of Student Teaching
• Middle Childhood Education Coordinator


- Teacher mentor for Clegg Park Elementary faculty.


RESEARCH EMPHASIS

PUBLICATIONS  Examining aspects of inquiry and active learning pedagogy in science and nature of science understandings.


OTHER SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES


Martin-Hansen, L.M. (2007). Ed.S. Science Education Online Portfolio Rubric. Developed online “clickable” assessment rubric for recording scores that can be tracked and reported at different stages.


Martin, L.M. (1999). Modification and development of NSF science and life issues curriculum (NSF funded). Field-tested and created modifications of the Science and Life Issues curriculum being developed through the Lawrence Hall of Science in Berkeley, California as part of an NSF grant.


Martin-Hansen, L.M. (2006). Inquiry and assessment in the science education for public understanding middle school curriculum, Presented at the National LASER Middle School Symposium, Sponsored by the National Science Resources Center, October, Birmingham, AL. (Invited speaker) International


Martin-Hansen, L.M. (2004). Converting cookbook labs into inquiry investigations, a workshop implemented at Des Moines Public Schools. Worked with teachers using their newly adopted curriculum to create better representations of the nature of science in the classroom. Teachers revised “cookbook” labs into more inquiry oriented lessons. (Invited Speaker) Des Moines Public Schools

Martin-Hansen, L.M. (2004). Des Moines science pioneers, Orchestrated professional development for elementary science camp teachers where teachers experienced coupled-inquiry and created inquiry lessons for camp elementary students. Grant funded by Pioneer Hybrid, Cattell Elementary, Des Moines, IA. (Co-PI and facilitator on grant) Des Moines Public Schools


Martin-Hansen, L.M. (2004). Moving from cookbook labs to inquiry investigations, Middle school teachers from several schools districts participated in a coupled-inquiry lesson and learned how to change “cookbook” science activities into more inquiry-oriented labs. Iowa Association for Middle Level Educators Summer Camp, Simpson College, Indianola, IA. (Invited Speaker) State


Martin-Hansen, L.M. (2002). Inquiry and the National Science Education Standards. Presentation at the annual conference of ISTS (Iowa Science Teacher’s Section), Des Moines, Iowa. State


Martin-Hansen, L.M. (2001). Inquiry and the National Science Education Standards. A workshop presentation modeling the coupled-inquiry model along with overview of the model through a power-point presentation at the annual conference of the ISTS -- Iowa Science Teachers Section. State


Martin, L.M. (2000). Teaching science using an inquiry approach. Presentation at the Governor’s FINE (First in the Nation in Education) Conference. Provided background information about inquiry according to the Nation Science Education Standards. Participants performed part of an inquiry investigation and further discussed classroom applications. (Invited speaker) State

Martin, L.M. (2000). Making science and language arts connections. Presentation at the ICE (Iowa Consortium of Educators) fall conference entitled “Instructional Strategies”. Elementary focus. Strategies were presented using reading and writing activities and instruction to enhance science teaching. While elementary teachers are being pressured to take science time away in order to spend more minutes teaching reading and writing, these strategies bridge the subject areas so science instruction can still take place. State

Martin, L.M. (1998-2000). Project Rise II and Project Rise III. Facilitated, with six other teacher-leaders the summer workshop which was a teacher in-service program affiliated with the University of Iowa and Dr. Edward Pizzini. Project Rise II and Rise III is designed to foster implementation and assessment of district standards as well as teaching ways to incorporate science inquiry lessons (as suggested by the National Science Education Standards and the National Council for Teachers of Mathematics) into what were originally traditional science lessons. (Invited facilitator) State

Martin, L.M. (1999). The perceptions of secondary science teaching methods students of the goals and objectives of The University of Iowa’s secondary science teaching methods program. Research presentation at the ISTS (Iowa Science Teachers Section) results of the spring Ph. D. Action Research course at The University of Iowa. State
Martin, L.M. (1998). Creating connections with science and literature, Presentation at the ISTS (Iowa Science Teachers Section). Included student writing samples created during science classes at both the elementary and jr. high levels. State

Martin, L.M. (1996-1998). Science PALs. Wrote and developed Science PALs (Parents/Activities/Literature) curriculum with other teachers, a project between Iowa City Community Schools and the University of Iowa which used literature to help identify student misconceptions during parent/student interviews. (Invited curriculum writer) Iowa City Community School District

Martin, L.M. (1997-1998). Making science and language connections. Served on a speaker’s bureau for the Iowa Association of Elementary Education to present a seminar to interested school districts or groups. (Invited speaker) State

HONORS AND AWARDS Ph.D. Dissertation Chair of Dissertations Receiving Honors

- John Pecore, American Association of Teaching and Curriculum Dissertation Award (2010)
- Jared Rashford, College of Education Hayden-Waltz Dissertation Award (2010)

Electronic Journal of Science Education, Invited Associate Editor (2008-2011)

STEM Coordinator for the College of Education, Georgia State University, Appointed Position (2009-2010)

Outstanding Faculty Teaching Award, Georgia State University, College of Education, (2007)

Sigma Gamma Epsilon (1988-present), honorary society for students in earth science

Iowa State Education Association – Student Program, University Faculty Sponsor Award, 2004

Phi Delta Kappa, member, 1996-2000

Phi Delta Kappa, elected secretary for local chapter, 1997-1998

Kappa Delta Pi Scholarship, 1989

Kappa Delta Pi, member of honorary society for education majors
EXTERNALLY FUNDED

GRANT AWARDS


(Benson, PI, Co-PI’s listed in no particular order)

Wrote and submitted the grant along with five colleagues in the College of Education. I-MAST is a collaborative effort involving the College of Education (COE) and the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) at Georgia State University (Georgia State), Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech), and four high need school districts (Atlanta Public Schools, Cobb County School District, DeKalb County School System, and Gwinnet County Public Schools) in the Metro Atlanta area. This effort seeks to address the critical need for high school science teachers in the Metro Atlanta area by increasing the preparation of the number of high quality science teachers who are committed to teaching in Metro Atlanta high need school districts. I-MAST Robert Noyce Scholarships will be awarded to STEM students and professionals interested in pursuing secondary science teacher certification program at Georgia State.


Hessinger, S., Coleman, D., Martin, C., Martin-Hansen, L.M., Kutal, C. (2008-2011). PRISM Phase II: Research on Key Strategies of the Partnership for Reform in Science and Mathematics. Funded by the National Science Foundation. Awarded $2,032,900. Role: Co-PI and Researcher. (Calendar months are represented in subaward)


INTERNALLY FUNDED GRANT AWARDS


Martin-Hansen, L.M. (2005). College of Education proposal development grant for GRA support of a proposed grant to the National Science Foundation Earth Sciences Research at the National Science Foundation (EAR) Education and Human Resources Program. Funded by Georgia State University. Awarded: $4,000.
UNFUNDED GRANTS


Courses Developed at Georgia State University

NSCI 3002/7002 Integrated Science II: Earth Science (Undergraduate & Graduate, 2009).
Prerequisite: NSCI 7001. Integrated science sequence. Matter; atoms and atomic structure; chemical bonds; acids and bases; oxidation and reduction; organic; minerals; rocks and the rock cycle/geochemical cycle; plate tectonics. An integrated laboratory is included.

CHEM 7900 Chemistry for Teachers (Graduate, 2008)
Collaboratively designed a summer chemistry course for teachers and pre-service teachers seeking certification in broad field science. Negotiated types of testing, activities and learning emphases with chemistry faculty and chemistry department chair.

EDSC 8430 Nature of Science (Graduate, 2007)
Designed and taught the course with the following description: Students explore the enterprise of science along with the cultural, economic, political, social structures and discourses as they relate to science teaching, learning and research.

EDSC 8440 Advanced Science Concepts and Issues (Graduate, 2007)
Redesigned and taught the course with the following description: This course provides an in-depth exploration of science concepts and issues and the various roles of teacher leaders in science education.

EDSC 9870 Advanced Research Seminar in Science Education (Graduate, 2007)
Designed and taught the course with the following description: Ph.D. level course examining nature of science concepts.
This course is designed for individuals to learn more about the methods and goals of science, the role of scientists and the place of science in society and how philosophical issues can and should be reflected in science teaching and learning. Throughout this course we will explore the content of the nature of science and use that knowledge as a guide in improving science instruction and developing philosophically appropriate science curricula.

Courses Developed at Drake University

- EDUC 130 Studies in the Nature of Science (Graduate, Directed Study Course)
- EDUC 136 Secondary Science Teaching Methods (Undergrad/Graduate)
- FYS-041 First Year Seminar; Evolution: History and Theory (Undergraduate only)

Courses Taught at Georgia State University, 2004-2008

- EDCI 4600 Practicum MCE Undergraduate Program
- EDCI 6600 Introduction to Secondary Teaching
- EDCI 7540 Theory and Pedagogy of Middle Childhood Education Math and Science (Graduate)
- EDCI 7660 Practicum (Graduate); Field observations and evaluation
- EDCI 8400 Dynamics of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum Development (Graduate)
- EDSC 4700 Concepts and Methods in Middle Childhood Science Education (Undergraduate)
- EDSC 6550 Principles of Science Instruction (Graduate)
- EDSC 7120 Science Concepts and Issues (Graduate)
- EDSC 7550 Theory and Pedagogy of Science Instruction
• EDSC 8430 Nature of Science (Graduate)
• EDSC 8440 Advanced Science Concepts and Issues (Graduate)
• EDSC 9879 Advanced Research Seminar in Science Education (Graduate)
• GSU 1010 Careers in Mathematics and Science Education (Undergraduate)
• NSCI 3002/7002 Integrated Science II (Undergraduate/Graduate)

Courses Taught at Drake University, 2001 – 2004

• EDUC 001 Introduction to Education (Undergraduate only)
• EDUC 107 Learning and Assessment (Undergraduate/Graduate)
• EDUC 125 Elementary Science Teaching Methods (Undergrad/Graduate)
• EDUC 131 Topics in Middle School Growth and Development (Undergraduate/Graduate)
• EDUC 131 Topics in Middle School Growth and Development – a web course for distance learning (Undergraduate/Graduate)
EDUC 134 Middle School Curriculum and Methods – an ICN course (Iowa Communications Network) for distance learning (Undergraduate/Graduate)

EDUC 136 Secondary Science Teaching Methods – Summer Study, (Graduate)

EDUC 167 Instruction and Management for Secondary Grades (Undergrad/Graduate)

EDUC 168 Student teaching supervisor (Undergraduate/Graduate)

FYS 041 First Year Seminar: Evolution; History and Theory

Courses taught at the University of Iowa: as an Instructor or TA, 1998-2000

7E:162, Teaching Elementary School Science (Undergraduate)

7S:151 Intro Science Teaching & Practicum with Early Learners (Undergraduate/Graduate) Practicum Supervisor and Instructor

7S:153, Instructional Issues in Teaching Science, (Undergraduate/Graduate)

7S:179, Practicum Supervisor (Undergraduate/Graduate)

GRADUATE COMMITTEES

Ph.D. Dissertation Committee Chair


Ph.D. Dissertation Committee Member


Parker, BA. (2010). The relationship between nature of science understandings and science self-efficacy beliefs of sixth grade students.


VISITING SCHOLAR SPONSOR  Kanli, Uygar. (2010). Visiting scholar, from Gazi University in Ankara, Turkey, researching science education, specific to active learning and inquiry.

LEADERSHIP AND CURRENT MEMBERSHIPS
AAAS: American Association for the Advancement of Science

- Member

ASTE: Association of Science Teacher Education (formerly AETS)

- President, Southeastern Association for Science Teacher Education, Elected Officer (2009-2010).
- Equity and Ethics Committee (appointed position) (2009-2011)
- Elections Committee Co-Chair, Nationally Elected Officer (2008-2010)
- Elections Committee, Nationally Elected Officer (2008-2010)
- Conference proposal referee (2002-2008)
- North Central Association of Science Teacher Education
(Nc-ASTE), member and presenter

- Southeastern Association of Science Teacher Education (S-ASTE), member and presenter

Electronic Journal of Science Education (EJSE). Associate Editor. (2008-2011)

IHPST: International History and Philosophy of Science and Teaching

- Science and Education Journal Referee (2006-present)
- Member and presenter

International Journal of Science Education

- Journal Referee. (2008-present)

NARST: National Association of Research in Science Teaching

- Equity and Ethics Committee, Appointed position (2007-2010)
- Outstanding Paper Award Committee member (2009-2011)
- National Association of Research in Science Teaching (NARST), conference proposal referee

NSTA: National Science Teachers Association

- Georgia Science Teachers Association (GSTA)
• Chair of Science Scope Review Board (2005-2007)
• Faculty sponsor of GSU-NSTA (2005-2007)
• Science Scope Journal Referee (2000-present)

SERVICE International/National/Regional
• National Sciences Resources Center, LASER: Leadership and Assistance for Science Education Reform,


• SEPUP consultant to curriculum development projects in the Lawrence Hall of Science at the University of California at Berkeley, California. Conduct workshops at conferences and school districts regarding Issues-Based curriculum (2000-present).

State of Georgia and Atlanta Metro Schools
• Georgia Department of Education Higher Education (Science Education) Initial Teaching Committee Member (2008-2010): provide feedback to state department regarding policies in initial teacher licensure.

• Clayton County Schools MSP Co-PI (2007-2009): coordinated and implemented professional development in reform science teaching

• Rockdale County Schools MSP Co-PI (2007-2009): coordinated and implemented professional development in reform science teaching

• PRISM Academy for Learning: Leader and member in focusing upon the infusion of active learning strategies, backward design, and performance assessments into higher education

• Invited workshop leader in Gwinnett County Schools regarding the teaching of evolution, and assessment strategies in active learning and inquiry-based curriculum.
• Invited workshop leader in Cobb County Schools regarding the teaching of evolution, and assessment strategies in active learning and inquiry-based curriculum.

• LASER, Higher Education team member with the Atlanta Public Schools to the LASER conference (Atlanta, GA, December 1-5, 2004). Assisted APS with creating science reform goals and action plans.

Georgia State University

• University Assessment Committee: Appointed College of Education Representative on the university committee to review university programs assessment plans. (2009-present)

• University Senate: Elected Faculty Representative for the Middle and Secondary Education and Instructional Technology Department (2007-2009)

• University Senate: Committee on Academic Programs (CAP) (2007-2009)

• University Senate: Committee on Academic Programs; Program Review Subcommittee (2007-2009)

• University Senate: University Research Committee (2007-2009)

• Georgia State University Academy for Learning: GSU Systemic Change committee orchestrating workshops in active learning strategies in higher education courses (2006-present)

• Content Knowledge Committee: Member of a university committee that examines the progress of teaching candidates’ content knowledge through GPA and Praxis scores. (2005-2007)

College of Education

• Dean’s Advisory Committee, (2010-2013)

• Student Affairs, Committee Member (2008-2009)

• NCATE Accreditation Science Education Committee Lead for Ed.S. and MAT Programs (2005-2007)

• P-16 Science Education, Committee Member (2006-present)

• Professional Education Faculty, Member (2004-present)

• College of Education Faculty, Member (2004-present)
• Content Knowledge Committee, Member (2006-2008)

Department of Middle and Secondary Education, and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University
• Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (2009-2011)
• Program Review Committee (2010-2011)
• TEEMS Program (MAT Science) Coordinator (2007-2010)
• Science Unit Chairperson (2006-2007; 2010-2011)
• Science Unit Member (2004-present)
• Science Education Search Committee, Chair for Five Science Education Positions (2011, 2010, 2006-2007)
• Middle Childhood Education, Committee Member (2004-2008)
• Social Committee Co-Chair (2005-2006)

State of Iowa
• E-SET Advisory Board Member (2002-2003). Extension, Science, Engineering, and Technology based at Iowa State University. The Iowa Space Grant is funneled through this group.
• State Physics Olympics Coordinator (2002-2003) with colleagues Jack Gerlovich, Drake University, Colleen Anderson, Heartland AEA, and Erica Larson, Grant Wood AEA.
• Iowa’s Child Project (2002-2004), representative of Iowa private colleges

Service to Des Moines, Iowa Community
• Co-Director of the “I Have a Dream” Foundation College Summer Camp where at-risk students from the community experience an intensive academic workshop with pre-service teachers and faculty members from Drake University. Summer, 2003.
• Community Forum on Raising the Graduation Rate/Preventing Drop-outs in the Des Moines Public Schools, Sept. 13, 2001
Co-PI on a grant initiative through the National Science Foundation with Heartland AEA, Des Moines Public Schools, Johnston Community Schools, West Des Moines Community Schools, Grant Wood AEA and The University of Iowa. Unfunded.

Drake University

- FYS Instructor, 2002. Taught a course for entering freshmen (FYS 041) combining college level reading and writing with science philosophy.
- Selection Committee Member for Honorary Drake Medal and Honorary Drake Degree, 2001-2004
- University Curriculum Committee, 2002-2003
- Instructional Technology Committee, 2003-2004
- University Hearing Panel, 2003, met when there were cases of violations of the Student Code of Conduct. These are instances in which the student appeals or wants a hearing of the case.

Teaching and Learning Department – Drake University

- Doctoral Dissertation Chair: 1 Ed.D. Candidate
- Doctoral Dissertation Committee Member: 1 Ed.D. Graduate
- Merit Pay Committee, 2003-2004. Examined issues surrounding merit pay. Met with faculty to gather information regarding their vision and concerns with this issue. Created criteria for several different faculty categories based upon research and faculty input.
- Teaching and Learning Curriculum Committee, 2001-2003
• State Accreditation: Chapter 2: Conceptual Framework -- co-chair of committee responsible for the writing of this section of our report.

• Social Committee, Chairperson, 2002-2003

• Social Committee, Member 2001-2002

WORKSHOPS ATTENDED

• Teach for America Research Results (Fall, 2010), Research Learning Presentation, Georgia State University

• University Program Assessment (Fall, 2010)

• Science Education for Public Understanding Program: Senior Leaders Training (2010, 2008)

• LiveText Workshops (2009, 2008)

• Research Methods Workshop (MSIT) Spring, 2008
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Research Interests  
Literacy and Technology; Teacher Education and Professional Development

Education

| Ph.D. 2003 | English Education, Syracuse University, NY, USA. |
M.A. 1992 English Philology and Teaching English as Other or Foreign Language (TEOFL)
Jagiellonian University, Poland [Note: 5-year M.A. degree which includes the B. A.]

Academic Appointments

April 2009 Earned Tenure and was promoted to Associate Professor

2003- 2009 May Assistant Professor, Georgia State University

2008 fall-present Coordinator, Master’s of Arts in Teaching English Program Degree, Georgia State University

2007- spring 2008 Coordinator, Master’s Advanced English Education Program Degree, Georgia State University

2001-2002 Teaching Assistant, Department of Reading and Language Arts Syracuse University, NY

1999-2001 Research Assistant, Departments of Teaching and Leadership and Reading and Language Arts, Syracuse University, NY

1996-1999 Instructor, Department of Applied Psychology and Linguistics, Jagiellonian University, Poland
1995-1998  Teacher Educator, the National Teacher Training Centre, Cracow, Poland

1995-1998  Teacher, English, Pijary High School, Cracow, Poland

1992-1999  Teacher, English at Primary and Secondary School levels,
International House, Cracow, affiliated to London International House, UK

Honors and Awards


2010  Invited to chair a one-day workshop, “Critical literacy and today’s online and digital media technologies,” at the 2010 Annual Convention of the National Council of Teachers of English in Orlando, Florida, November 18-23.


2007  Recipient of The Distinguished Program in Teacher Education Award from Georgia Association of Teacher Educators (GATE) for the TEEMS English Education Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Degree Program with colleagues; Drs. Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, and Michelle Zoss, Savannah, GA
2007   Invited to participate in the Second Conference English Education Leadership and Policy Summit to continue the work begun in the first summit in 2005. The invitation was extended to only 100 CEE leaders in the field.

2005   Invited to serve as co-convener of Strand 4: Writing Group in the Conference English Education Leadership and Policy Summit responsible for the crafting of a position statement concerning the role of technology in English education. Only 50 leaders in the field were invited.

2005   Recipient of The Conference on English Education National Leadership Fellowship Award for research report on technology integration in English education, Indianapolis, IN

2004   Recipient of The Ethnicity, Race, and Multilingualism Award for Line of Literacy Research and Commitment to the National Reading Conference Organization, San Antonio, TX

2003   Recipient of the Certificate in University Teaching from the Future Professoriate Project, The Graduate School, Syracuse University, NY

2002   Recipient of William D. Sheldon Fellowship for Academic Excellence, Reading and Language Arts Center, Syracuse University, NY

2002, May   Recipient of Graduate School Research and Creative Grant Competition Award, Graduate School, Syracuse University, NY

2002, August   Recipient of Teaching Fellowship Award for Excellent Performance as a Teaching Fellow, Summer Teaching Assistants’ Orientation, Syracuse University, NY

2001, April   Recognition of the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi for Academic Excellence, Syracuse University Chapter, NY
2004, April  Recognition of Outstanding Achievements in the Areas of International Education and Exchange by Phi Beta Delta Honor Society for International Scholars, Office of International Service, Syracuse University, NY

2000-2003  Awarded Summer Fellowship, Graduate School, Syracuse University, NY

2000-2002  Awarded Teaching Assistantship, Reading and Language Arts Center, Syracuse University, NY

1999-2003  Awarded Research Assistantship, Syracuse University, NY

1992  Recipient of Honors Scholarship for Academic Excellence, School of English and American Studies, Exeter University, United Kingdom

1992  Awarded M.A. degree, English Philology, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland

1987-1992  Recipient of Scholarship for Academic Excellence, English Philology Department, Jagiellonian University, Poland

Grants


Hsieh, M. Milbrandt, and M. Zoss (25% effort as Co-PIs). “Urban Internet Conversations in Literacy, the Arts, and Digital Media (uiCLAD). Project proposal IS&T, Georgia State University FY2009 Student Technology Fee. Atlanta, GA, $156,000, Unfunded.


Hsieh, M. Milbrandt, and M. Zoss (equal effort as Co-PIs). “Urban Internet Conversations in Literacy, the Arts, and Digital Media (uiCLAD) Project Proposal” submitted to College of Arts and Sciences, Atlanta, GA, $15,000, funded.


SCHOLARSHIP

Peer-Refereed/ Prestigious Journal Publications


Spanish Translation: Lo que hay de malo con los derechos de autor: Leyes analogas de propiedad intelectual en un mundo digital.


Peer-Refereed Book Publications: Chapters, Monographs

and coming of age in the academy. In S. Smith & F. Santini (Eds.), Bridging cultures or caught


cases in educational technology. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

McGrail, E., & Davis, A. (accepted). Blogversing with fifth graders: The challenges in the initial stages of
the research process. In Kajder, S., & Young, C.A. (Eds.), Research in English language arts and
technology. Information Age Publishing. 20pgs.


[Book
insert]. In R. Beach, C. Anson, L.A. Bruech, & T. Swiss (Eds.), Engaging Students in Digital Writing,
Christopher Gordon Publishers.

Published Peer-Reviewed Abstracts or Proceedings

and challenges. Proceedings of the Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education
International Conference, USA, 15, 3935-3941. 6pgs.

Other Peer/Editor Reviewed Publications

communications classrooms. Adviser Update [the Dow Jones Newspaper Funds' Quarterly], 51(1).21A.


Publications under Review


Publications in Preparation for Review


Peer-Reviewed Presentations


McGrail, E. (2008). The what, how, and why of technology use in middle grades reading instruction. Paper presented as part of the symposium, Examining literacy teacher preparation at the elementary, middle, and high school levels, at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Orlando, Fl. (International)


Dixey, B., McGrail, E., Myrick, C., Sackor, S., Stanley, B., & Tinker Sachs, G. (2007). How are teachers in Georgia prepared to teach reading and/or address reading in the content areas in grades 4-8? Paper presented as part of the symposium: Learning about literacy and the teaching of reading: A state wide examination of literacy teacher preparation at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX. (International)


[Note: an invited presentation as the Conference on English Education National Leadership Fellowship Award winner].


McGrail, E. (2004, October). The multimedia case study as a tool for the shaping of a reflective and critical lens for pre-service teachers and teacher educators. Presentation at the annual meeting of the Georgia Association of Teacher Educators and Georgia Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Atlanta, GA.


Jarzab, E. (December, 2001). What happens when students are more tech-savvy than their teachers: English teachers’ perspectives? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX. (International)


Other Peer Reviewed Presentations

applications. Workshop session to be presented at the annual meeting of Conference on Literacy, Urban Issues, and Social Studies Education. Atlanta, GA.


Workshop to be presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Orlando, FL.


Copyright and fair use policy. Workshop session presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, New York, NY.

Information/Creativity Age, Lessons learned from blogging with elementary and university students. Poster session presented at the National Educational Computing Conference, Atlanta, GA. (International)


McGrail, E. (2006, October). Strategies for composing the literature review for proposals and dissertations. Invited seminar presentation to Dr. Fox’s Doctoral Seminar class, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


McGrail, E. (2006, February). Developing a critical and analytical cognitive mindset for composing the literature review for proposals and dissertations. Invited seminar presentation to Dr. Many’s Doctoral Seminar class, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


McGrail, E. (2004, June). Creating the literature review for proposals and dissertations: What does it involve? Invited seminar presentation to Dr. Many’s Doctoral Seminar class, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


English as a first, second, or foreign language. Presentation for Panel Discussion for EDLA 8330: Language Variation and Learning. Georgia State University. Atlanta, GA.

McGrail, E. (2004, April). Creating the literature review for proposals and dissertations: What does it involve? Invited seminar presentation to Dr. Many’s Doctoral Seminar class, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Albers, M., McGrail, E., & Fox, D. (2003). Praxis II for ELA teachers. MSIT departmental workshop for pre-service teachers, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Jarzab, E (1993). Integrating listening with other language skills. Workshop presented at International Association of Teaching English as A Foreign Language Conference, Cracow, Poland. (International)

Jarzab, E (1992, November). Live listening for comprehension and communication. Workshop presented at International Association of Teaching English as A Foreign Language Conference, Cracow, Poland. (International)

Editorial Service
2010  Proposal Reviewer, the Program Committee for SITE 2011--Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference, Nashville, TN, (International)

2009  Proposal Reviewer, the Program Committee for SITE 2010--Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference, San Diego, CA (International)

2008  Proposal Reviewer, the Program Committee for SITE 2008--Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada (International)

2007  Proposal Reviewer, the Program Committee for SITE 2007--Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference, San Antonio, TX (International)

2007, Fall-present  Book Manuscript Reviewer, SAGE Publishers

2010-present  Reviewer, Journal of Teacher Education

2006  Proposal Reviewer, the Program Committee for SITE 2006--Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference, Orlando, FL (International)

2005-present  Reviewer, the Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education Journal

2004-present  Reviewer, the Teachers College Record Journal (International)

2004, October  Guest Reviewer Member, Georgia Early College Initiative: Request for proposals and announcement of information meeting. Macon, GA
2003-present  Reviewer, the English Education Journal, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA

2003-present  Reviewer, Georgia Educational Researcher Journal, Valdosta, GA

2001  Guest Reviewer, Journal of Research in the Teaching of English, University of Georgia, Athens, GA

Consulting

2010, spring  Grant reviewer/consulting, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP), Central Michigan University

TEACHING

Teacher Certification

University Certification in Future Professorate Program, Syracuse University, New York

National Certification in Regular Education, Primary School (Grades 1-5), Poland
National Certification in Regular Education, Secondary School (Grades 6-12), Poland
National Certification in Teaching English as a Second/Foreign Language (TESOL and TEFL), Poland
Royal Academy of Arts (RSA) Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) Certificate, Poland
Royal Academy of Arts (RSA) Younger Learner English Certificate, Poland
Royal Academy of Arts (RSA) Business English Certificate, Poland
Academy of Economics Business English Certificate, Polish Academy of Economics, Poland
University Level Teaching in the U.S. A.

2010, Fall  EDRD 7630: Reading in the Content Areas
2010, Fall  EDCI 7660: Practicum I. Georgia State University
2010, May  EDLA 7150: Children and Adolescent Literature, Georgia State University
2010, Spring EDLA 7460: Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Writing, Georgia State University
2010, Spring EDCI 7670/80: Practicum II & III. Georgia State University
2009, Fall  EDCI 9850: Research Seminar, Prospectus. Georgia State University
2009, Fall  EDCI 7660: Practicum I. Georgia State University
2009, May  RGTR 0198: Regents’ Reading Skills. Georgia State University
2009, Spring EDCI 7670/80: Practicum II & III. Georgia State University
2008, Fall  EDLA 7440: Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Literature. Georgia State University
2008, Fall  EDCI 7660: Practicum I. Georgia State University
2008, Spring EDCI 7670/80: Practicum II & III. Georgia State University
2007, Fall  EDLA 7440: Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Literature. Georgia State University
2007, Fall  EDCI 7660: Practicum I. Georgia State University
2007, Spring EDRD 7360: Literacy and Technology. Georgia State University
2006, Fall  EDCI 7660: Practicum I. Georgia State University
2006, May  EDRD 8550: Trends and Issues in Literacy Teacher Education. Topic: Literacy Teacher Education: Exploring the Research and Practice. Georgia State University
2006, Spring  EDLA 7460: Theory and Pedagogy of Composition. Georgia State University
2006, Spring  EDCI 7670/80: Practicum II & III. Georgia State University
2005, Fall  EDCI 7660: Practicum I. Georgia State University
2005, Spring  EDCI 7670/80: Practicum II & III. Georgia State University
2005, Spring  EDRD 7360: Literacy and Technology. Georgia State University
2006, Fall  EDLA 7550: Theory and Pedagogy of English Instruction. Georgia State University
2005, Fall  EDLA 7550: Theory and Pedagogy of English Instruction. Georgia State University
Fall 2004  EDLA 7550: Theory and Pedagogy of English Instruction. Georgia State University
2004, Fall  EDCI 7660: Practicum I. Georgia State University
2004, Spring  EDLA 7460: Theory and Pedagogy of Composition. Georgia State University
2003, Fall  EDCI 6600: Introduction to Secondary Teaching. Georgia State University
2003, Fall  EDCI 7660: Practicum I. Georgia State University
2002, June  RED 600: Literacy Institute (Teaching Section-Comprehension Instruction). Syracuse University
2002, Fall  EDU 508: Student Teaching-English (Supervision). Syracuse University
2001, Fall  SED 415/615: Teacher Development in English (A Teaching Methods Seminar), Syracuse University
2001, Spring  EDU 508: Student Teaching-English, (Supervision). Syracuse University

University Level Teaching in Poland

1997-1999  Methods of Teaching Reading and Writing. Jagiellonian University


High School Level Teaching in Poland


1997-1998  General Certificate in English (GSE) Preparation Course. Pijary High School, Cracow

1996-1997  General Certificate in English (GSE) Preparation Course. Pijary High School, Cracow

1995-1999  General English. International House, Cracow

1992  Practicum for Secondary English Education. Jana Sobieskiego II Gymnasium (High School), Cracow

Elementary and Middle School Level Teaching in Poland

1994-1999  English for Adolescent Learners. International House, Cracow

1992-1999  English for Young Learners. International House, Cracow

1992  Practicum for Primary and Middle School. Queen Jadwiga II Primary/Middle School No. 2. Nowy Sacz
Other Teaching Assignments in Poland


Volunteered Presentations/Workshops

McGrail, E. (Fall 2010). Crafting a Terrific Curriculum Vita. Faculty Mentoring Conversations, Department of
Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University

Faculty Mentoring

Fall, 2010 Mentor of an untenured new clinical faculty member, Gladys Yarbrough

Impact on Students

Invited Guest Presentation

McGrail, E. (April 26, 2010). Blogging in the elementary classroom. 34 Peachtree Building, Georgia State
University. Atlanta, GA

SERVICE
National

2007, December
-present Chair of the Assembly on Computers in English, National Council of Teachers of English Association of Teacher Educators, Urbana, Illinois, IL

2010 Editor of the wiki for the Assembly for Computers in English

2007, April-June Member of Strand 4: What is the role of English education in responding to the changes being wrought by economic globalization? at the Conference on English Education (CEE) Leadership and Policy Summit II, Lake Forest, IL

2007, Fall-present Member of the Technology Innovative Community Group, National Reading Conference

2006, Fall-2007, Spring Member of the Conference on English Education (CEE) Web Editor Search Committee for National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)

2005, May-2006,
Spring Co-Convener for Strand 4: What do we know and believe about multi-modal literacies and digital technologies in English education? at the Conference on English Education (CEE) Leadership and Policy Summit, Atlanta GA

2004-2005, Fall Member of the Ethnicity, Race, and Multilingualism Committee to the National Reading Conference Organization

2004, Fall-present Member of the Commission on Technology and Teacher Education National Council of Teachers of English Association of Teacher Educators, Urbana, Illinois, IL

2005, Fall, 2009 Member of the Conference on English Education National Leadership Fellowship Award Task Force

Products

http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/convention2009/


University/College Levels

2010, Fall Co-Chair of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) Content Knowledge Committee

2010, Fall Member of the Professional Education Council (PEC) Content Knowledge Committee

2007, Fall-May 2010 Member of the College of Education (COE) Content Knowledge Committee

2005, Fall-present Member of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF/COE) Diversity Committee, Leader of Curriculum Subcommittee.

2005, Fall-006, Spring Member of the College of Education (COE) Think-Tank Committee

2005, Fall-2006 Member of the COE Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Program, Georgia State University

2006, Spring Member of the Organizational Committee for Literacy Center at Georgia State University

Local/Departmental

2010, Fall Co-Chair of the MSIT Tenure and Promotion Committee. Georgia State University
2009, May  
Member of the MSIT Tenure and Promotion Committee. Georgia State University

2008, Spring  

2008, Spring  
Reviewer of the Comprehensive Exam for Myrnelle. Spring 2008. Georgia State University

2008, Spring  
Member of the Faculty Annual Review Committee, MSIT, Georgia State University

2008, Spring  
Member of the LL-SS Division Faculty Search Committee, Georgia State University

2010, Fall  
Coordinator, English Education Specialist Degree, Georgia State University

2008 fall-May 2010  
Coordinator, Master’s of Arts in Teaching English Program Degree, Georgia State University

2007- spring 2008  
Coordinator, Master’s Advanced English Education Program Degree, Georgia State University

2007, Fall-2008, Feb  
Co-director, Conference on Literacy, Urban Issues, and Social Studies Education, MSIT, Georgia State University

2006, Fall-2007, Jan  
Co-director, Georgia Read-Write Now Conference, MSIT, Georgia State University

2006, Fall-2007, Spring  
Member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Mentoring Policy for Language Literacy and Social Studies Division

2006, Fall  
Member of the LL-SS Division Faculty Search Committee, Georgia State University

2005, Fall-2006, Fall  
Chair, MSIT Technology Committee, Georgia State University

2005-2007, Spring  
Member of the Diversity Committee, MSIT, Georgia State University

2005, Spring  
Task Force for Area F Guidelines: Teacher Education, MSIT, Georgia State University

2004, Spring-present  
Member, Language and Literacy Education Unit, MSIT, Doctoral Candidates Interview and Dissertation Committees, Georgia State University
2004, Spring-present  Member, TEEMS, English Education Alternative Preparation Program, Student Interviews Committee

2003, Fall-present  Member, Education Specialist, English Education Preparation Program, Georgia State University

2003, Fall-present  Member, English Education Advanced Program, Georgia State University

2003, Fall-present  Member, Language and Literacy Education Unit L, MSIT, Georgia State University

2001  Graduate Student Representative, Faculty Search Committee, Reading and Language Arts, Syracuse University

2001  Member, Teaching Committee, Tenure and Promotion, School of Education, Syracuse University

2001  Member, Chancellor’s Review Committee, Syracuse University

2001  Graduate Student Representative, Graduate School Program Review Committee, Teaching and Leadership, Syracuse University

2001  Member, The English Academy Portfolio Review Committee, English Education, Syracuse University

2000  Graduate Student Representative, Faculty Search Committee, Teaching and Leadership, Syracuse University

1996-1999  Examiner on the Entrance Exam English Language Committee for Students Entering the Department of Applied Psychology and Linguistics. The Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland

1996-1998  Co-examiner on the Entrance Exam Committee for College Students, the Jagiellonian Teaching College, Cracow, Poland

2002  Associate Graduate Student Researcher, The Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology (PT3) Grant for Tomorrow’s Teachers, Principal Investigator: Scott Shablak, Office of Professional Development, Syracuse University

2001  Associate Researcher, Adolescent girls’ use of electronic technologies in their literacy practices, Elva Knight Research Grant, International Reading Association, Principal Investigator: Kelly Chandler-Olcott, Syracuse University
2001   Associate Researcher and Reviewer, The Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology (PT3) Grant for Tomorrow’s Teachers Grant for Tomorrow’s Teachers, Office of Professional Development, Syracuse University

2001   Co-facilitator on Task Force on Electronic Supervision in Teacher Education Programs for the Living School Book, Teaching and Leadership, Syracuse University

2000, April    Program Assistant for the New York State Secondary Program Revisions for Teaching & Leadership Program. Huntington Hall, Syracuse. NY

2000, March    Program Assistant for the New York State Doctoral Program Revisions for Teaching & Leadership Program. Huntington Hall, Syracuse. NY.

2000, March    Program Assistant for the New York State Doctoral Program Revisions for Reading & Language Arts Program. Huntington Hall, Syracuse. NY.

Community Work

2006-2007, Fall Outreach Research Project on Blogging, with Anne Davis—an instructional technology pioneer in the use of blogs for educational purposes. The project’s purpose was to model exemplar technology integration in an urban elementary school context

2005, Fall-present    Counting at the Shrine. Helping the local parish with counting money and inputting these data into the database system

2006, Spring    Outreach Research Project on a Middle School Writer. As part of EDLA 7460, pre-service teachers explored an individual middle school writer in a mini-action research project. They offered support and strategies to the student, based on what they learned about this student’s writing from the data collected and the readings from the professional literature in the course.

2006    Member of the Atlanta Central Night Shelter, and responsible for providing lunch and working overnight, Atlanta

2000-2001    Participated in Literacy Volunteers of Greater Syracuse Corporate Breakfast. Syracuse Hotel, Syracuse, NY

1999    Member, School of Education Future Professoriate Project, Syracuse University

1996-1997, Su    Supervisor and Instructor, International Language Summer Programs. International House, Cracow, Poland

Professional Memberships

2004-present  National Council of Teachers of English
2004-present  Member of the Assembly for Computers in English, National Council of Teachers of English Association of Teacher Educators
2000-2008  National Reading Conference
2003-present  Member of the Georgia Association of Teacher Educators and Georgia Association of Colleges of Teacher Education
2003-2008  Georgia Read Write Now Conference (CLUISSE)
2001-2003  Association of Teacher Educators
2001-2003  New York State Reading Association
2001-2003  Central New York Reading Council
2000-2002  The Association of Severely Handicapped
1996-1999  The Polish Academy of Sciences
1996-1999  Member of Applied Psychology and Linguistics Research
1995-present  The Polish Teacher Association
1995-1998  Member of the Board of Examiners for General Certificate in English (GSE)
1992-1999  Member of International Association of Teachers of English As A Foreign Language (IATEFL) Poland

1992-1999  Member of International House Organization
1992  Member of Tempus Program, United Kingdom
Student Organizations

2001-2003 Member of School of Education Doctoral Program, Syracuse University

2001-present Member of the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi, Syracuse University Chapter

2000-present Member of the Honor Society for International Scholars, Phi Beta Delta, Syracuse University

1999-2003 Member of Office of International Students, Syracuse University

2000-2003 Member of Recreation Ski Program, Syracuse University

Professional Development

Advanced Training Program: A series of Advanced Education Research Design and Methods Course. (Fall 2010). Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Dedication of the Confucius Institute. (October 15, 2010). The Rialto Center, Atlanta, GA

Research Wednesday Speaker Series. (Fall 2010). Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA

A conversation with Dr. Henry Louis Gates. (March, 2010). The Rialto Center, Atlanta, GA


The mixed-methods research seminar. Professional development workshop. (Feb, 29, 2008). 329 Aderhold Center, Georgia State University. Speaker/Leader: Dr. Anthony Onwuegbuzie.

The Grant Institute’s Grants 101 Course: Professional grant proposal writing workshop. (April 8-20,

Husted, S. (2006). Podcasting 101. Instructional Technology Center, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Live Text Training. (2006, Fall). Instructional Technology Center, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Member of Professional Book Club, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, Spring 2006.

Member of Podcasting Discussion Group, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, Fall 2007-present.

Member of Initial Teacher Prep Discussion Group, Mentoring opportunities for co-operating teachers,

brainstorming ideas for grant development, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, Fall 2007.
Puvirajah
Anton Puvirajah
Assistant Professor
Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology Department
College Of Education, Georgia State University

EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Ph.D., Teacher Education - Science Education, 2007
Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

Dissertation: Exploring the Quality and Credibility of Students’ Argumentation: Teacher Facilitated Technology Embedded Scientific Inquiry

University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

Bachelor of Education, General Science & Chemistry, 1999
University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

Bachelor of Science, Botany & Zoology, 1997
University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

Manitoba Teaching Certification – Permanent

Ontario Teaching Certification – 2004/2005
PROFESSIONAL

EXPERIENCE    Assistant Professor - Science Education

Georgia State University, College of Education, Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology Department, Atlanta, Georgia 2007 – Present

- Educational Specialist Degree in Science Education Program Coordinator (2008 – Present)
- Graduate Faculty Member (2008 – Present)
- Georgia State University STEM Fellow (2008 – Present)

Responsibilities include conducting various research, teaching, advising, program development, program coordinating, service, and professional development activities.

Adjunct Faculty - Science Education

Wayne State University, College of Education, Teacher Education Division, Detroit, Michigan

2002 – 2007

Taught various undergraduate and graduate level science content and science education methods courses to preservice and inservice teachers.

Research Assistant - Science Education

Wayne State University, College of Education, Teacher Education Division, Detroit, Michigan

2006 – 2007

Worked on project “Senior Year Students’ Understanding of Science through Inquiry: A Scenario Based Approach”
Graduate Research Assistant - Science Education
Wayne State University, College of Education, Teacher Education Division, Detroit, Michigan
2005 – 2007

Worked on National Science Foundation funded project “Transforming Information Technology into Classroom”

Science Teacher
University Prep High School, Detroit, Michigan
2004 – 2006

Taught general science, chemistry, and physics to high school students

Graduate Research Assistant - Science Education
Wayne State University, College of Education, Teacher Education Division, Detroit, Michigan
2002 – 2003

Worked on project “Plus II Students’ Conceptions on Solution Chemistry”

Graduate Research Assistant - Science Education
University of Manitoba, Faculty of Education, Winnipeg, Manitoba
2000 – 2001

Worked on project “Middle School Students’ Conceptions on Particle Theory of Matter”
Science Teacher
Kildonan-East Collegiate, Winnipeg, Manitoba
2000 – 2001

Taught general science and biology to high school students

Military Instructor
#49 JTCVC Royal Canadian Sea Cadet Corps, Winnipeg, Manitoba
1992 – 2001

Taught general military and naval oriented courses

RESEARCH INTERESTS    Scientific reasoning, argumentation, informal reasoning, scientific explanation, science teacher development, integration of technology into science teaching and learning


SCHOLARLY WORK UNDER REVIEW


SCHOLARLY WORK IN PROGRESS

Puvirajah, A. (In Progress). The nature of middle school students’ online scientific explanations: A post lesson analysis using Walton’s presumptive reasoning schemes.
WRITTEN SCHOLARSHIP AND
CREATIVE ACTIVITIES
(NON REFEREED)


CONFERENCE

PRESENTATIONS


WORKSHOP & OTHER

PRESENTATIONS

Puvirajah, A., & Calandra, B. (August, 2010). Project based learning and technology activities. All Stars After Schools Program. Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, GA.

Puvirajah, A. (May, 2010). Workshop on Second Life Virtual Worlds & Virtual Worlds Recording. TEEMS Secondary Science. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Jarrett, O., Puvirajah, A., & Williams, B. (April, 2010). Science methods – Building on science content. Georgia Perimeter College, Clarkson, GA.

Puvirajah, A. (2007, November). The use of Walton’s schemes for presumptive reasoning: First steps in students’ scientific reasoning. Georgia State University, College of Education Ph.D. Colloquium, Atlanta, GA. (Invited)

Puvirajah, A. (2002). Overview of calculator-based laboratories for science education faculty. Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.


EXTERNALLY FUNDED AWARDS


INTERNALLY FUNDED AWARDS


Puvirajah, A. (Spring 2010). A survey and focus group study of undergraduate students’ interest in and perceptions of science and mathematics teaching as a career. Funded by STEM Focus Award. Awarded $6,000. Role: Principal Investigator.

Puvirajah, A. (Spring 2010). Minority faculty development grant for travel. Funded by the Office for Underrepresented Faculty. Awarded $600. Role: Principal Investigator.


Puvirajah, A. (Fall 2009). Minority faculty development grant for travel. Funded by the Office for Underrepresented Faculty. Awarded $800. Role: Principal Investigator.


SUBMITTED GRANTS


UNFUNDED GRANTS


SCHOLARLY SERVICE • Journal Referee – Journal of Science Education and Technology (2010 – Present)
• Journal Referee – Science Education (2006 – Present)
• Journal Referee – Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching (2009 – Present)
• Journal Referee – Educational Technology (2010)
• Session Chair – 10th Annual International Conference on Education, Athens, Greece (2008)
HONORS AND AWARDS

- Georgia State University STEM Fellow, 2009 - 2010
- Wayne State University, College of Education Joseph Taranto Scholarship, 2006
- Wayne State University, College of Education Joseph Taranto Scholarship, 2005
- Wayne State University, Graduate Professional Scholarship, 2005
- Wayne State University, Graduate Professional Scholarship, 2004
- Wayne State University, Humanities Center Graduate Travel Award, 2003
- Wayne State University, Graduate Assistantship, 2003
- Wayne State University, Graduate Assistantship, 2002
- Community Service Award, Presented by the Navy League of Canada, 1998
- Duke of Edinburgh’s Award for Leadership and Community Service (Gold Medal), Presented by Prince Edward, 1993

Duke of Edinburgh’s Award for Leadership and Community Service (Silver Medal), Presented by the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, 1990

UNIVERSITY

TEACHING

Courses Developed at Georgia State University

- EDSC 4470 Concepts and Methods in Middle Childhood Science (Undergraduate, 2010)
- EDSC 3250 Topics in Middle Grades Science (Undergraduate, 2009)
- EDSC 9870 Advanced Research Seminar in Science Education (Graduate, 2008)

Courses Taught at Georgia State University, 2007 – Present

- EDSC 4470 Concepts and Methods in Middle Childhood Science (Undergraduate – 1 section)
- EDSC 3250 Topics in Middle Grades Science (Undergraduate – 2 sections)
- EDSC 6550 Principles of Science Instruction (Graduate – 2 sections)
- EDSC 7550 Theory and Pedagogy in Science Instruction (Graduate – 2 sections)
- EDSC 9870 Advanced Research Seminar in Science Education (Graduate – 1 section)
• EDCI 6600 Introduction to Secondary Teaching (Graduate – 1 sections)
• EDCI 7540 Theory and Pedagogy in Middle Childhood Mathematics and Science (Graduate – 1 section)
• EDCI 7660 Practicum I (Graduate – 3 sections)
• EDCI 7670 Practicum II (Graduate – 3 sections)
• EDCI 7680 Practicum II (Graduate – 3 sections)
• ECE 3606 Science and Inquiry in Early Childhood Education (Undergraduate – 2 sections)

Courses Taught at Wayne State University, 2002 – 2007
• SCE 5010 Life Sciences for Elementary/Middle School Teachers (Graduate – 2 sections)
• SCE 5020 Physical Sciences for Elementary/Middle School Teachers (Graduate – 8 sections)
• SCE 5060 Methods and Materials in Secondary School Science (Graduate – 1 section)
• ELE 3500 Teaching Science: Preprimary – 9 (Undergraduate – 7 sections)
• ELE 6500 Science Curriculum: Preprimary – 9 (Graduate – 1 section)

GRADUATE COMMITTEES

Ph.D. Dissertation Committee Chair

Thomaston, Anita. (in progress). Dissertation Title: Variations in attitude toward science among grade levels, gender, and English language learners: A mixed methods study (final stages writing). Georgia State University.


Dennis, James. (in progress). Course work in progress. Georgia State University.


Ph.D. Dissertation Committee Member

Sun, Yuleu. (in progress). Dissertation in progress. Georgia State University.

SERVICE State of Georgia and Atlanta Metro Schools

• Atlanta After-School All Stars – Creating and providing curricular materials, including supplies to carry out lessons, and training teachers (2008 – Present)
• DeKalb County Schools – Elementary science teacher conference co-presenter (2009)

Georgia State University

• Georgia State University STEM Fellow
• Noyce News Release, Georgia State Public Relations & Atlanta Journal Constitution, 2009
• Advanced Academy for Future Teachers Contributor

College of Education, Georgia State University

• Professional Education Faculty, Member (2007 – Present)
• College of Education Faculty, Member (2007 – Present)
• P-16 Science Education, Committee Member (2007 – 2009)

Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, Georgia State University

• Ad-Hoc Committee on New Faculty Mentoring Policy (2009 – 2010)
• Educational Specialist Degree in Science Education Program Coordinator (2008 – Present)
• Advanced Graduate Degree Program Committee Member (2008 – 2010)
• Annual Department Faculty Retreat, Stone Mountain, GA (2009)
• Annual Department Faculty Retreat, Braselton, GA (2008)
• Ad-Hoc Committee on MSIT By-Laws (2008)
• Ad-Hoc Committee on Annual Faculty Evaluation Guideline (2008)
• Exploratory Committee on Bachelor of Science in Middle Childhood Education (2008)
• 1st Annual MCE TEEMS Mathematics and Science Action Research Symposium Organizer (2008)
• Initial Teacher Prep Faculty (2007 – Present)
• Science Unit Member (2007 – Present)
• Science Education PhD Admissions Committee (2007 – Present)
• Middle Childhood Education, Committee Member (2007 – 2009)
• MAT in Middle Childhood Education, Science Education Lead (2007 – 2008)

Other Service

• Southeastern Michigan Junior Science and Humanities Symposium Judge and Facilitator, (2007)
• Science Education Search Committee, Wayne State University (2006 – 2007)
• Member of University of Manitoba Senate (2000)
• Member of the University of Manitoba Faculty of Education Student Council (2000)
• Member of the Canadian Forces Cadet Instructor Cadre (1998 – 2002)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT • nVivo Workshop (2010)
• STEM Fellows Institute on Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (2009)
• Nature Smart Schools Symposium (2009)
• National Science Foundation Proposal Development Workshop (2009)
• LiveText Workshop (2008)
• Research Mentoring of Doctoral Students: Lessons From Trial and Error (2008)
• Mixed Methods Workshop (2008)
• Critical Friends Workshop (2007)

MEMBERSHIPS

IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
• American Educational Research Association (AERA) – Current Member
  • National Association of Research in Science Teaching (NARST) – Current Member
  • Association for Science Teacher Education (ASTE) – Current Member
  • Southeastern Association for Science Teacher Education (SASTE) – Current Member
  • Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education – Past Member
  • National Science Teachers Association – Past Member
  • Michigan Science Teachers Association – Past Member
  • Metropolitan Detroit Science Teachers Association – Past Member
  • Ontario College of Teachers – Past Member
  • Manitoba Teachers Society – Past Member
Mary B. Winterhalter Shoffner, Ph.D.

- Curriculum Vita -

Associate Professor  8500 River Walk Landing
Unit Leader, Learning Technologies  Johns Creek, GA 30024
Georgia State University  Ph 770.814.3914
Department of Middle/Secondary Education & Instructional Technology
P.O. Box 3987
Atlanta, GA 30303-3987
Ph.404.413.8424
Email mshoffner@gsu.edu

Educational Background

Ph. D., Educational Psychology, 1997
emphasis in Instructional Technology; minor in Higher Education Administration
Kent State University

Dissertation:  Effects of Instructional Strategies on Emerging Technology-Based Visual Literacy Instruction: Problem-Based, Networked Hypermedia-Based, and Cooperative Learning Strategies
M.S., Instructional Systems, 1994
The Pennsylvania State University

Thesis: Affective Design Considerations in Computer-Based Instruction for the Adult Learner

B.S., Microbiology, 1983
The Pennsylvania State University

Employment Experience

August 2008 – present  Georgia State University
Associate Professor & Unit Leader, Learning Technologies
Department of Middle/Secondary Education & Instructional Technology

August 2003 – 2007  Georgia State University
Associate Professor, Learning Technologies
Department of Middle/Secondary Education & Instructional Technology

September 1997-2003  Georgia State University
Assistant Professor, Instructional Technology
Department of Middle/Secondary Education & Instructional Technology
Teaching duties include the following courses:

IT 2010E/2210: Integrating Technology into the Elementary Classroom (undergraduate)

IT 3210: Teachers and Technology (undergraduate)

IT 7360: Integrating Technology into School-Based Learning Environments/Technology for Educators (graduate; online and classroom versions) (Service Course Coordinator) (instructor of record for 3 sections, 2010)

IT 7100: Design of Performance and Instructional Systems (graduate, online)

IT 7150: Analysis of Performance and Instructional Systems (graduate. Online and classroom versions)

IT 7990: Master’s Project in Instructional Technology (graduate)

IT 814: Theory and Design of Computer-Assisted Instruction (graduate)

IT 8000: Foundations of Instructional Technology (graduate)

IT 8200: Diffusion and Adoption of Technological Innovations (graduate, online)

IT 8420: Trends in Instructional Technology: Theory of CAI (graduate)

IT 8420: Trends in Instructional Technology: Visual Communication (graduate)

IT 8500: Advanced Instructional Design (graduate, online and classroom versions)

EDCI 8400: Dynamics of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum Development (graduate)

EDCI 8810: Directed Reading (graduate)

EDCI 8900: Educational Inquiry (graduate)

EDCI 8960: Seminar in Leadership and Supervision in Teaching and Learning (graduate)

EDCI 9900: Critique of Educational Research (graduate, Ph.D. only)

EDCI 9660: Internship

ELMT 894T: Topics in Instructional Technology (graduate)


Kent State University

Aug. 1997

Instructor & Teaching Fellow, Instructional Technology

Department of Educational Foundations & Special Services
Teaching duties included the following courses.

Design & Production of Educational Media (graduate)

Principles of Educational Media (undergraduate)

Introduction to Microcomputers in Education (graduate/undergraduate)

Principles of Instructional Design (graduate)

Assisted in the teaching of the following courses:

Designing Computer-Assisted Instruction (graduate; supervised by Dr. D. Dalton)

Principles of Instructional Design (graduate; supervised by Dr. D. Dalton)

July, 1996-Aug. 1996 Kent State University

Teaching Fellow, Research and Graduate Studies

Teaching duties included orientation sessions, workshops and mentoring activities for newly appointed domestic and international graduate research and teaching assistants and teaching fellows.


School of Graduate Professional Studies, Great Valley

Campus Registrar & Trainer, Guest Instructor

Responsible to the Director of Graduate Program Administration for the variety of functions related to records, registration, class scheduling, data collection and distribution, and for the development and maintenance of related files, systems, and procedures for graduate and continuing education credit and non-credit courses, and bursar function. Supervised full-time staff of three along with multiple part-time staff.
Served as Guest Instructor to a variety of graduate courses in the topic areas of Instructional Design, Educational Psychology, Adult Learning, and Design of Computer-Based Instruction. Also served as University Trainer for a variety of software packages and their related tasks, including e-mail, relational database report calling, desktop publication, and other varieties of institutional research and publication.

Professional Affiliations and Honors

Memberships

- Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education
- Association for Educational Communications and Technology
~ Member, Definition and Terms Committee, 2009-present
~ Past-President, Teacher Education Division, 2001-2002
~ President, Teacher Education Division, 2000-2001
~ President-Elect, Teacher Education Division, 1999-2000
~ Member, November 2001 Conference Planning Committee
~ Division Chair, October 2000 Conference Planning Committee
~ Advisor, 2001 Conference Graduate Student Lounge
- American Educational Research Association
- International Society for Technology in Education
~ ISTE/National Educational Technology Standards 2000 Review Committee

Honors
Kent State University College of Education Excellence in Teaching Award as a Teaching Fellow (1997)

Kent State University Graduate Student Senate Teaching, Research, and Creative Achievement Award (1997)

Teaching Fellowship, Educational Psychology & Instructional Technology, Kent State University (1994–1997)

Teaching Fellowship, Research and Graduate Studies, Kent State University (1996)

Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) Cochran Intern Award for Outstanding Graduate Student in Educational Communications & Technology (1995)


Research and Scholarly Activities

Publications (peer-reviewed)

Stone D. E. & Shoffner, M.B. (accepted). Organizational change strategies of administrators in higher education distance learning program transformations. Distance Learning Administration Annual 2011


Shoffner, M. B. (2002). Using a Resource-Based Learning Environment to Foster Self-Directed Learning in In-Service Teachers. In C. Crawford et al. (Eds.), Proceedings of Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International Conference 2002 (pp. 903-904). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.


Publications (non-peer-reviewed)


Books:


Book Chapters:


Encyclopedia Entries:

Papers Presented at Professional Meetings:

Stone, D.E., & Shoffner, M.B. (accepted for 2011, May). Applying organizational development concepts to support online delivery capacity. Paper to be presented at the Distance Learning Administration Conference, Savannah, GA.


Regional Presentations

Brantley-Dias, L. & Shoffner, M.B. (2005, October). Technology integration in teacher education. A presentation for the Partners in Learning from the Ministry of Education, P.R. China at Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Reports


Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology (2003-2006). U.S. Department of Education grant for the research and development of initiatives to coordinate and increase the infusion of technology into pre-service education. Funded for $530,243 for the time period of October 2003- August 2006. Served as author/Co-Principal Investigator. Unpublished manuscript.


Funded Research & Development

MSIT Mobile Wireless Teaching Computer Laboratory (2008-2009). Georgia State University Information Systems and Technology Student Technology Fee Grant for the replacement of a two wireless teaching laboratories with access points on the 6th floor of the College of Education. Served as grant author, administrator, and evaluator. Requested funding amount $163,394.14. Proposal funded at 50% for $ 74,617.00. (Internal)

Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology (2003-2007). U.S. Department of Education grant for the research and development of initiatives to coordinate and increase the infusion of technology into pre-service education. Served as Co-Principal Investigator. Funded for $530, 243 for the time period of October 2003- October 2007. (External)
MSIT Mobile Wireless Teaching Computer Laboratory (2002-2003). Georgia State University Information Systems and Technology Student Technology Fee Grant for the establishment of a wireless teaching lab with access points on the 6th floor of the College of Education. Served as grant author, administrator, and evaluator. Proposal funded for $64,090. (Internal)

Instructional Computing Lab at Alpharetta Campus (2002-2003). Georgia State University Information Systems and Technology Student Technology Fee Grant for the establishment of a teaching laboratory for COE and COB classes at the Alpharetta North Metro Campus. Served as grant author, administrator, and evaluator. Proposal funded for $54,567. (Internal)

On-line Support and Portfolio Assessment for NETS-T Standards in Preservice Programs at Georgia State University (2000-2001). Georgia State University Center for Teaching and Learning PT3 mini-grant for the research and development of initiatives to coordinate and increase the infusion of technology into pre-service education. Served as lead author and project director. Funded for $14,680.13 for the period of November, 2000-August, 2001. Refunded for $9000.00 for the period of January 2002 – August 2002. (Internal)

A study of first year middle school teachers and their ability to integrate technology into the school (2000-2001). Georgia State University College of Education Scholarly Inquiry grant for the establishment of research initiatives. Served a major contributing author and member of project team. Funded for $3000 for the time period of October 2000 – June 2001. (Internal)

Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology (1999-2003). U.S. Department of Education grant for the research and development of initiatives to coordinate and increase the infusion of technology into pre-service education. Served as major contributing author. Funded for $808,813 for the time period of September 1999- August 2003. (External).

Non-Funded Research & Development

MSIT Mobile Wireless Teaching Computer Laboratories (2007-2008). Georgia State University Information Systems and Technology Student Technology FY2008 Fee Grant for the replacement
and extension of a wireless teaching lab with access points on the 6th floor of the College of Education. Served as grant author. Proposal requested funding of $134,042.14 (Internal)


Breaking Through the Barriers: Wireless Communication in the Mathematics Classroom (2001). Hewlett Packard High-Achieving Schools Initiative. Proposal detailed the development and assessment of a wireless laboratory for use with seven low income/high achieving schools to study factors contributing to success, integration of technology into the delivery of the mathematics curriculum, and to create a sustainable technological mathematics community. Funding of $222,500 was requested. Served as contributing author. (External)

Teaching and Learning Grant: Model Technology-Infused Course (1998). University System of Georgia grant for the redesign and development of a pre-service technology integration course. Proposal detailed the development of a resource-based, web-based learning environment for middle and secondary education students. Funding of $15,000 was requested. The initial learning environment was developed without funding. (External)

Dissertations Chaired


Note: Winner, MSIT Outstanding Doctoral Dissertation Award, 2010.

Note: Tsang Kosma (2011). University Staff Perspectives on Change Management Strategies in Student Information System Adoption Saarbrücken, Germany: LAMBERT.


Dissertations in Progress (Chair)


Millington, D. (in progress). Application of Kirkpatrick’s evaluation system to a blended learning solution at a large corporation: A single case study.


Thorsett, P. (in progress). The influence of perceived characteristics on college student on-line housing system adoption.


Special Competencies

Workshops
Sharing Thoughts and Ideas: Creating a Presentation Using MS PowerPoint (June, 2000). Workshop developed and presented to participants in the Peachtree Urban Writing Project at Georgia State University.

Sharing Thoughts and Ideas: Creating Cognitive Maps with Inspiration 5.0. (June 2000). Workshop developed and presented to participants in the Peachtree Urban Writing Project at Georgia State University.

Sharing Thoughts and Ideas: Creating a Presentation Using MS PowerPoint (June, 1999). Workshop developed and presented to participants in the Peachtree Urban Writing Project at Georgia State University.

Sharing Thoughts and Ideas: Creating Cognitive Maps with Inspiration 5.0 (June 1999). Workshop developed and presented to participants in the Peachtree Urban Writing Project at Georgia State University.

PowerPoint as an Alternative Student Presentation Format (June 1998), Workshop developed and presented to participants in the Peachtree Urban Writing Project at Georgia State University.

HyperStudio as an Alternative Student Presentation Format. (June 1998) Workshop developed and presented to participants in the Peachtree Urban Writing Project at Georgia State University.

Multimedia on Demand: Learn to Author Multimedia with HyperStudio (February, 1997) with M. Tipton. Workshop designed for K-12 and college faculty wishing to incorporate technology into their teaching methods. Workshop accepted as part of the program at the 1997 AECT National Convention in Albuquerque, New Mexico.
Syllabus and Schedule Planning (1996). Workshop presented to new graduate research and teaching assistant appointments as part of a weeklong orientation program. (Kent State University)

Kent State University Campus and Community Workshop (1996). History of Kent and an orientation to the campus and community presented to new graduate research and teaching assistant appointments as part of a weeklong orientation program.

CUSeeMe (1996). Workshop presented as part of a daylong "Infusing Technology into Teacher Education Workshop" for Kent State College of Education faculty guest facilitated by Dr. Landra Rezabek, University of Wyoming.

Introduction to ClarisWorks Word Processing (1994). Hands-on workshop presented to Kent State University College of Education students and administrative staff.

Consulting

Evaluation Consultant, ESEA/NCLB Title II, Part D. Enhancing Education Through Technology. Reviewed evaluation plans of awarded proposals and made suggestions for improvement in order to generate empirical, valid, and reliable indicator data.

Writing team member to revise and rewrite the ISTE/NCATE standards to align specialty technology preparation programs with NET standards, design rubrics for program review, and provide input on the supporting explanations for the revised standards and rubrics document submitted to NCATE. Advanced Program Standards adopted by NCATE June 2002.

Grant Peer Reviewer. Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology (PT3) Program. Year 1999 Tier I and Year 2000 Tiers I & II grant application reviewer. Reviewed a total of 25 grant applications each year, each requesting funding of approximately $1 million. A total of $75 million awarded each year.


Grant Peer Reviewer. Technology Literacy Challenge Grant. Reviewed submissions from throughout the state for nationally fund grant.

Kent State University, Center for Educational Leadership Studies (1995).

Data compilation and analysis of research in the area of local school teaching methodologies in comparison to standardized test scores.

Instructional Development Projects

A Guide to Emc2 (Penn State e-mail system) (1993). Training seminar presented to PSU registrars, faculty, and staff.

Development of the Schedule of Classes (1994). Training seminar and instructional manual for the production of the PSGV schedule of classes, presented to PSGV staff.


Mediated Productions

(Individual and team productions)
IT 7360 online learning environment (2008). Internet-based, resource-based learning environment for pre-service and in-service teachers. Includes resources in pedagogy, classroom management, diversity, information literacy, visual literacy, technology skills, and technology integration (major revision). Resides in password-protected LMS. 100% online course, text, and video resources.


IT 3210/7360 Resource-Based Learning Environment (2002). Internet-based, resource-based learning environment for pre-service and in-service teachers. Includes resources in pedagogy, classroom management, diversity, information literacy, visual literacy, technology skills, and technology integration. http://msit.gsu.edu/IT/Teachers/ [archived]


Kent State University, May 1970. (1995) An educational multimedia CD-ROM for grades 9-12 and college freshmen depicting the events leading to and including the shootings of four Kent State students by the Ohio National Guard.


Service

Department of Middle/Secondary Education & Instructional Technology


- Unit Leader, Learning Technologies (2008-2011). Serve as professor-in-charge of all Learning Technology programs, including the M.S. in Instructional Design & Technology, the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning, Instructional Technology emphasis, and the Ph.D. in Instructional Technology. Manage course scheduling and other administrative tasks for unit. Attend monthly Leadership Committee meeting with MSIT Department Chair and other Unit Leaders.
- Program Coordinator, Instructional Technology Online Teaching Endorsement (2010-present). Developed and oversee the teacher education endorsement in Online Teaching. Includes admissions review, advising, and compilation of data for accreditation.

- Coordinator, IT 7360 (1999-2011). Oversee the scheduling, staffing and teaching of IT 7360, Integrating Technology into School-Based Learning, a required course in many graduate teacher education programs. Interacts with the Office of Academic Assistance, the Dean's Office, multiple graduate programs for scheduling purposes, approving student requests for course substitutions, maintaining an online course learning environment, and interacting with faculty who use enrolled students and the course learning environment as a basis for research. Approve students from various non-IT programs for course waivers in order for students to earn certification. Beginning 2007, developed 100% asynchronous online version of course. Course is updated every semester.

- MSIT Faculty Annual Review Committee (2010 – present). Served as member to recommend procedure and conduct peer review of MSIT faculty.

- Mathematics Education Faculty Search Committee, Chair (2008-2009). Served as committee chair for search and interview process for a clinical faculty position in Mathematics Education.

- MSIT Promotion and Tenure Committee (2005, 2006-2008). Department-level committee; reviews candidate briefs for consideration for promotion to associate professor and for tenure. Submits recommendation to college committee, ACFPT. Also conducts third-year review of non-tenured faculty.


- Instructional Technology Faculty Search Committee, Chair (2007-2008). Served as committee chair for search and interview process for a clinical faculty position in LMT.
- Graduate Program Coordinator, MSIT (2004-2006). Managed the administrative functions of all graduate programs for the department chair as needed with the exception of the TEEMS programs.


- Instructional Technology Faculty Search Committee (2002-2003). Participated in the search and interview process for two tenure track positions in IT.

- Guest Speaker, IT 8000, Foundations in Instructional Technology (Fall, 2002). Discussed research experiences and establishment of personal research agenda.

- Instructional Technology/Library Media Search Committee, Chair (1999-2000). Served as committee chair for search and interview process for a tenure track position in IT/LMT.

- Instructional Technology/Library Media Faculty Search Committee (1997-98). Participated in the search and interview process for a tenure track position in IT/LMT.

- Instructional Technology Liaison – Middle Childhood Education (1998-present). Participated in the planning and portfolio review process for Middle Grades students. Developed guidelines and associated web site for the conversion of the IT 3210 Learning Environment Portfolio to the INTASC portfolio for junior and senior year review.


- Guest Speaker - EDCI 896 Seminar in Teaching and Learning (Spring, 1998). Discussed research experiences and establishment of personal research agenda.

- Guest Speaker – EDCI 8970 Seminar in Teaching and Learning (Spring, 2000). Discussed national technology standards for pre-service and in-service educators, as well as K-12 students.
GSU College of Education

- Student Affairs Committee, Chair. (2010-present). Addressed issues regarding student affairs for the college, including the awarding of college scholarships, distribution of student fees to student organizations for travel, and reviewing Student Academic Dishonesty Hearing procedures.

- Dean’s Advisory Committee (2010-present). Student Affairs representative to committee. Advises dean on college issues.

- College Committee for the Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty (2008-2009), Member. Reviewed dossiers for the five year review of tenured faculty.

- College Strategic Planning Faculty Retreat Co-Covener. (February, 2008), Co-Chaired workshop committee on alternative college structures.

- Professional Education Council (2004-2006) Chair, 2005-2006; Chair-elect, 2004-2005
  *March 2006 NCATE review


- Professional Education Committee Executive Council (2003-2006)

- Dean’s Research Advisory Council (2005-2006)

- COE Faculty Appeals Committee (2005-2006).

- Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology Grant Representative (September 1999 – August 2002). Represented GSU at meetings regarding the PT3 Federal Grant in Dallas, TX, Atlanta, GA, and Washington, D.C., as well as on campus.

- Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology Grant Advisory Committee (September 1999 – August 2000). Steering committee for the implementation of the PT3 Federal Grant.

- Technology for Teachers 1998 Regional Conference Planning Committee (December 1998) (Sponsored by the COE/Instructional Technology Center).

- Peachtree Urban Writing Project Workshop Instructor (1998-1999). Designed, developed, and delivered workshops in technology skills and technology integrated learning environments for PUWP participants.

Georgia State University
University Strategic Plan Writing Group (2004). Appointed by the Dean as one of three COE representatives to this committee chaired by the Provost to write the University 2005-2010 strategic plan.

Georgia State University Senate. Elected senator representing Department of Middle/Secondary Education & Instruction Technology (2003 – 2010)

Committees:

- Admissions and Standards (2003-04)
- Enrollment Management subcommittee (2003-04)
- Retention (Adhoc Subcommittee) (2003-04)
  - Academic Program Review Subcommittee (2004-07)
- School of Music Review Committee (2004-05)
- Department of Social Work Review Committee (2005-06)
- Department of Marketing Department Review Committee, Chair (2006-07)
  - Graduate Council (2005-07)
- President’s Commencement Committee (2003-04)
- Information Systems & Technology (IS&T) (2004-05; 2008-2009)
- University Standards and Senate Bylaws (2005-07)
- Planning and Development Committee (2008-2010)

Faculty Evaluator, BANNER Implementation Project, (2000). Serve as faculty evaluator for training modules and screen design of new administrative software (student information system).

Community at large


Technology Project Leader (1998). Medlock Bridge Elementary School, Fulton County School District. Coordinated with T. Sasso, teacher; designed, developed, and managed technology infused unit on the civil War for a fifth grade class.


National/Professional Organizations

Association for Educational Communications and Technology (2009 – present). Member, Definition and Terms Committee. Address changing definitions and domains of the field of Instructional Systems Design. Currently authoring/editing AECT Encyclopedia of Instructional Design and Technology Terminology for publication in 2012.


Association for Educational Communications and Technology Peer Reviewer – Research and Theory Division (2005). Participated in peer-review process for research papers for the
national meeting program and for inclusion in the Annual Research and Conference Proceedings Publication.

Association for Educational Communications and Technology (November, 2001 – November, 2002). Past-President, Teacher Education Division.

Association for Educational Communications and Technology (October, 2000 – November, 2001). President, Teacher Education Division.

Association for Educational Communications and Technology (November, 2000 - present). 2001 conference Graduate Student Lounge Planning Committee Adviser.

Association for Educational Communications and Technology (February 2000-October, 2000). President Elect, Teacher Education Division. Responsible for planning conference program and coordinating peer-review of papers.

Association for Educational Communications and Technology (May-July, 2000). Division chair, 2000 Conference Program Planning Committee.

Association for Educational Communications and Technology Peer Reviewer – Teacher Education Division (1999-2003). Participated in peer-review process for research papers for the national meeting program and for inclusion in the Annual Research and Conference Proceedings Publication.


Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) 2000 Conference Planning Committee. (February 1999 – February 2000). Evaluated feedback from 1999 national meeting In Houston, Texas, and assisted in the planning of the February 2000 national meeting in San Diego, California.


Association for Educational Communications and Technology Peer Reviewer – Research and Theory Division (1997-2000). Reviewed research proposals for the national meeting program and for inclusion in the Annual Research and Conference Proceedings Publication.

Association for Educational Communications and Technology Peer Reviewer – Design of Learning and Performance Environments Division (1996-1999). Reviewed research proposals for the national meeting program.

Association for Educational Communications and Technology National Meeting Session Chair – Design of Learning and Performance Environments Division (1997-1999).

Previous Institutional Service ((partial listing)

Kent State University, Department of Educational Foundations and Special Services, Academic Complaint Committee (1996-97). Graduate student representative. Mediated student complaints of an academic nature.

Kent State University, Department of Educational Foundations and Special Services, Faculty Search Committee (1995-96). Search to fill a faculty position in Instructional Technology and Educational Psychology.

Kent State University, College Of Education, Dean’s Graduate Student Advisory Committee (1994-1995). Apprised Dean of the College of the needs of graduate students.

The Pennsylvania State University, Office of Administrative Systems, OASIS (Open Access to Student Information System) Design Committee (1993-94). Designed screens for computer
program using graphical user interface and developed University recommendations and guidelines for screen design for future application development.

The Pennsylvania State University, Office of the University Registrar, Schedule of Classes Committee (1993-94). Revised Schedule of Classes publication and developed guidelines and best practices for the standardization of the Schedule of Classes at all 23 Penn State locations.

Penn State Great Valley, Information Sharing Committee, Chair (1991-1994). Facilitated monthly meetings of all campus constituencies for purpose of increasing interdepartmental communication.

Penn State Great Valley, Staff Development Committee (1992-94). Determined staff development needs and organized professional and personal training programs to meet needs.

Penn State Great Valley, Information Systems Committee (1991-94). Determined academic and administrative technology needs, developed three-year strategic plan for organization of campus information systems personnel and purchases.


References

Available upon request.

May, 2011.
Sullivan
Caroline Cecelia Sullivan

Curriculum Vita

Contact Georgia State University
College of Education
Department of Middle, Secondary, and Instructional Technology
30 Pryor Street, 601
Atlanta, GA 30303
770.402.1103 cellular
404.413.8404 office
ccsullivan@gsu.edu

Degrees Earned Doctor of Philosophy, 2007
College of Education, The University of Texas at Austin
Concentration in Curriculum Studies and Social Studies

Master of Arts in Education, 2001
College of Education, The University of Texas at Austin
Concentration: Curriculum and Instruction

Bachelor of Arts, 1993
College of Liberal Arts, Spanish Civilization, The University of Texas at Austin

Bachelor of Science, 1993
College of Communication, Speech Communication, The University of Texas at Austin

Texas Secondary Lifetime Teaching Certificate: Spanish & Speech Communication

College of Education, The University of Texas at San Antonio, 1996

Professional Appointments Assistant Clinical Professor, Department of Middle, Secondary, and Instructional Technology Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, 2011 - present
Assistant Professor, Department of Middle, Secondary, and Instructional Technology Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, 2007 - 2011

University Lead Facilitator/Seminar Instructor/Field Supervisor, The University of Texas at Austin, Secondary Social Studies Apprentice & Intern Level Teachers, 2003-2007

Teaching Assistant, The University of Texas at Austin, Academic and Professional Uses of Technology, Foundations of Data Analysis and Information Systems, Literacy Acquisition, Sociocultural Influences on Learning, 2001-2006

Invited Instructor, The University of Texas at Austin, Advanced Social Studies Methods, The Scholarship of Inquiry, Introduction to Curriculum Studies, 2003-07

Graduate Research Assistant, Learning Technology Center, IDEA Studio, Knowledge Innovation for Technology in Education Program (K.I.T.E. http://kite.missouri.edu/), The University of Texas at Austin, 2003-2004

Teacher, Speech Communication, Debate Team, Akins High School, Austin ISD, Austin, TX, 2001-02

Teacher, Spanish IA, IB, Language Discovery, Small Middle School, Austin ISD, Austin, TX, 1998-2001

Teacher, Spanish IA, IB, Language Discovery, Dobie Middle School, Austin ISD, Austin, TX, 1996-98

Scholarly Activity

Research Interests: socioconstructivist theory and pedagogy, epistemic cognition, critical historical thinking, authentic intellectual engagement, preservice teacher education and induction, social studies curriculum and pedagogy, middle / secondary level curriculum and pedagogy


Submitted Manuscripts and Presentations


Manuscripts in Preparation


Dissertation


Chair: Cinthia S. Salinas, Ph.D.

Research Projects

Georgia Coordinator, Representative and Principal Investigator, Social Studies Inquiry Research Collaborative (SSIRC), Fall 2008 – present

This national collaborative, sponsored by the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies, is a group of studies being conducted across the United States to determine how the kind of learning students experience in their social studies classes
affects student performances on both low and high thinking order assessments. This project involves supervising Graduate Research Assistant(s) over multiple semesters.

Grants Awarded:

Teaching American History Grant, (SHIFT: Seeing History in Focus Together), $1,000,000 DeKalb County Schools/Georgia State University, awarded for 3 years, 2009-2012

Dean’s Graduate Research Assistantship Grant, $12,000, College of Education, Georgia State University, 2008-09

Proposal Development/Internal Grants Program, Educational Research Bureau, $2,000, College of Education, Georgia State University, 2008

Proposal Development/Internal Grants Program, $3,000, College of Education, Georgia State University, 2007

The Office of Graduate Studies, The University of Texas at Austin, Professional Development Award, $1,000, 2006

Kappa Delta Pi, Marcella L. Kysilka Doctoral Student Scholarship in Curriculum Studies, $2,000, 2006

American Educational Research Association (AERA), Division B Travel Grant, San Francisco, $250, 2005

College and University Faculty Assembly (CUFA) / National Council for the Social Studies, (NCSS) Travel Grant, Kansas City, MO $250, 2005

Rotary Club of Eagle Pass, TX, Graduate Education Scholarship, $1,000, 2005

American Educational Research Association (AERA), Division B Travel Grant, Montreal, $250, 2005

College of Education, University of Texas at Austin, Field-based Funding Award, $3,000, 2005

Submitted – Not Funded:

The Spencer Foundation Dissertation Fellowship, $25,000, University of Texas at Austin, 2006

Presentations


accepted for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Sullivan, C.C. (2010, November). What is the role of epistemological stance in learning socioconstructivist social studies pedagogy? Paper accepted for presentation at the annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly, National Council of the Social Studies, Denver, CO.

Sullivan, C.C. (2010, November). Whom do I follow, university or school? Preservice teachers, standardized curriculum and historical thinking. Paper accepted for presentation at the annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly, National Council of the Social Studies, Denver, CO.

Social Studies Inquiry Research Collaborative (SSIRC). (2010, November). Authentic Pedagogy: Examining intellectual challenge in a national sample of social studies classrooms. Paper accepted for presentation at the annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly, National Council of the Social Studies, Denver, CO.


Tinker-Sachs, G., Junor-Clarke, P., Kinuthia, W., Lim, M., McGrail, E., Sullivan, C.C. (2010, October). The Challenges and Opportunities for Meeting the Needs of English Language Learners in the Midst of Education Reform. Invited panel speaker at the annual meeting of the Georgia Association of Teacher Educators, Atlanta, GA.


Advising and Related Student Service

Courses Developed

Honors 1000: City Schools: Urban Teaching and Learning

EDCI 7980: Teaching and Learning in Urban Contexts

Courses Taught Graduate

EDSS 8420: Topics in School Social Studies Curriculum, Spring 2011

EDCI 9660: Teaching Internship Faculty Supervisor, Summer 2010

HIST 8890 / EDSS 8420: Teaching American History SHIFT (Seeing History in Focus Together) Grant Courses, co-teaching with History and Elementary Education Faculty with DeKalb County Educators, Spring 2010-11

EDCI 9660: Research Internship Faculty Supervisor, Spring 2010

EDCI 7980: Teaching and Learning in Urban Contexts, Spring 2010-11

EDCI 8970: Seminar in Teaching and Learning, Spring 2009

EDCI 8810: Directed Reading: ESOL and Inservice Teacher Professional Development, Spring 2009

EDSS 7570: Social Studies Concepts and Issues, Fall 2007-11

EDCI 7660: Field Practicum I, Fall 2007-11

EDCI 7670/7680: Field Practicum II & III, Spring 2008-10

EDCI 7020: Middle Schools in a Diverse Society, Summer 2008-11

Undergraduate

HON 1000: Honors Freshman Seminar: Schools in the City: Urban Teaching and Learning, Fall 2011
EDSS 3400: Topics in Middle Grades Social Sciences / History, Fall 2011

Dissertation Committees

Aoulou, Eudes. (2011). Understanding how ESOL Preservice Teachers' Prior Experiences / Beliefs and Personal Background Shape their Processes of Becoming L2 (Reading) Teachers. Georgia State University, Dissertation Committee Member

Clemente, Robert, Dissertation Committee Member, Georgia State University, in progress

McCrorry, Keith. (2008). Social studies educators’ perceptions of and beliefs about the inclusion of religion in textbooks. Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia Dissertation Committee Member

Moore, Christopher, Dissertation Chair, Georgia State University, in progress

Randolph, Patricia, Dissertation Committee Member, Georgia State University, in progress

Ruiz, Amanda. (2011). Teachers and English Language Learners Experiencing the Secondary Mainstream Classroom: A Case Study. Georgia State University, Dissertation Committee Member.

Schewe, Audrey, Dissertation Chair, Georgia State University, in progress

Stevens, Heather, Dissertation Chair, Georgia State University, in progress

Wacker, Thomas. (2009). Autodidaxy in children: Understanding interest, the informal curriculum and engagement with rationalized systems of knowledge. The University of Texas at Austin, Dissertation Committee Member

Wood, Kevin, Dissertation Committee Member, Georgia State University, in progress

Program Advisor and Coordinator
Faculty Advisor, Social Studies Student Association, 2009 - present
Advisor, Teaching and Learning Social Studies Doctoral Students, 2007 - present
Program Coordinator & Advisor, Social Studies Master of Education Program Students, 2007 - present
Program Coordinator & Advisor, Middle Level Education (Language Arts/Social Studies), 2008 – present

Professional and Administrative Service
National Executive Board Member, College and University Faculty Assembly/National Council for the Social Studies, 2009-11

Program Co-Chair, College and University Faculty Assembly/National Council for the Social Studies Annual Conference, Atlanta, 2008-09

Secretary, Graduate Student Special Interest Group, CUFA/NCSS, 2005-06

University Georgia State University Presidential Investiture, Fall 2009

Georgia State University Commencement, Fall 2008-09

Curriculum Studies Elected Representative, Graduate Student Assembly, The University of Texas at Austin, 2006-07

Graduate Student Representative, College of Education Vision Plan Committee, The University of Texas at Austin, 2003-07

College of Education Member, AdHoc Committee on Developing an Innovative Master of Education Degree, Spring-Fall 2010

Member, College of Education Standards and Accreditation Committee, 2008-10

Professional Development Schools University Coordinator, DeKalb County Schools, Peachtree Charter Middle School, 2008-09

Member, AdHoc Committee on Middle Secondary Teacher Preparation, 2008

Member, College of Education Strategic Planning Committee, Georgia State University, 2008

Professional Development Schools University Coordinator, Atlanta Public Schools, Bunch Middle School, 2007-08

Faculty Volunteer, New Teacher Induction Conference, Georgia State University, 2007

Lead Facilitator, University Facilitator Training, Office of Education Experiences, College of Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 2004-07

President, Secretary, Kappa Delta Pi, Delta Chapter, The University of Texas at Austin, 2005-07

Department Member, Search Committee, Social Studies Education Clinical Faculty Search, Spring 2010

Member, Search Committee, Middle Childhood Education Clinical Faculty Search, Fall 2009
Member, Annual Faculty Review Development Committee, Spring 2009

Member, AdHoc Committee on Bylaws Revision, Fall 2008

Member, Steering Committee, Department Chairperson Search, 2008

Member, Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee, Department of Middle, Secondary, and Instructional Technology, Spring 2008, 2010

Co-chair, MSIT Ad Hoc Outreach Materials Committee, 2007

Professional Development Schools Annual Retreat, Atlanta, GA, 2008-09


MSIT Faculty Retreat, Chateau Elan Braselton, GA, 2008

MSIT Faculty Retreat, Brasstown Valley Resort, Young Harris, GA, 2007

Journal Reviewer Social Studies Research and Practice

Journal of Teacher Education

The Social Studies


Proposal Reviewer & Session Chair, American Educational Research Association (Division K, Constructivist Theory, Research, and Practice) and College and University Faculty Assembly, 2006-present

Travel Grant Proposal Reviewer, College and University Faculty Assembly Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., 2006

Local School Service Co-Chair, Campus Advisory Committee, 2000-02

Member, Exploratory Languages Textbook Committee, 1998-99

Chair, Foreign Language Department, 2000

Campus Coordinator, InteGrade Pro and Class XP Software, 2000-01
Member, Student Assistance Program Committee, 1999-2002

Professional Organizations
• American Educational Research Association
  • College and University Faculty Assembly
  • National Council for Social Studies
  • Georgia Council for the Social Studies
  • Kappa Delta Pi, Delta Chapter
  • The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi
  • Pi Lambda Theta, Psi Chapter

Professional Development
Center for Civic Education Seminar on Civil Rights Movement, Birmingham, AL, 2010

Center for Civic Education and Center for Social Studies and International Education at Indiana University, R. Freeman Butts Institute on Civic Learning in Teacher Education, Indianapolis, IN, 2010

Center for Civic Education and College of Education at the University of Florida Summer Institute on Constitutional Issues: The Supreme Court, Gainesville, FL, 2009


American Educational Research Association, Division B Graduate Student Seminar, Montreal, 2005
Gifted and Talented Certification, 1999

National Faculty-Smithsonian Institution Program, 1998


Nominated, William S. Livingston Outstanding Graduate Student Academic Employee Award, The University of Texas at Austin, 2005

Teacher of the Year, Clint Small Middle School, Austin ISD, Austin, Texas, 2001-02
Stinson
Curriculum Vitae (as of May 2011)

Name: David Wayne Stinson

Present Rank: Associate Professor

Tenure Status: Tenured

Graduate Faculty Status: Expires 2015

Department: Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology: Unit – Mathematics Education

Women's Studies Institute Affiliated Faculty (2007–)

Effective Date of Last Promotion: August 2010

EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Educational Institutions:

The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

Doctor of Philosophy—Mathematics Education 2004

Dissertation: African American Male Students and Achievement in School Mathematics: A Critical Postmodern Analysis of Agency

Committee: Drs. Denise S. Mewborn (Chair), Jerome E. Morris, George M. A. Stanic, Paola Sztajn, Dorothy Y. White
Educational Leadership Add-on—2004
Interdisciplinary Qualitative Studies Certificate—2004

Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia
Master of Education—Mathematics Education 1999
Post-baccalaureate Teacher Certification (108 quarter hours)—Mathematics 1995
Bachelor of Business Administration—Marketing 1985

Certificates:

State of Georgia Educator Certificate, Mathematics (6–12)—Level 7
State of Georgia Educator Certificate, Educational Leadership (P–12)—Level 7
The University of Georgia Interdisciplinary Qualitative Studies Certificate

Professional Employment History:

2010— Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA
Position: associate professor-mathematics education, College of Education: Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology: Unit – Mathematics Education

2004–2010 Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA
Position: assistant professor-mathematics education, College of Education: Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology: Unit – Mathematics Education

2000–2004 The University of Georgia, Athens, GA
Position: graduate assistant, College of Education: Department of
Mathematics Education

1995–2000 Fulton County School System: Westlake High School, Mathematics and Science Magnet, Atlanta, GA

Position: secondary mathematics teacher

1990–1992 Jerell, Inc., Dallas, TX (women’s apparel manufacturer)

Position: sales representative; territory: Georgia and Alabama

1989–1990 Gasparilla Designs, Boca Grande, FL (home interior design store)

Position: co-owner


Position: sales representative; territory: South Georgia


Positions: assistant buyer, sales manager, and head-of-sales

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, and Reviews

Published Articles (Refereed):


2194


Chapters in Books (Refereed):


Books and Monographs:


Book Reviews (Refereed):

Published Abstracts or Proceedings (Refereed):


Developed and edited an on-line [World Wide Web] newsletter PRIME News (Partnerships and Reform In Mathematics Education) for the Department of Mathematics Education at the
University of Georgia, a bi-monthly newsletter for secondary mathematics preservice and mentor teachers, 2000–2001

Submitted/In Progress Scholarly Writings:


Stinson, D. W. (in progress, May 2011). Practicing the science of culturally relevant mathematics pedagogy: Indeed, it is just good mathematics teaching! Teachers College Record.


Presentations at Professional Meetings (Refereed):
Stinson, D. W. (2011, April). Opening different spaces for different statements about urban mathematics education, paper presented at the research symposium Who decides what counts as mathematics education research? (Chair: Dr. Rochelle Gutiérrez) at the Research Presession of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Indianapolis, IN.


Stinson, D. W. (2009, April). Negotiating the “White male math myth”: African American male students and success in school mathematics, paper presented at the research symposium Moving beyond the “gap-gazing” fetish: Exploring mathematics learning and participation as racialized forms of experience (Chair: Dr. David Stinson; Discussant: Dr. Danny Martin) at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Stinson, D. W. (2009, April). Negotiating the “White male math myth”: African American male students and success in school mathematics, paper presented at the research symposium Mathematics as racialized forms of experience (Chair: Dr. David Stinson; Discussant: Dr. Rochelle Gutiérrez) at the Research Preession of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Washington, DC.


Mewborn, D. S., & Stinson, D. W. (2004, April). We heard, we saw, we did: The impact of consistent experiences in a teacher education program, paper presented at the research symposium Building practice from the ground up: Potential of early field experiences (Chair: Dr. Denise Mewborn; Discussant: Dr. Lew Romagnano) at the Research Presession of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA.


Awards and Grants:

Funded external awards:

2009 National Science Foundation: Mathematics Attainment and African American Students: Discourse from Multiple Perspectives; PI: Dr. Jacqueline Leonard (Temple University); Co-PIs: Drs. Erica Davila (Arcadia University) and David Stinson; submitted: $197,467.00 November 2008; awarded September 2009

Funded internal awards:

2008 Georgia State University, Proposal Development Grant; PIs: Drs. Chara Bohan and David Stinson; submitted: $6,000.00 August 2008; awarded September 2008

Submitted and/or unfunded external awards:

2010 National Science Foundation – Math and Science Partnership Grant: Targeted: Partnership for Student Achievement in Mathematics (PSAM); PI: Dr. Christine Thomas; Co-PIs: Drs. David Stinson, Janice Fournillier, Draga Vidakovic, and Dottie Whitlow; submitted: $9,999,116.00 October 2010; not funded February 2011

2009 Institute of Education Science: Education Research Grant Programs – Mathematics and Science Education: Developing a Social Justice Mathematics Curriculum for a Ninth-Grade, Integrated Mathematics Course; PI: Dr. David Stinson; Co-PI: Dr. Chara Bohan; submitted: $1,334,461.00 September 2009; not funded May 2010
Institute of Education Science: Education Research Grant Programs – Mathematics and Science Education: Teaching for Social Justice: Developing an Interdisciplinary Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies Curriculum; PI: Dr. David Stinson; Co-PIs: Drs. Chara Bohan, Joseph Feinberg, Miyoun Lim; LOI submitted: $1,125,000 April 2009; LOI declined May 2009


Institute of Education Science: Education Research Grant Programs – Teacher Quality-Mathematics and Science Education: Establishing Urban Professional Development Community Schools: Teacher Preparation That Enriches Schools and Society; PI: Dr. David Stinson; Letter of Intent submitted: $1,425,000.00 April 2008; LOI declined May 2008

Evidence of Peer Recognition and Reputation:

Significant professional service:

Editor-in-chief: Journal of Urban Mathematics Education (JUME) – a peer-reviewed, open-access, academic journal developed by faculty members of mathematics education at GSU; see: http://education.gsu.edu/JUME. (Term as editor-in-chief began with Vol. 2, No. 2; copy and production editor)

Co-founder and associate editor JUME (and copy and production editor: Vol. 1, No. 1; Vol. 2, No. 1 & 2)


Manuscript reviewer for the following scholarly journals (number of times):
- American Educational Research Journal (3)
- Educational Researcher (3)
- International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (1)
- Journal for Research in Mathematics Education (4)
- Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education (1)
- Journal of Teacher Education (2)
- Mathematical Thinking and Learning: An International Journal (2)
- Review of Educational Research (4)
- The Mathematics Educator (8)
- Teachers College Record (1)
- Urban Education (1)

Manuscript reviewer for the following scholarly publishing companies (number of times):
- Sage Publications: Learner-Centered Instruction: Building Relationships for Student Success (2)

Proposal reviewer for the following conferences:
- NCTM Research Presession, Indianapolis, IN, 2011
- NCTM Research Presession, San Diego, CA, 2010
- American Educational Research Association Review Panel: Division G (Social Context of Education) Section 2 (Education in Multicultural Contexts Within and Across Subject Areas), Denver, CO, 2010
- North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education, Mérida, Yucatán, Mexico, 2006

Proposal reviewer for the following proceedings:


Recognition by scholarly and professional associations:


Stinson, D. W. (2010, November). Invited keynote speaker at the Multicultural Teaching and Learning Institute: Culturally Sensitive Pedagogy in Higher Education: Is there a need (or space) for culturally relevant pedagogy in higher education? Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN.

Stinson, D. W. (2010, October). Invited participant at the National Science Foundation funded summit: Mathematics attainment and African American students: Discourse from multiple perspectives, University of Colorado at Denver, Denver, CO.

Stinson, D. W. (2010, April). Invited keynote speaker at the National Science Foundation funded conference: Midwestern Noyce Regional Conference – Preparing Excellent STEM Teachers for Urban and Rural High-Need Schools: Practicing the science of culturally relevant mathematics pedagogy: Indeed, it is just good mathematics teaching! Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN.

Stinson, D. W. (2009, September). The many roles of an academic professional: Author, reviewer, and editor. Invited speaker to Advanced Seminar in Qualitative Research EPS 8970, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Stinson, D. W. (2009, September). The proliferation of theoretical paradigms quandary: How one novice researcher used eclecticism as a solution? Invited speaker to Research Seminar in Language and Literacy and Social Studies Education EDCI 9850, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Stinson, D. W. (2009, July). Invited participant at Case Study Data Camp (a National Science Foundation funded week-long workshop examining an extensive qualitative dataset on successful African American mathematics teachers of African American students), University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Stinson, D. W. (2009, March). Tips for writing in the academic community. Invited speaker to Advanced Research Seminar in Language and Literacy Education EDRD 9870, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

MSIT Brown Bag Series: Race, Class, and Culture in Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Stinson, D. W. (2009, February). Negotiating sociocultural discourses: The counter-storytelling of academically (and mathematically) successful African American male students. Invited speaker to Education and Cultural Diversity EDS 771, Division of Educational Studies, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.


Stinson, D. W. (2006, March). The theoretical paradigm quandary: Eclecticism as a solution? Invited speaker to Ethnography II EPTD 8510, College of Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Stinson, D. W. (2005, July). Expanding science: What are they so afraid of? Invited speaker to the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology-Mathematics Education Unit, Doctoral Research Seminar, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.
Stinson, D. W. (2005, March). African American male students and school mathematics, Invited speaker to the Department of Mathematics Education, Mathematics Education Student Association Colloquium, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.


TEACHING

Teaching Assignments:

Georgia State University:

EDMT 8430 Sociocultural and Sociohistorical Issues of Mathematics Education; times taught: 3; enrollment average: 13 students

EDMT 8420/EDMT 8290 Critical Theory and Teaching for Social Justice (Topics in School Mathematics Curriculum/The Study of Learning and Instruction in Mathematics); times taught: 3; enrollment average: 15 students

EDMT 8420/EDMT 8290 Mathematics within the Postmodern (Topics in School Mathematics Curriculum/The Study of Learning and Instruction in Mathematics); times taught: 3; enrollment average: 9 students

EDMT 8290 What is Mathematics, Really? (The Study of Learning and Instruction in Mathematics); times taught: 1; enrollment average: 15 students
EDMT 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction; times taught 1; enrollment average: 6 students (MED-MTE)

EDMT 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction; times taught: 4; enrollment average: 10 students (MAT-MTE)

EDMT 6560 Principles of Mathematics Instruction; times taught: 2; enrollment average: 7 students (MAT-MTE)

EDCI 9900 Critique of Education Research (Mathematics Education Ph.D. Students Only); times taught: 1; enrollment average: 7 students

EDCI 8970 Seminar in Teaching and Learning (Introduction to the Ph.D. in Mathematics Education); times taught: 2; enrollment average: 10 students

EDCI 8970 Seminar in Teaching and Learning (Foucault in Education); times taught: 1; enrollment average: 10 students

EDCI 8810 Directed Reading; times taught: 3; enrollment average: 2 students
(Overview of Mathematics Education; Philosophy of Mathematics; Feminist Pedagogy)

EDCI 8400 Dynamics of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum Development; times taught 2; enrollment average: 16 students

EDCI 7680 Practicum III; times taught 4; enrollment average: 6 students (MAT-MTE)

EDCI 7670 Practicum II; times taught 4; enrollment average: 6 students (MAT-MTE)
EDCI 7660 Practicum I; times taught 4; enrollment average: 6 students (MAT-MTE)

EDCI 6660 Introduction to Secondary Instruction; times taught 4; enrollment average 10 students (MAT-MTE)

EDUC 2120 Exploring Sociocultural Perspectives on Diversity; times taught 3; enrollment average: 23 students

GSU 1010 New Student Orientation (Freshman Learning Community): Careers in Mathematics and Science Education; times taught 1; enrollment average: 22 students

University of Georgia:

EMAT 8990 Research Seminar in Mathematics Education: Rethinking Mathematics Education from a Critical Pedagogy Perspective (co-created and -taught); times taught: 1; average enrollment: 9 students; spring 2001

EMAT 6000 Special Problems in Mathematics Education: Sociocultural and Sociohistorical Issues of Mathematics Education (co-created and -taught); times taught: 1; average enrollment: 13 students; spring 2004


Westlake High School:

Advanced Placement Calculus, Advanced Placement Statistics, Honors Pre-Calculus, Accelerated Advanced Algebra & Trigonometry, Accelerated Honors Algebra II, Honors Algebra II,

Courses Developed:

EDMT 8290 What is Mathematics, Really? (within existing course number), co-creator and instructor (with Kimberly White-Fredette, doctoral student), summer 2007

EDMT 8430 Sociocultural and Sociohistorical Issues of Mathematics Education, creator and instructor (new course number), spring 2007, spring 2008, spring 2009

EDMT 8420/EDMT 8290 Critical Theory and Teaching for Social Justice (within existing course numbers), creator and instructor, spring 2006, fall 2008, fall 2009

EDMT 8290/EDMT 8420 Mathematics within the Postmodern (within existing course numbers), creator and instructor, summer 2004, summer 2005, spring 2009

EDCI 8970 Foucault in Education (within existing course number), creator and instructor, spring 2010

Graduate Student Committees:

13 PHD students, major professor, in progress:
Randall Archer, Erika Bullock, Jennifer Feenstra, Pamela Hughes, Jason Hunter, Bradley McPhail, Kasele Mshinda, Gerard Petty, Dean Potts, Ginny Powell, Katrina Stanfield, John Wamsted, Candance Williams

4 PHD students, major professor, completed:
• Carla Bidwell: Successful White Mathematics Teachers of African American Students, fall 2010
• Barry Shildneck: Female Students and Achievement in Secondary School Mathematics, fall 2009
• Christopher Jett: African American Men and College Mathematics: Gaining Access and Attaining Success, summer 2009
• Kimberly White-Fredette: What is Mathematics: An Exploration of Teachers’ Philosophies of Mathematics During a Time of Curriculum Reform, summer 2009

5 PHD students, committee member, in progress:
Dorothy Lewis Grace, Jacqueline Hennings, Becky Patterson, Brandon Lewis (ECE), Jeffrey Morrison (EPS)

1 PHD student, committee member, completed:
• Carol Taylor: Promoting Mathematical Understanding through Open-Ended Tasks: Experiences of an Eight-Grade Gifted Geometry Class, spring 2008

4 EDS students, major professor, completed:
• Dean Potts: Professional Portfolio, fall 2010
• Cassandra Accurso: Professional Portfolio, spring 2009
• Angela McCreery: Algebra I Revisited: Beginning at the End in a Gateway Mathematics Course, fall 2007
• Carl Chernard: Using Writing to Improve Student Achievement in the Mathematics Classroom, fall 2006

3 MED students, in progress

16 MED students, completed:
• Laura Stott, spring 2011
• Lindell Coker, summer 2010
- Jamie Fitzpatrick, summer 2010
- Carri Carver, fall 2009
- David Girmay, summer 2009
- Lauren McKinley, summer 2009
- Kirsten Scott, summer 2009
- Wenona Young, summer 2009
- Monica Vestal, spring 2009
- Tasha Allen, fall 2008
- Sandra Bradley, fall 2008
- Amy Buchanan, fall 2008
- Danielle Shea, fall 2008
- Erica Bullock, summer 2008
- Katrina Stanfield, summer 2008
- Candace Williams, summer 2008

Honors and Awards:

Georgia State University
- Nominated for Outstanding Faculty Teaching Award 2010–2011, Georgia State University, College of Education
- Nominated for Outstanding Faculty Achievement Award 2009–2010, Georgia State University
- Nominated for Outstanding Faculty Teaching Award 2009–2010, Georgia State University, College of Education
- Nominated for Outstanding Faculty Teaching Award 2007–2008, Georgia State University, College of Education
Westlake High School

- Teacher of the Year, Finalist, 2000
- The Atlanta Journal & Constitution Honor Teacher Award Nominee, 1999
- Magnet Educator of the Year—Math Teacher of the Year, 1999
- Georgia Institute of Technology: Center for Education Integrating Science, Mathematics, and Computing (CEISMC), Georgia Industrial Fellowships for Teachers (GIFT) Fellow

Impact on Students:

Summary of student evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Times</th>
<th>Taught Number of Students</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Average: All 12 Questions1</th>
<th>Question 13: Overall Teaching Effectiveness2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDMT 8430</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMT 8420</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMT 8290</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMT 7560</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMT 6560</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 9900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 8970</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 7
21 3
19 5.0
4.9 5.0
5.0

EDCI 8970 1 9 8 5.0 5.0
EDCI 8400 2 33 31 4.8 4.8
EDCI 6600 4 41 37 4.7 4.6
EDUC 2120 3 69 58 4.7 4.7
GSU 1010** 1 22 16 3.7 3.8

Note: 1Scale is from 1.0–5.0, with 5.0 = Very Descriptive. 2Scale is from 1.0–5.0, with 5.0 = Extremely Effective.

EDCI 7660/7670/7680* 12/12 – 4.7 and 4.7
* Only the 2007–2008 cohort of 6 students completed evaluation form for practicums I and II/III.

** GSU 1010 uses the College of Arts and Sciences Evaluation of Instructor form, 17 total questions. Scale is from 1.0–5.0, with 5.0 = Very High.

Evidence of student achievement

Collaborative work with students:


Published work by students (selected):


SERVICE

Service to the Profession:

- Membership:
  - American Association of University Professors (AAUP)
  - Benjamin Banneker Association (BBA)
  - Lambda Theta Pi
  - Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN)
  - Georgia Council of Teachers of Mathematics (GCTM)
  - Georgia Association of Mathematics Teachers Educators (GaAMTE)
  - National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)
- Partnership for Reform in Science & Mathematics (PRISM)


Metro Atlanta Regional PRISM Teaching and Learning Institute. Mableton, GA, October 15–16, 2006

Improving Student Learning in Introductory Science, Math, and Engineering Courses. Atlanta, GA, January 26, 2006


How Do We Access Our Students in Our Courses? How Can We Do It Better? Savannah, GA, February 25–26, 2005

Fostering and Rewarding Faculty Engagement in P–16 Education, Atlanta, GA, February 17–18, 2005

Service to the Community:

- Membership:
  - American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)
  - National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
  - The Carter Center
- University System of Georgia Early College Curriculum Working Group, Atlanta, GA, April 14–15, 2005; November 3–4, 2005
- Georgia Department of Education Office of Curriculum and Instruction, Preparing Teachers to Teach the New GPS, Atlanta, GA, February 3–4, 2005
Service to the University:

Department:

• Unit Leader – Mathematics Education, 2009–2011
• Program Coordinator for Master of Education-Mathematics Education, 2005–
• Program Co-coordinator for Doctor of Philosophy in Teaching and Learning-
  Mathematics Education (Lead coordinator 2009–) 2005–
• Member, Leadership Team, 2009–2011
• Member, Advanced Graduate Degree Committee, 2008–2009
• Member, Faculty Search Committee for assistant/associate/full mathematics education professor, 2008–2009
• Member, Ad Hoc Committee to Develop MSIT 2008 Bylaws, 2008
• Member, Committee on Diversity, 2005–2007
• Co-developed Bachelor of Science-Master of Arts for Teachers (BS-MAT) program (a seamless, 5-year program of study for students who are earning a Bachelor of Science degree in mathematics or engineering), 2006–2007
• Co-writer in redesigning the Doctor of Philosophy in Teaching and Learning with a Concentration in Mathematics Education degree program, 2005–2008
• Co-developed mission statement, goals and activities, administrative structure of Institute for Mathematics Education, 2005–2007
• Member, Faculty Search Committee for associate/full mathematics education professor, 2006–2007


College:

• Member, Dean’s Faculty Advisory Committee, 2009–2011
• Co-Project Coordinator, Urban Graduate Research Collaborative, 2008–2011
• Member, Ad Hoc Committee on Doctor of Education Degree Program, 2008
• Chair, Committee on Diversity of the College Community, 2009–2011
  o Member, Committee on Diversity of the College Community, 2006–2011
  o Coordinator of sub-committee on Environment 2006–2008
• Spearheaded Informal Exploratory Committee for Interdisciplinary Qualitative Research Certificate, 2005–2006
• Member, Selection Committee for Urban Graduate Research Assistants for COE’s Urban Graduate Research Collaborative, May 2005
• Member, Dean’s Council on Diversity (UGA), 2003–2004

University:

• Lead contact for LGBTQ Faculty Learning Community, under the direction of the Senior Faculty Associate for Underrepresented Faculty, Dr. Cora Presley, 2009–2010
• Safe Space provider to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people (UGA), 2003–2004

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Conferences Attended (but did not present):
• Annual Conference of Georgia Council of Teachers of Mathematics, October 19, 2007, Eatonton, GA

• Annual Conference of Georgia Council of Teachers of Mathematics, October 19, 2006, Eatonton, GA.

• Annual Conference of Interdisciplinary Qualitative Studies, January 6–8, 2006, Athens, GA.

• Annual Conference of National Association for Multicultural Education, November 9–13, 2005, Atlanta, GA.

• Annual Conference of Georgia Council of Teachers of Mathematics, October 20, 2005, Eatonton, GA.

• International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry, May 5–7, 2005, Urbana-Champaign, IL.

• Annual Conference of Georgia Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Mathematics, October 14, 2004, Eatonton, GA.

Workshops:

• The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) Grant Writing Workshop (Webinar), Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, May 20, 2008

• Critical Friends Training, National School Reform Faculty – Harmony Education Center, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, October 22, 2007

• Institute for Communication Improvement, The Grant Institute, Grants 101: Professional Grant Proposal Writing; Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, April 18–20, 2007.

Courses Audited:

• WSt 8290, Youth and Sexualities, Dr. Susan Talburt, Georgia State University, spring 2006
Secondary Education Professional Development:

- Alternative Assessment for Algebra I and Geometry (70 hrs)
- Algebra I CORD Applied Mathematics (40 hrs)
- Texas Instrument TI-82 (20 hrs)
- Technology in the Classroom (16 hrs)
- Gifted Education (10 hrs)
- Mini-tab Statistical Software (8 hrs)

The College Board Summer Institutes:

- Advanced Placement Calculus (40 hrs)
- Advanced Placement Statistics (40 hrs)
- Pacesetter Pre-calculus (60 hrs)
Thomas
Christine D. Thomas, PhD

Curriculum Vita

______________________________________________________________________

Associate Professor Mathematics Education

Middle/Secondary Education & Instructional Technology

Georgia State University

Atlanta, Georgia 30303

(404) 413-8065

cthomas11@gsu.edu

Education:

1993  Ph.D.  Mathematics Education; Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

1987  Ed.S.  Mathematics Education; Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

1984  M.Ed.  Mathematics Education; Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia

1979  B.S.  Mathematics  Valdosta State College, Valdosta, Georgia

Professional Experience:

2002--present  Georgia State University; Associate Professor, Mathematics Education

2006---2008  Georgia State University, Chair Mathematics and Science Education Division

1995 -2002  Georgia State University; Assistant Professor, Mathematics Education

1994-1995  Clark Atlanta University, Assistant Professor, Mathematics Education

1993-1995  Clark Atlanta University, Associate Director of the MASTER Institute for Teachers

1979-1993  Fulton County School System, Atlanta, Georgia, Mathematics Teacher,
Research and Scholarly Activities:

Refereed Publications:


Refereed Papers


Invited Speaker:


Presentations (2001-2011):


Thomas, C.D., & Dillon, F. (July 2010). Focus on High School Mathematics: Reasoning and Sense Making, Robert Noyce Program Conference National Science Foundation


Funded Projects
2011     Principal Investigator, Teacher Quality, Collaborative for Mathematics and Science Achievement, $58,000

2011     Principal Investigators, Mathematics and Science Partnership Fulton County Schools and Georgia State University, Awarded, $300,000

2009     Principal Investigator, National Science Foundation, Robert Noyce: Urban Mathematics Educator Program, Awarded $93,805*

2005-2011 Principal Investigator, National Science Foundation Robert Noyce: Urban Mathematics Educator Program, Awarded: $653,803*

2007-2009 Principal Investigator, Mathematics and Science Partnership Grant: Georgia State University and Clayton County Public Schools; Awarded $160,000

2007-2009 Principal Investigator, Mathematics and Science Partnership Grant: Georgia State University and Rockdale County Public Schools, Awarded $120,000.

2007-2008 Principal Investigator, Improving Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant; The Mathematics Initiative for Leadership Enhancement II. Awarded: $60,000

2006-2007 Principal Investigator, Improving Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant; The Mathematics Initiative for Leadership Enhancement. Awarded: $45,000

2005-2006 Principal Investigator, Improving Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant, Secondary Mathematics Initiative for Leadership Enhancement Awarded: $38,000
2005- 2006 Co-Principal Investigator, PRISM Institute Mini-Grant for University Faculty Urban Teacher Researcher Collaborative: A PRISM Professional Learning Community (UTRC-PRISM PLC) Awarded: $12,000

Teaching

Courses Taught at GSU:

EDCI 9900 Critique of Education Research: Mathematics Education
EDCI 9850 Doctoral Seminar Mathematics Education
EDMT 9870 Advanced Research Seminar: Mathematics Education
EDCI 8950 Educational Inquiry
EDMT 8550 Trends and Issues of Teaching Mathematics Teaching
EDMT 8420 Topics in the Mathematics Curriculum: Geometry
EDMT 8290 Learning and Instruction in Mathematics
EDMT 7560 Theory and Pedagogy of Mathematics Instruction
EDCI 7680 Practicum III
EDCI 7670 Practicum II
EDCI 7660 Practicum I
EDCI 6600 Introduction to Secondary Teaching
EDMT 6550 Principles of Mathematics Instruction

Chair of 18 Doctoral Committees in Mathematics Education 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Brown</td>
<td>Course Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynwall Clarke</td>
<td>Prospectus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher DeCastro</td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dante Edwards  
Anthonia Ewuocha  
Isaac Gitonga  
Jacqueline K. Henning  
Laurn Jordan  
Dorothy Lewis-Grace  
Marsha McCrary-Barron  
Bhupinder Naidu  
Becky Patterson  
Tammie Scott  
Luba Sengova  
Mary Beth Rogers  
Rabia Shahbaz  
Nathalie Smalls  
Umamaheswari Subramanian

Faculty Advisor:

Educational Specialist Degree Program Teaching and Learning in Mathematics

2010 Graduates

Rebecca Backfisch
Tekeshia Davis
Lisa Phillips
Dean Potts
Nathalie Smalls
Chair of Doctoral Students Completing Degree (2001-2009)


Desha Williams, (December 2007). Student Teaching in an urban context: Student teachers' views and construction of identities.


Sandra Canterbury (December 2006). An investigation of urban 8th grade middle school students' ability to compute and conceptualize fractions.

Walter Cotter (December 2006). Comparison of three methods of placement and advisement into freshmen mathematics courses and the effect on eventual degree completion.
Dorothy Whitlow (August 2006). Mathematics Program Acceleration Experience for Mathematically Promising Students: A Phenomenological Study


Scholarship of Teaching Products:

Georgia on My Line (GMOL) (2007): Developed the online degree program for the Master’s of Education Degree in Mathematics Education

Georgia Performance Standards; Advisory Committee Member for review and revision of High School Mathematics Standards (2005)—Curriculum development/revision.


Delivery of Instructional Workshops

Tier III Mathematics Academy, DeKalb County Public Schools, Fall 2010

Teaching Geometry, Clayton County Public Schools, Fall 2009

The Mathematics Initiative for Leadership Enhancement; Summer 2006 Academic Session with Academic Year Follow Up; DeKalb County Schools Secondary Mathematics Teachers.

The Secondary Mathematics Initiative for Leadership Enhancement, Summer 2005 Session with Academic Year Follow Up; Atlanta Public School Secondary Mathematics Teachers.

Urban Teacher-Researcher Collaborative; Summer 2004 Academic Session with Academic Year Follow Up; Atlanta Public Schools and DeKalb County Schools Middle/Secondary Mathematics Teachers.


Service

University & College Service:

- TEA Instructor for Mathematics 2011
- Coach in Residence NET-Q, 2010 - 2012
- Committee Member, Professional Education Committee 2003-2005
- Committee Member, Advisory Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure 2003-2005
• Committee, Committee on Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty 2004-2006
• Liaison for Partner School, Kimberly Elementary 2003-2005
• Committee Member, Revision of Guidelines (Research and Scholarly Activities) for Promotion and Tenure Review in the College of Education 2004-2005.
• Mathematics Education Member of Partnership for Reform In Science and Mathematics (PRISM), Atlanta Metro Region 2004-2006
• Member, PRISM Learning Academy Georgia State University 2005-present
• Chair Mathematics and Science Education Division 2006—2008

Department Service
Academic Program Review Committee 2011
Coordinator Educational Specialist Degree Program 2007-2011
Coordinator Doctoral Program Mathematics Education 2005-2008
Promotion and Tenure Committee Member 2007 – 2011
Advisor Educational Specialist Teaching and Learning Mathematics Education 2007 -2011
Mathematics Unit Coordinator 2003-2006
TEEMS Coordinator (MAT Degree Program, Mathematics Education) 2001-2003

Community Service
Mathematics Education Consultant Atlanta Public Schools
Mathematics Education Consultant Clayton County Public Schools
Mathematics Education Consultant DeKalb County School System
Mathematics Education Consultant Fulton County Schools
Mathematics Education Consultant Rockdale County Public Schools

National Service
2011  National Science Foundation’s Committee of Eight for Review of Guidelines: Math and Science Partnership Program

2010  Review Panel Member, National Science Foundation, Math and Science Partnership Program

2010-2011  Program Committee Member, Focus on High School Mathematics National Institute for Mathematics Teachers and Teacher Leaders, NCTM

2008-2011  Member of Board of Directors, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics

2008-2011  Mathematics Teacher, Editorial Panel Member

2010  Reviewer, Urban Education

2009  Co-Chair Program Committee, Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Psychology of Mathematics Education 2009

2009  Reviewer American Educational Research Association Division K, Urban

2009  Member of Planning Committee Robert Noyce Scholars PI Conference

2009  Reviewer Focus in High School Mathematics, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics

2009  Journal Editorial Panel, Mathematics Teacher

2009  Journal Editor, Journal for Urban Mathematics Education

2009  Member Nominations and Election Committee, Association of Mathematics Teacher Educators

2009  Reviewer North American Chapter Psychology of Mathematics Education

2009  Reviewer Teacher Quality Grant
2009 Psychology of Mathematics Education North American Chapter, Annual Conference Co-Chair and Steering Committee Member
2009 National Science Foundation Principal Investigators’ Conference Member of Planning Committee
2008 Discussant American Educational Research Association Annual Conference Division K
2007 Co-Chair, Local Arrangements Committee, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
2004 – 2006 Reviewer National Science Foundation
2005 Chair Review Panel National Science Foundation

Statewide
Georgia Coalition for Science Mathematics and Technology Education, Executive Committee Member 2010
Georgia Department of Education Advisory Committee Member for Common Core Georgia Performance Standards 2010-2011
Georgia Department of Education, committee for ECOT cut off scores, Math I and II, December 2009
Advisory Committee Member, Georgia Performance Standards High School Mathematics 2005-present
Executive Committee Member, Georgia Council of Teacher of Mathematics, 2001-2006

Professional Affiliations
American Education Research Association
Association of Mathematics Teacher Educators
Benjamin Banneker Association
European Teacher Education Network Urban Education Thematic Interest Group
Georgia Council of Teachers of Mathematics
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics
Psychology of Mathematics Education-International Chapter and North American Chapter
Research in Mathematics Education, Special Interest Group
Teacher Induction, Special Interest Group
Urban Learning and Teaching Research, Special Interest Group

Honors and Awards

Appointed Chair Nominations and Elections Committee Association of Mathematics Teacher Educators 2010

Elected to Steering Committee for the Psychology of Mathematics Education North American Chapter (2008-2010)
Recognized as top producer of doctoral students in Mathematics Education 2008

Elected to Board of Directors National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (2009 -2011)

Selected for Gladys M. Thomason Award 2005, Georgia’s Most Outstanding Mathematics Educator, presented by the Georgia Council of Teacher of Mathematics.

Selected for Excellence in Mathematics Teaching (2003), presented by the Mathematics Education Faculty Georgia State University.
Tinker Sachs
Curriculum Vitae Gertrude Marilyn Tinker Sachs

Position Associate Professor (with tenure)
ESOL Language, Literacy
Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology Department
College of Education, P. O. Box 3978
Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303-3083

Office Address
Room 647, MSIT, College of Education
Phone: 404-413-8384
Fax: 404-413-8063
email: gtinkersachs@gsu.edu

Education
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
1989 Department of Curriculum, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.

Focus of Studies: Reading and Language Development
Dissertation Topic: An Investigation into Levels of Knowledge and Reading Comprehension
Committee Members: Carl Bereiter (chair), Dale Willows and Michael Canale; University External Examiner – Ellen Bialystock (York University)

Master of Education (M.A.)
1984 Department of Curriculum, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education,
University of Toronto.

- Focus of Studies: Reading
- Dissertation Topic: Dialect and Reading: A Question of Interference

Master of Science in Education (M.Sc.) (part-time, Bahamas campus)
1981   School of Education, University of Miami.
- Focus of Studies: Education, Language and Reading

Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) (part-time, Bahamas campus)
1979   School of Education, University of Miami.
- Focus of Studies: Education, Language and Reading

Teaching Certificate (Honors)
1974   Bahamas Teachers’ College, University of the West Indies.
- Focus of Studies: Secondary Education, Language Arts and Social Studies (double major)

Specialist Training
1979, 1978, 1977:  Advanced training Sessions in Reading by the Organization of Canadian Overseas Development (OCOD). Three weeks full time for each year venues Antigua Teachers’ College and Barbados Teachers’ College.
1976 - 1977:    12 Credits in Library Science, College of the Bahamas

Television Broadcasting Experience
1979 - 1982   Hostess of “It’s Academic” Television Program

Awards & Scholarships
May 2000   Teaching Excellence Award
City University of Hong Kong

Jan. 2000  Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
          Promotion of Teaching and Learning Award

City University of Hong Kong

1983 - 1989  Commonwealth Scholarship Award
1983 - 1985  Bahamas Government In-service Award

Professional Experience

Tertiary Teaching Experience

Special Courses/Groups

February – April 2011

19 English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers representing more than ten countries TEA Fellows (Georgia State University)

Full-time Positions

Associate Professor

January 2008 - present  MSIT, College of Education, Georgia State University

Assistant Professor

Aug. 2003 – December 2007  MSIT, Faculty of Education, Georgia State University

Feb. 1995- July 2003  Department of English, City University of Hong Kong.

Lecturer

Part-time Positions

Lecturer

1993 – 1994  School of Professional and Continuing Education, University of Hong Kong.
Course:           Introduction to Reading in English (October -November)

Lecturer

Course:                           Reading Methods in the Primary School

Lecturer


战胜 Substituted for one three hour session.

Topic: Theoretical and Practical Issues in Reading Comprehension

Lecturer

Feb. 1987  Faculty of Education, University of Toronto.

战胜 Substituted for one three hour session.

Topic:           Reading and Multicultural Issues for Teachers of Children from the West Indies

Secondary Teaching Experience

Secondary Teacher & Department Head

Subjects: English Language, Reading, Library Science

Levels Taught: All levels of grades 7-9

Extracurricular activities: Library Prefects, Drama and Debating Clubs, House Mistress

Professional Experience Primary Teaching Experience

Language Arts Specialist and Literacy Program Developer

Apr. 1989 - Apr. 1991 T.G. Glover Primary School

Programs Developed:

- Language Enrichment Program for lower and middle primary students and ESL Haitian immigrants
- Parents Education Program (PEP)
- Cross-age (Peer) Tutoring in Reading (Primary 4-6)
- Support Program for New Learners of English (English as a Second Language)
- T. G. Glover’s Motivational Program
- Lock Away the Textbooks Teachers’ Program (theme-based cross curricular teaching without textbooks)

Teaching & Research Interests

- Action research, teacher professional development and curriculum change
- Reading in a first/second/foreign language, English as a second dialect
- Cooperative learning, task-based teaching and learning
- Vocabulary development
Research in Progress

Completed Papers

Perceptions of Dialect (College of the Bahamas with Jessica Minnis); Globalization Project with Colleagues from China, Macau, Thailand, Argentina and USA; Critical Curricula Development in Haiti with Colleagues in Haiti; Fostering the Development of Dialogic Communities of Practice, Bahamas (T.G. Glover Primary School) and Atlanta, GA (with Doctoral Students); Working with Refugee and Immigrant Mothers with Masters Students in Atlanta, GA; Roles: Initiator/Team Leader/Principal Investigator for aforementioned).

Submitted Scholarly Articles - Under Peer Review/Being Revised/ Accepted and Awaiting Publication

Completed Papers/Books Under Review

Tinker Sachs, G. Reading in English as a favourite pastime in Hong Kong. Language, Culture and Curriculum 40 pages (to be revised for resubmission)


Tinker Sachs, G. (Ed.). Critical Mass in the academy. (ten chapters including my own are now under review - University of Michigan Press)

Tinker Sachs, G. You are One of Us: Forging the Development of Dialogic Communities of Practice in Nassau, Bahamas (International Reading Association publication) (under revision)


Listing of Research Papers in Progress

- Cooperative Learning in Teacher Education
- DARK-SKINNED PEOPLE in TESOL
- ESOL in the Content Areas – The Way Forward (MSIT Professors GATE 2010 presentation)
- Dik’s Language Learning in Beijing and Atlanta (With Chinese Visiting Scholar)
• Doing Multiculturalism in the United States - Three University Teachers (With Chinese Visiting Scholars)
• Discourse on Immigration: Arizona’s Bill 1070 (with Therese Austin and Lynne Diaz-Rico)
• EFL and ESL Teachers’ Perceptions of Globalization (with colleagues in Alabama, China, Macau, Thailand, Argentina)
• DIALECT IN THE BAHAMAS – DO ALL BAHAMIANS SPEAK ENGLISH THE WAY YOU DO? (with Jessica Minnis)
• Conversations with novice teachers of English as a foreign language (with Sarah Mantegna)
• Paper with Barbara Clarke and ESOL Endorsement Teachers
• Paper with Annmarie Jackson and ESOL Endorsement Teachers

Publications

Peer-Reviewed


Published Working Papers

Peer-Reviewed Department Publications: Department of English and Communication, City University of Hong Kong - “Perspectives”


Peer Reviewed Electronic Publications


Books

Tinker Sachs, G. (Eds.) Critical mass in the academy.

Tinker Sachs, G. & Ho, B. (2007). EFL/ESL Cases: Contexts for teacher professional discussions. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong. (peer reviewed)


(See review by Andy Curtis, July 2003 see City University, Department of English and Communication Second Newsletter – Issue 2)


Resource Book for Teachers
Tinker Sachs, G. (July 2003). Teachers’ CL Resource Book. City University of Hong Kong. (Accompanied by VCD)

Book Chapters


Tinker Sachs, G. (2002). Framing action research. In G. Tinker Sachs (Ed.), Action research in English language teaching (pp. 67-86). City University of Hong Kong. Hong Kong.


Peer Reviewed

Newsletter Publications

http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_issue.asp?nid=2813&iid=4472&sid=1


http://www.iasce.net/Newsletters/2004_Summer/2004_summer_1.shtml


Tinker Sachs, G. TESL-Hong Kong – (2001, May): The Post-graduate Diploma in English Language Education.

Tinker Sachs, G. TESL-Hong Kong – (2000, May): A teachable moment: Spice up your teaching with an integrated project for the new millennium. TESL-HK, 5, pp 11-12.. City University of Hong Kong.


Tinker Sachs, G. TESL-Hong Kong – (1998/1999). One country: Three Languages. TESL-HK, 1, pp.1, Department of English, City University of Hong Kong.
Textbook Materials Development

Tinker Sachs, G., Lo, A. & Kong, S. Textbooks for the New Target Oriented Curriculum for Key Stage 1, “Adventures in English.” (manuscript)

Open Learning Institute Distance Learning Materials Development for Primary English Language Teaching Elective – Units as follows:


Video Materials Development


Tinker Sachs, G. (1997a,b). Critical thinking in language learning. Education Department, Hong Kong.

Tinker Sachs, G. (2000a,b). Extensive Reading in Hong Kong. Education Department, Hong Kong.


Tinker Sachs, G. (July 2003). Fostering the development of EFL cooperative learning contexts. City University of Hong Kong.

Grants

HK$7.8 = US$1.00

Hong Kong Funded Research Projects

(approximately US$618,482.00)

Fostering the Development of EFL Cooperative Learning Contexts


Tinker Sachs, G. (PI) & Li, D. (AI)
Learning Cantonese: A collaborative investigation
HK$48,955 (US$6,276)

Fostering and furthering Effective Practices in the teaching of English.
HK$0.895 million (US$114,743), University Grants Committee Fund

Sep. 1998 - Sep. 2002  Tinker Sachs, G. (PI) with Belinda Ho (AI)
Hong Kong Cases
HK$311,582 (US$ 39,946) Quality Enhancement Fund

Primary English Reading Project
HK$1.5 million (US$192,308), Hong Kong Language Fund

Candlin, C., Tinker Sachs, G. (Co-PI) & Rose, K. (AI)
Developing co-operative learning in the language classroom
HK$544,380 (US$69,793), Strategic Grant

Thinking and Talking like Real Teachers - Pre-service Teacher Development Project (PI)
HK$10,000 (US$1,282) The Department of English - small scale Public Discourse Research Group

Reseaching the Researcher (PI)
HK$10,250 (US$1,314), English Department, Ed. – TESL Discourse Group
Reading in the Primary School (PI)

HK$40,000 (US$5128), Department of English, City University of Hong Kong

Tinker Sachs, G. (PI) with Angel Lin (AI)

Video Development for BATESL Pre-service Student Teachers

HK$90,000; HK$24000 extension, (US$ 14,615) the Quality Assurance Fund

Non-funded Projects


United States Grant Applications

Tinker Sachs, G. (2004). Intercultural Harmony Fund (Funding denied)

Tinker Sachs, G. (2004). COE International Travel Grant (denied)

Tinker Sachs, G. (Summer, 2006). GSU Minority Travel Grant

Tinker Sachs, G. & Fox, D. (March, 2007). GSU Mentoring Grant (denied)

Wang, Y & Tinker Sachs, G. (March, 2007). GSU Mentoring Grant (denied)

Tinker Sachs, G. (Summer 2007). GSU Minority Travel Grant

Tinker Sachs, G. (Summer 2010) GSU International Initiatives Grant (denied)


Tinker Sachs, G. (TESOL March 2011). East, west conceptualizations of globalizations in EFL and ESL contexts. With Austin, J., Spezzini, S., Wong, M., Wang, Y, (Organizer, with international panel/presenter) SUCHADA

Tinker Sachs, G. & Jackson, A. (Jan 28, 2011). Funds of Knowledge and Ethnographic Studies in the ESOL Classroom. AMTESOL, Auburn, Alabama. (with doctoral students)


Tinker Sachs, G., Brown, N., Junor Clarke, P., Kinuthia, W., Lim, M., McGrail, E., & Sullivan, C. (October, 2010). Realities of K-12 Education Reform: Challenges and Opportunities for Teacher Education. GATE, Atlanta: Georgia. (organizer, presenter) (with MSIT Colleagues)


Tinker Sachs, G. (October, 2010). Reaching beyond borders through ethnographic approaches in the ESOL endorsement program. GATESOL, Atlanta: Georgia.


Tinker Sachs, G (Panel Organizer and Presenter). (March 27, 2010). (In)visibility of second language learners in US Teacher Education Programs - the Case of GA. With Diaz Ricco, L., Hruska, B. & Austin, T. TESOL. Boston, MA

Tinker Sachs, G. (Organizer), March 27, 2010 (rescheduled/ with doctoral students). Dialects and Dialogic Communities – what they are and what they are not!! With Freeman, N., Gardiner, J. & Rodriguez, S. CLUES Conference, Atlanta, GA. (with doctoral students)
Tinker Sachs, G. (Organizer/with doctoral student). March 27, 2010 (rescheduled). Developing Ethnographic Approaches in ESOL Teacher Education. With Pelissero, A. CLUES Conference, Atlanta, GA.

Tinker Sachs, G. (March 8, 2010). Teaching and Researching Critical Ethnographic Approaches in ESOL Teacher Education. With Austin, T. Wong, S., Grant, R., Pirbhai-Illlich, F. & Kumagai, Y. AAAL, Atlanta, GA,


Tinker Sachs, G, Mantegna, S., Ruiz, A., & Stocking, K. (Organizer, with doctoral students/ Presenter March 2009). Balancing Language and Content in History and Social Studies Lessons. TESOL International Conference. Denver, Col

Tinker Sachs, G. (May, 2009). Specializing in Reading and ESOL: What the two have in common. International Reading Association, Minneapolis, MN (invited paper)


Tinker Sachs, G. (May, 2008) ESOL in middle school reading courses. International Reading Association, Atlanta, GA.


Tinker Sachs, G. (December, 2008). Infusing ESOL in teacher education. How are we doing? NRC Orlando, FLA.

Tinker Sachs, G. (2007, December). ESOL in the Middle School Reading Courses. Paper presented as part of the symposium: Learning about literacy and the teaching of reading: A state wide examination of literacy teacher preparation at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.


Tinker Sachs, G. (2005, October), The battleground of teaching and the quest for engaged knowledge generators in Hong Kong. Sino American Conference, Kennesaw State University Conference, Atlanta GA.


Tinker Sachs, G. (2004, October). The impact of cooperative learning in the teacher education classroom. GATE-GACTE-GAICTE Fall Conference, Atlanta GA.


Tinker Sachs, G. (2003). Cultural Ambassador in Hong Kong; Hearing the Voices of Our Student Teachers; Critical Voices of Teacher Educators in the Academy. TESOL. Baltimore, Maryland.


Invited Plenaries and Talks

Bahamas, China, Haiti, Hong Kong, Macau, Singapore, USA

- New Territories, Hong Kong, Hong Kong Taipo Secondary School, May 26, 2011. Promoting Cooperative Learning in EFL Classrooms
- Port-au-Prince, Haiti, Lessons Learned from Teaching EFL: Challenges and Rewards MATE-TESOL, Haitian-American Institute June 29 & 30, 2011.
- Doctoral Students’ Symposium October 16th, 2010. Invited talk on Minorities in Academia
- University of Macau May 24 & 26, 2010 “Language Teaching in the 21st century – A vision of the present
- Capital Normal University, Beijing China May 2009
- Chinese University of Hong Kong May, 2008
- Hong Kong Government May, 2008
- IATEFL Young learner SIG and Lorna Whiston Study Centres, 24th November, 2007 – Singapore
• IATEFL Young learner SIG and British Council Hong Kong, 26 November, 2007 – British Council, Hong Kong

• Bahamas Government – Ministry of Education Strategic Planning Conference – November 7, 2007

Journal Reviewer

TESOL Quarterly

Asian Journal of English Language Teaching

New Horizons Journal of Education

Journal of Language and Literacy Education

Book Reviewer  Hong Kong Institute of Education

Corwin Press

External Examiner/ Program Reviewer

Department of Linguistics, Macquarie University, Australia

Hong Kong Institute of Education

University Service
Georgia State University

Division Level

- Member, Language & Literacy
- Unit Leader, Language & Literacy (Oct 2010 – present)
- ESOL Team Leader EdS, Endorsement Programs
- Co-Chair, Georgia Read Write Now Conference 2004-05; 2005-06

Department Level

- Chair, Diversity Committee, Culture, Climate & Equity Committee
- Founder & Project Team Leader, Critical Mass Project
- Mentoring Novice Professors
- Setting up the ESOL Study Abroad Program, Beijing
- Host Visiting Scholars: China (3), Mentoring Korea (1)
- Chair, ESOL Search Committee
- Forging Connections with other Programs & Content Areas for ESOL
- Advisor
- Leadership Team (as of November, 2010)

College Level

- Member, COE, Literacy Think Tank Team
- Teacher Education Research Team
- Member various Search Committees
University Level (2009 – 2011); (2011 – 2013)

University Senate, committees & subcommittees (Admissions and Standards, Library Committee)

State Level

Consortium – Reading Research Team

Georgia Department of Education, Task Development Committee

ESOL Advisory Committee (Board of Regents, GSU representative)

National Level

International Reading Association Advisor – Alpha Upsilon Alpha Committee

Advisor – Educational Testing Service (ETS)

Hong Kong

Faculty Committee

Faculty Board

Departmental Committees

Department Executive Committee

BATESL Programme Planning Committee

MATESL Programme Planning Committee

Post Graduate Course in English Language Education Development Committee, Programme Leader

Member of English Language Teaching and Communication Centre
Professional Development Experiences

Bahamas, Canada, China, Hong Kong, United States

Teach for America, Jan

2009 April 13, Gainesville State College, Foreign Language Speaker Series, Globalization of English (invited)

2009 May 27, International Exchange between GSU and Capital Normal University, Capital Normal University, Beijing, China. (invited)

2009 May 27 Research methodologies in Language, Literacy and TESOL, Capital Normal University, Beijing, China. (invited)

2009 (October 8-9) Enhancing Literacy in the Primary School. T.G. Glover Primary School, Nassau Bahamas (invited)

2006 Best practices in English as a second/foreign language Education and Manpower Bureau, Education Department, Hong Kong Government. (invited)

2006 Observation Techniques in teacher supervision, Education and Manpower Bureau, Education Department, Hong Kong Government. (invited)
2006  Reading in English – How to motivate and engage your students, Chinese University of Hong Kong. (invited)

2006  Oral language development in pre-primary learners of English as a second/foreign language, Standing Committee on Language Education and Research, Hong Kong. (invited)

2005 – 2006  Professional development work at Sequoyah Middle School, Atlanta Georgia

2004  ESOL Content Area Instructional Strategies, Cross Keys Middle School Atlanta, Georgia

2003  Teachers’ Update Course, City University of Hong Kong: and Learner Autonomy in the EFL Classroom Teacher

Developing a research culture at Shue Yan College, Hong Kong

2002  Teachers’ Update Course City University of Hong Kong Critical and Creative use of the textbook

2001  Parents' Workshop Developing Children's Literacy in English: Tuen Mun District

Curriculum Development Institute, Hong Kong Education Department, Plenary Speaker at annual sharing event

Everyday English Every Day Summer Camp for Secondary School Students (2-week summer camp, leader and organizer)
2000  Parents' Workshop Developing Children's Literacy in English:
        Kwun Tung District, 2000

        Supervision in ELT, a Workshop for English Panel Chairs, City
        University of Hong Kong

1999  Special Hong Kong-Chinese Lesson Observation Exchange.
        Curriculum Development Institute, Education Department.

1998  Using Big Books to facilitate children’s English language
        development.
        City University BATESL Recent Graduates

1998  Address to Curriculum Development Institute: School-based
        Curriculum Tailoring Scheme Extensive Reading Award
        Ceremony. Engaging students in reading activities.

1997  Workshop for Primary Teachers in Shared Reading in Primary
        4-6, HKERS, Advisory Inspectorate

1997  2 Workshops for secondary teachers of English on Critical
        Thinking in Language Learning, Hong Kong Teachers’
        Inspectorate, Hong Kong Education Department Centre

1996  Strategies for teaching reading in the Secondary Classroom,
Advisory

1995 Strategies for teaching Reading on Extensive Reading

Programme Primary teachers June 27, (9 - 12:30)

Strategies for teaching Reading on Extensive Reading

Programme Secondary teachers July 4, 1995 (9 - 12:30)

English Department, City University of Hong Kong - Secondary

English Teachers Workshop Incorporating Tasks in the EFL

Classroom

1994 Task-Centred Teaching & Learning: A setting to Motivate learners

January 26, 1994 Delia School of Canada (3 hour workshop)

1993 New Developments in Education in Hong Kong

January, Delia School of Canada (3 hour workshop)

1987 Teaching English to Children from the West Indies, Toronto Board of Education

1992 2 one week inservice course for English language primary teachers, Nassau, Freeport and Andros Bahamas

1991 3 three hour workshops on Trends in the teaching of English for secondary teachers, Nassau Bahamas
1989-1991  3 Weeks Summer inservice for primary teachers of reading, Nassau, Bahamas

1974-1982  3 Weeks Summer inservice for primary and secondary teachers of English Nassau, Bahamas

2008 – present Archdiocesan of Atlanta Choir Camp, Drama Teacher, Reinhardt College

Civic

Responsibilities

2004 - Children’s Choir Co-Director, Basilica of the Sacred Heart of Jesus Catholic Church, Atlanta,

2005 - 2006 Parish Council, Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Atlanta, GA

1992 - 2003 Music & Liturgical Leader, Adam Schall Catholic Community,

Chinese University of Hong Kong


1983 - 1989 Sunday School Teacher, Our Lady of Lourdes Parish, Toronto

1968 - 1991 Choir Member, Choir Director, Sunday School teacher and Director, Parish Council Member St. Joseph’s Church, Nassau Bahamas

1974 - 1983 11 Bahamas Brownie & Guide Leader, Bahamas Girl Guides Association

Professional Memberships
American Association of Applied Linguists (AAAL)
American Educational Research Association (AERA) (since 1988)
International Reading Association (IRA) (since 1974)
National Council of Teachers of English
National Reading Council
Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
Georgia Association of Teacher Educators (GATE)
Georgia Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages
South East TESOL (member)
Alabama TESOL (member)
Leadership Conference on English Education (CEE)

Service - TESOL International

Appointed Chair of TESOL Conference 2009 (Denver, Colorado).
Member TESOL Conference Committee April 2007 – April 2010
TESOL Conference Committee Chair April 2009 – April 2010
TESOL Board of Directors April 2008 – April 2009
Incoming Chair TESOL Special Interest Group – Teacher Education April 2011 – April 2012

Service – Georgia Association of Teacher Educators
Executive Committee (Secretary) 2010 - 2012
Service - International Reading Association

• Committee Member, Alpha Upsilon Alpha, International Reading Association 2009 – 2012

Forging and Maintaining Community Connections

• Latin American Association, Atlanta, GA
• Genesis Shelter for Homeless Parents and Children, Atlanta, GA
• Refugee Family Services, Clarkston, GA

Evidence of Student Achievement (list separately on vita)

Jan – Dec 2010

• Dr. Jayoung Choi (Assistant Clinical Professor, GSU)
• MAT – ESOL students’ employment (both locally and internationally)
• Graduation: Dr. Myrnelle Gregory-Bryan
• Hong Kong student, Iris Siu’s graduation with a masters from University of Reading
Yarbrough
Gladys Ross Yarbrough, Ph.D.

570 Grant Street, SE
Atlanta, GA 30312
Home: 404/659-2131
Cell: 404/313-2131
Work: 404/413-8061
Home E-mail: ottoross@hotmail.com
Work E-mail: mstgry@langate.gsu.edu

Education


• M.Ed. in Early Childhood. Georgia State University. Atlanta, GA. College of Education, 6/95.


Certifications

• Reading (P-12), 8/06
• Early Childhood (P-5), 3/06
• Gifted in Field, 12/07
• Certification Level: 7, 8/05
Research Interests

• Urban Education
• Teacher Study Groups
• Teaching and Technology

Children & Adolescent Literature
High Stakes Testing
Diversity/Multicultural Education

Teaching Experience

Clinical Assistant Professor (Temporary) Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA,
8/08 to present.

• Served as the Coordinator of the Bachelor of Science in Education Degree Program in Middle Childhood Education, which included: coordinating and planning the launching of the new program; providing leadership to faculty in creating the information/materials needed to begin processing student applications; participating in recruitment fairs and advertisement campaigns to attract students, and addressing inquiries about the programs from interested students and other connected parties.

• Helped to compile BSE data for the PRS Review, and worked with program faculty to ensure that program materials were beginning created and updated regularly. In addition, I also served as the PDS University Coordinator for both Brown Middle School, forming a teacher study group, and Tri Cities High School. Mentored Visiting Scholar from Middle East Institute (MEI) at GSU.

Courses Taught:

• Read/Writing in the Content Areas, EDRD 4600, Undergraduate Course, 8/10.

• Practicum, EDCI 4600, Undergraduate Course, 8/10 & 1/11.
• Student Teaching, EDCI 4700, Undergraduate Course, 1/11.

• Concept/Methods Reading MCE, EDRD 4450, Undergraduate Course, 8/10.

• Literacy for a Diverse Society, EDRD 8280, Graduate Course, 6/10, 6/09.

• Literacy in the Content Areas, EDRD 7630, Undergraduate Course, 6/10 & 6/09.

• Reading Methods for Middle Level Education, EDRD 3490, Undergraduate Course, 1/10 & 1/11.

• Assessment and Instruction of Middle Level Students with Reading Difficulties, EDRD 3500, Undergraduate Course, 1/10 & 1/11.

• Regent’s Reading Skill, RGTR 0198, Undergraduate Course, 1/10.

• Children/Adolescent Literature, EDLA 7150, Undergraduate Course, 8/09.

• Early Writing Development, EDLA 7280, Early Writing Development, Graduate Course, 8/09.

• Topics in Middle Grades Language Arts, EDLA 3200, Undergraduate Course, 1/09, 8/10, & 1/11.

• Early Literacy Development, EDRD 7260, Graduate Course, 1/09.
• Practicum I (Social Studies), EDCI 7670, Graduate Course, 1/09.

• Practicum II (Social Studies), EDCI 7680, Graduate Course, 3/09.

• Teaching in Today’s Society, GSU 1010, Freshmen Learning Communities Course, 8/08.

• Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Reading, EDRD 7600, Graduate Course, 8/08.

• Practicum (Social Studies), EDCI 7660, Graduate Course, 8/08.

Reading Specialist/ Early Intervention Prevention (EIP) Teacher. DeKalb County School System, Atlanta, GA, Clifton Elementary Computer Magnet School, 8/06 – 6/08.

• Provided immediate and direct assistance in reading to help students achieve academic success at their grade level in the shortest time possible. Instruction was provided in grades K-5 in whole group, small group, and independently to help students meet their academic and socio-emotional needs. Served as a member of Clifton’s Leadership Team, and several other committees and organizations.

• Selected the Principal’s entire Book of the Month for the 2007/08 school year, and created a monthly on-line teacher newsletter, Yarbrough’s News and Notes to provide effective instructional strategies for each book; created a webpage containing information about effective reading strategies and exemplary children’s literature. Participated in tutorial program for 4th grade students and mentored students in 2006/2007; co-authored a summer reading package for all grade levels, and wrote and received a Junior League Grant for reading program in 2007/08.

Adjunct Professor and Tutor. Georgia Perimeter College, Decatur, GA, 8/05 to 8/06.

Regent’s Reading Test Preparation. RGTR 0198, Undergraduate Course.
• Helped students to successfully prepare for the reading portion of the Georgia Regent’s Test. Particular emphasis was placed on helping students improve their vocabulary, literal skills, inferential skills, overall test taking strategies, and to reduce test-taking anxiety.

• Provided ongoing educational assistance in the tutorial lab for students requesting additional help in language arts and Regent’s Test preparation.

Graduate Teaching Assistant. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, 8/01 to 7/05.

• Taught more than 15 language and literacy courses in the Department of Middle-Secondary and Instructional Technology, which involved providing instruction to both graduate and undergraduate students in the areas of adolescent literacy development, children’s literature and pre-teaching preparation for the classroom environment.

Courses Taught:

• Literacy in the Content Areas. EDRD 7630. Graduate Course, 6/05.

• Literature for Mid/Secondary Education. EDLA 7150. Graduate Course, 6/04.

• Topics in Middle Grades Language Arts. EDLA 3200. Undergraduate Course, 1/03, 6/03, 8/03, 1/04, 8/04, 01/05.

• Master’s Thesis. EPS 7990. Graduate Course, 6/03.

• Concepts and Methods in Language Arts for Middle Childhood. EDLA 4400. Undergraduate Course, Team-taught 8/02 & 1/03.
• Practicum. EDLA 4600. Undergraduate Course, Team-taught, 8/02 & 1/03.

• Reading Methods for Middle Childhood Education. EDRD 3490. Undergraduate Course, Team-taught, 8/01 and 1/02.

• Assessment and Instruction of Middle Childhood Students with Reading Difficulty. EDRD 3500. Undergraduate Course, Team Taught, 8/01 and 1/02.


• Provided appropriate instruction and services across the curriculum to my students. This included working with whole and small groups, and individualized instruction; informal and formal assessment and evaluation, and developing learning materials.

• Created and implemented, The Literacy Forum, a teacher study collaborative, designed to help educators share effective, environmentally driven, best teacher practices in reading; coordinated two school-wide reading festivals.

• Served as a mentor teacher for new teachers and as a cooperative teacher for student interns for Georgia State University.

Other Professional Work Experiences

Human Resources Manager. A Beeper Company, Atlanta, GA, (subsidiary of Bell Atlantic Corporation), 1/85 to 9/87.

• Managed all personnel and employee relations activities for a national sales organization, including personnel policy development and interpretation, employment, EEOC, benefits administration, payroll processing, and record keeping. Supervised a staff of two. Received two promotions since starting with the company.

• Analyzed and recommended service improvements for employee benefits programs, through the use of flow charts, statistical studies and employee surveys. Developed employee benefits procedural forms and manuals.

Professional Awards

• Kappa Delta Pi, 6/05, 6/03.

• MSIT Doctoral Award for Scholarly Excellence, 6/02.

• Pi Lambda Theta, 6/02.

• Teacher of the Year for Slaton Elementary, 9/98-6/99.

Presentations

• Yarbrough, G.R. (2011). Faculty perceptions on teaching in a graduate online degree program. Educational Research Association Conference, (EERA), Sarasota, FL.


• Yarbrough, G.R. (2010). Holy cow! You can use comic books in the classroom. Conference of Literacy, Urban Issues and Social Studies Education,


Yarbrough, G.R. (2006). Conducting a literature review for the prospectus and dissertation. Georgia State University, MSIT Department, Atlanta, GA.

Yarbrough, G.R. (2005). Completing a Ph.D. program at Georgia State University. MSIT Department, Atlanta, GA.

Yarbrough, G.R. (2005). How to write a doctoral thesis. Georgia State University, MSIT Department, Atlanta, GA.

Yarbrough, G.R. (2005). Finding that middle ground: Teacher beliefs and teacher leadership in the urban classroom. Georgia Read -Write Now Conference, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

for Urban Excellence First Annual Adding to the Circle of Voices Reception. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

• Yarbrough, G.R. (2002). How to form a teacher study group. Georgia Read - Write Now Conference, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

• Yarbrough, G.R. (1999). Using African masks to promote aesthetic responses in the classroom. Georgia Read - Write Now Conference, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.


Publications in Development


• Manley, O., & Yarbrough, G., Faculty perceptions of teaching a graduate online program.

Grant Writing And Manuscript Reviewing


- Yarbrough, G.R. (1992). Around the world is just next door: Celebrating cultural diversity at Slaton. Apple Corp, Inc. Grant used to develop multicultural program at Slaton Elementary, Atlanta, GA.


Georgia State University’s Committees/Programs

- Urban Teacher Leadership Program Redesign Committee
- Istanbul Center of Atlanta art and essay contest reviewing committee.
- Member of BSE interview committee.
- Graduate/undergraduate interviewing and selection committee.
- Portfolio review and assessment committee.
Community Outreach

- Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, (Graduate Chapter).
  1. West-End Medical Fair, 08

- Slaton Elementary, Atlanta, GA, (Volunteer Services).
  1. The Literacy Forum, Chairperson, 97/00.
  2. PTA Vice President, 90/91.
  3. Teacher/Parent Liaison, 91/93.
  4. Editor of the Slatonian, 90/92.
  5. Hospitality/ Book Drive Chairperson, 92/93.

- Grant Park Learning Center. Atlanta, GA.
  1. Chairperson, 90/93.
  2. Board Member, 93/94.

- Institute for Young Women and Girls, Atlanta, GA.
  1. Board Member, 93/95.

Professional Associations

- International Reading Association.
- National Middle School Association.
- Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority (Graduate Chapter).
Youngjoo Yi

Updated: January 2011

Georgia State University

Department of Middle Secondary Education
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EDUCATION

Ph. D. in Education, The Ohio State University, 2005
• Specialization: Foreign and Second Language Education
• Minor: Research Methods in Human Resources and Development
• Dissertation: Immigrant Students’ Out-of-School Literacy Practices: A Qualitative Study of Korean Students’ Experiences
• Finalist for AERA Second Language Research SIG Outstanding Dissertation Award, 2006.
• Committee: Alan Hirvela (Chair); George E. Newell; Chan Park; Naomi Fukumori

M.A. in Teaching English as a Second Language, Arizona State University, 1998
• Thesis: Acquisition of English Determiners by Adult Korean Learners
• Committee: Elly van Gelderen (Chair); Christian J. Faltis; Roy Major

B.A. in Education, Teachers’ College, Kyungpook National University, South Korea, 1995
• Major: History Education
• Minor: English Education

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS

Professional Employment History:

2008 – present: Assistant Professor in English to Speakers of Other Languages [ESOL] and Literacy, Department of Middle Secondary Education and Instructional Technology, College of Education, Georgia State University
Unit- Language and Literacy Education (Graduate Faculty Membership granted in Fall 2008)

2005 – 2008: Assistant Professor in Second Language Acquisition and Teaching, College of Education, University of Alabama; Faculty Affiliate, TESOL Program, Department of English, University of Alabama


2004 – 2005: ESL Classroom Bilingual Aide, Dublin Scioto High School, Dublin, Ohio
2003 – 2004: ESL Instructor, Adult Immigrant ESL Class, Columbus, Ohio

2001 – 2003: Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures, The Ohio State University

2002: Korean Language and Culture Counselor, Concordia University, Korean Language Village (Korean Language Immersion Program), Bemiji, Minnesota

1998 – 2000: English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Teacher, Young-Chun Middle School, Young-Chun, South Korea


1995 – 1996: English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Teacher, Young-Hae Middle School, Young-Hae, South Korea

Certificates:

National Certificate (Level 1) in Teaching English in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12) in South Korea, 2000

National Certificate (Level 2) in Teaching English in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12) in South Korea, 1995

National Certificate (Level 2) in Teaching History in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12) in South Korea, 1995
SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, and Reviews

Special Issue Edited for a Refereed Journal:


The Journal of Asian Pacific Communication [JAPC] is an international refereed journal. The acceptance rate for the JAPC is approximately 15-20% of those manuscripts that are actually reviewed. Publisher: John Benjamins.

Published Articles:

(† denotes work with students)

* For the three (3) articles that have been published in journals that are recognized by the 2009 ISI Web of Knowledge: Journal Citation Reports (112 journals under the category “Education & Educational Research” and 92 journals under the category of “Linguistics”), I have included the Impact Factor (Rank) and 5-Year Impact Factor (Rank) of each respective journal.

Computers and Composition is an international refereed journal. In 2009, the journal had more than 50,000 full-text downloads in 72 different countries. The acceptance rate is approximately 30%. Publisher: Elsevier.


Journal of Second Language Writing [JSLW]: Impact Factor: 1.25 (Rank: No. 25); 5-Year Impact Factor: 1.521 (Rank: No. 26)

JSLW is the only second language writing research journal recognized by the ISI Web of Knowledge and considered as the No. 1 journal in the field of Second Language Writing.

The acceptance rate in 2009 was approximately 5-8%. Publisher: Elsevier.


This paper was a contribution to a special issue on “Biliterate Asian students’ literacy practices in North America,” and thus, it was reviewed by two guest-editors and a chief editor of the journal. The acceptance rate for the Journal of Asian Pacific Communication is approximately 15-20% of those manuscripts that are actually reviewed. Publisher: John Benjamins.

encounters with heritage and second language writing. Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 19(1), 1-6. (refereed; international) (50% contribution)

This paper was the introduction to our special issue on “Biliterate Asian students’ literacy practices in North America,” and thus, it was reviewed by two guest-editors and a chief editor of the journal. Publisher: John Benjamins.


Articles for The CATESOL Journal are peer reviewed by an editorial board of scholars in the field of TESOL, and they are reviewed blindly. 15-20% of the articles are invited, and the acceptance rate for the journal is 33%.


The Heritage Language Journal is the only national journal that is solely devoted to the issues of heritage language education. This paper was a contribution to a special issue on “Korean as a Heritage Language,” and it was reviewed by two blind reviewers, two guest editors, and a chief editor of the journal. The acceptance rate for the Korean issue was 18%. Publisher: National Heritage Language Resource Center and UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching.


Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy [JAAL]: Impact Factor: 0.67 (Rank: No. 78); 5-Year Impact Factor: 0.616 (Rank: No. 86)
The JAAL is the only literacy journal published exclusively for researchers and teachers of older learners. The acceptance rate is approximately 18%. Publisher: International Reading Association.


Journal of Second Language Writing [JSLW]: Impact Factor: 1.25 (Rank: No. 25); 5-Year Impact Factor: 1.521 (Rank: No. 26)

JSLW is the only second language writing research journal recognized by the ISI Web of Knowledge and considered as the No. 1 journal in the field of Second Language Writing. The acceptance rate in 2007 was approximately 10%. Publisher: Elsevier.


The Journal of Asian Pacific Communication [JAPC] is an international refereed journal. The acceptance rate for the JAPC is approximately 15-20% of those manuscripts that are actually reviewed. Publisher: John Benjamins.

Chapters in Books:

Yi, Y. (accepted, August 2010). Becoming a multilingual writer, researcher, and educator. In G. Tinker Sachs, & G. Verma. (Eds.). Critical mass in the academy. (refereed; international; invited book chapter)


National Council of Teachers of English publishes only 10-15 books each year. Each goes through a rigorous peer-review process.


Book Review:


English for Specific Purposes [ESP]: Impact Factor: 0.795 (Rank: No.42); 5-Year Impact Factor: 1.102 (Rank: No. 36). Publisher: Elsevier.

This was an invited book review for ESP, which is an international peer-reviewed, research journal.
Submitted Scholarly Writings:

(† denotes work with students)


† Choi, J., & Yi, Y. (submitted in April 2010). The role and use of popular culture in heritage language learning: A study of advanced learners of Korean. Foreign Language Annals. 35 pages. (refereed; international) (50% contribution)

Other:

Presentations at Professional Meetings:

(† denotes work with students)

a. Presentations at national and international meetings:

Yi, Y. (2011, April). Creating a space for a multilingual writer navigating in and out-of-school writing. Presentation at the Colloquium, “Making a ‘space’ for multilingual writing in composition” with Steven Fraiberg, Xiaoye You, Joel Bloch (respondent), and Paul Prior (chair). Annual Conference on College Composition and Communication, Atlanta, Georgia. (refereed; national)


America: Innovative approaches and nontraditional learners” with Jin Sook Lee, Sarah Shin, and Kyung-Eun Yoon at the First International Conference on Heritage/Community Languages, Los Angeles, California. (refereed; international)


Yi, Y. (2009, March). High school Generation 1.5 students’ out-of-school writing. Paper presented at the Colloquium, “Preparing ESL Writing Teachers for Generation 1.5,” with Ditlev Larsen (chair), Deborah Crusan, Dana Ferris, and Lynn Goldstein at the annual convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Denver, Colorado. (refereed; international)


Paper presented at the annual convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Seattle, Washington. (refereed; international)


Aktuna, S; Kim, S; Llurda, E; Park, G; & Yi, Y. (2006, March). From International Students to Successful Scholars. Paper presented at the annual convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Tampa, Florida. (refereed; international)


Yi, Y. (2005, July). What can applied linguistics contribute to Generation 1.5 literacy research? Paper presented at the 14th World Congress of Applied Linguistics (AILA), Madison, Wisconsin. (refereed; international)


b. Presentation at a regional meeting:


Awards and Grants:
a. Funded internal awards:


2009 Minority Faculty Development Grants ($1,400), Georgia State University.


2005 Asian American Studies Research Grant ($500), College of the Arts and Sciences, The Ohio State University.

2005 Ray Travel Award ($750), Council of Graduate Studies, The Ohio State University.

2003, 2004 Graduate Student Travel Grant ($400), School of Teaching and Learning, The Ohio State University.

2000-2003 Public School Teachers’ Study-Abroad Scholarship, Ministry of Education and Human Resources Department, South Korea.

1996-1998 International Graduate Students Tuition Scholarship, Department of English, Arizona State University.

2000 Recruitment Scholarship ($5,000), College of Education, The Ohio State University.
1991-1995 Four-Year-Full-Tuition Scholarship, Teachers’ College, Kyungpook National University, Daegu, South Korea.

b. Unfunded awards:


2007 Re-conceptualizing writing development of English Language Learners (ELLs) in K-12 schools: The interrelationship of development, instruction, and assessment. Sole PI: Youngjoo Yi. Research Advisory Committee Grant ($5,000), University of Alabama (Submitted in January 2007, but not funded).

Evidence of Peer Recognition and Reputation:

a. Significant professional services:

Guest co-editor:

- Guest co-editor of a special issue on biliteracy practices for the Journal of Asian Pacific Communication (2009)

Editorial and executive boards:


- Editorial Review Board of TESOL Journal (2009–present)
TESOL Journal is an electronic benefit for all TESOL members in the world.

Thus, the circulation is approximately 11,000 (the current number of TESOL members), plus approximately 1,100 libraries that have subscriptions.

· Editorial Review Board of Literacy Research and Instruction (2008–2010)

The circulation of Literacy Research and Instruction is approximately 1,125. There are 454 institutional subscriptions as of August 2010. The acceptance rate is 20%.

· Executive Board Member of the Korean Association for Multicultural Education (KAME) (2008–2010)

The KAME is the only association for multicultural education in South Korea and has approximately 500 members as of August 2010. Since the KAME was established in 2008, it published the Journal of Multicultural Education Review [MER] twice per year. The circulation of the Journal of MER is approximately 300.

Reviewer for the following scholarly journals (number of manuscripts reviewed):

· American Educational Research Journal (2)
· Educational Report (2)
· Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics (1)
· Foreign Language Annals (1)
· Journal of Interactive Online Learning (1)
· Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development (1)
· Journal of Second Language Writing (1)
· Language, Learning, and Technology (1)
· Literacy Research and Instruction (3)
• Reading Research Quarterly (2)
• TESOL Journal (2)
• TESOL Quarterly (3)
• Urban Education (1)

Manuscript reviewer for the following scholarly publishing company:

• Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall: Christian Faltis and Kathy Coulter’s Teaching English Language Learners and Immigrant Students in Secondary School, 2005

Proposal reviewer for the following conferences:

• American Association for Applied Linguistics Annual Meeting; 2006, 2009, 2010
• American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting; 2003–2010
• Reviewer for Outstanding Dissertation Awards for SLR-SIG; 2007–2010
• Invited Review Panel of AERA Division G, Section 2; 2009
• Invited Review Panel of AERA Writing and Literacies SIG; 2010
• National Council of Teachers of English-Assembly of Research; 2005
• National Reading Conference; 2009, 2010
• Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages; 2003–2010

Leadership in the profession:

• Program Chair for American Educational Research Association (AERA), Second Language Research-SIG (2009–2011)

• E-Discussion Manager for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Second Language Writing-Interest Section (SLW-IS) (2007–present)

b. Recognition by scholarly and professional associations:

Invited colloquia and sessions at international meetings:


Invited talks and a workshop:

Yi, Y. (2010, July 28). Triple socialization in U.S. graduate programs. Invited talk to international students in the Cultural Exchange Program in the Department of Applied Linguistics and ESL at Georgia State University.


Yi, Y. (2008, September 30). Academic writing is everyone’s second language. Invited talk at an advanced research seminar in language and literacy education (EDRD 9870) at Georgia State University.

Yi, Y. (2005, November). What does it mean to be a doctoral student at a research one university? Invited talk at the Foreign and Second Language Education program at The Ohio State University.

Yi, Y. (2003, March). How to support ESL/EFL graduate students with their academic writing. Invited talk at the Writing Center at The Ohio State University.


Consultancies:

“Re-imagining second language writing: An evening with friends of second language writing”–TESOL, Second Language Writing-Interest Section, Boston, MA (March 25, 2010)–invited consultant

“Forging New Pathways in the Teaching of Second Language Writing”–TESOL, Second Language Writing Interest Section, Denver, CO (March 26, 2009)– invited consultant

Invited consultant for a grant project, Problem-Based Learning within Gaming Environments proposed by Andy Walker and Brett Shelton, Grant proposal submitted to DOE Institute of Education Sciences Grant ($1,390,842) (submitted in June, 2008, but not funded)

Invited pedagogical approach advisor for “Sesame Street English in Asia,” 2007–2008

INSTRUCTION, INCLUDING ADVISING

Teaching Assignments:

a. Georgia State University, August 2008 – present, Assistant Professor in ESOL/Literacy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Designation</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Times Taught</th>
<th>Average Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 7660</td>
<td>Practicum I (Fall 2008, 2009, 2010)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 7670</td>
<td>Practicum II (Spring 2009, 2010, 2011)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 7680</td>
<td>Practicum III (Spring 2009, 2010, 2011)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 9900</td>
<td>Critique of Educational Research (Spring 2011)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDRD 8310</td>
<td>Theoretical Models and Processes of Literacy Learning (Eds/Doctoral, Spring 2010)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSLE 7250</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics for ESOL/Bilingual Teachers (Master’s, Fall 2009, 2010)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSLE 7260</td>
<td>Cultural Issues for the Bilingual/ESL Teacher (Master’s, Spring 2009)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Designation</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Times Taught</th>
<th>Average Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIE 527/627</td>
<td>Teaching Literacy to Second Language Learners (Master’s/Doctoral, Spring 2007)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE 562</td>
<td>Teaching ESL: Basic Methods (Master’s, Summer 2007)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIE 567 Improving Foreign Language Instruction (Master’s, Spring 2007)  
1 7

CIE 576/676 Linguistics for Classroom Teaching (Master’s/Doctoral, Fall 2007)  
1 4

CIE 577 Second Language Acquisition: Issues, Theories, and Instructional Implications  
(Master’s/Doctoral, Fall 2005, 2007)  
2 7

CSE 390 Instruction and Accommodation in Secondary Schools (Undergraduate, Spring 2006, Fall 2006, Spring 2008)  
3 19

CIE/CSE 480/580 Methods in Teaching Foreign Languages (Undergraduate/Master’s, Fall 2007)  
1 3

CIE/CSE 489/592 Clinical Experiences in Secondary Schools (Undergraduate, Master’s, Fall 2005)  
1 3

5 2

Clinical Master Teachers (CMT) Liaison, (Spring 2006, 2008)  
2 6

c. Ohio State University, Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures, March 2001 – June 2003, Graduate Teaching Assistant
KOR 103, First Year Korean Language III (Team-teaching)  
KOR 104, Second Year Korean Language I (Team-teaching)  
KOR 205, Second Year Korean Language II  
KOR 206, Second Year Korean Language III  
KOR 507, Third Year Korean Language I  
KOR 508, Third Year Korean Language II (Team-teaching)  
KOR 509, Third Year Korean Language III (Team-teaching)  
KOR 231, Elements of Korean Culture (Team-teaching)  
KOR 251, Korean Literature in Translation (Team-teaching)  

Graduate Student Committees:

a. At Georgia State University:

PhD Tuba Angay 2011-present Chair  
PhD Eliza Allen 2009-present Chair  
PhD Nicole Bush 2009-2010 Chair  
PhD John Bunting (Department of Applied Linguistics and ESL, College of Arts and Sciences) 2010-present Dissertation Committee  
MAT Javan Bukhaya Fall 2009 (completed) Advisor  
MAT Kisha Jackson Fall 2009 (completed) Advisor  
MAT Belinda Bailey 2009-2010 (completed) Advisor  
MAT Mary Allen 2009-2010 (completed) Advisor  
MAT Renea Bartlett 2009-2010 (completed) Advisor  
MAT Pattillo Samuel 2009-2010 (completed) Advisor  
MAT Courtney Robinson 2009-2010 (completed) Advisor
MAT Kimberly Bundschu 2009-2010 (completed) Advisor
MAT Magda Khoury 2009-2010 (completed) Advisor
MAT Lukas Faber 2009-2010 (completed) Advisor
MAT Laurie Cummings 2009-2010 (completed) Advisor
MAT Yumin Liu 2009-2010 (completed) Advisor
MAT Melissa Monney 2009-2010 (completed) Advisor
MAT Carrie Gaglione 2009-2010 (completed) Advisor
MAT Camelle Campton 2009-present Advisor
MAT Taina Deliz 2009-present Advisor
MAT Christy Hunt 2010-present Advisor
MAT Jaimal Page 2010-present Advisor
MAT Ashley Topham 2010-present Advisor
MAT Ashley Wilber 2010-present Advisor
MAT Soonhong Park 2010-present Advisor
MAT Jenny Elizabeth Hicks 2010-present Advisor
MAT Amy Jaret 2010-present Advisor
MAT Natalie Ann Copeland 2010-present Advisor
MAT Katherine Collins 2010-present Advisor
MAT Maureen Olivia Simpson 2010-present Advisor
MAT Heather Momand 2010-present Advisor
MAT Anna Leonhard 2010-present Advisor
MAT Michelle Terry 2010-present Advisor
MAT Anni Rosita Gunter 2010-2010 Advisor
MAT Kristine Allen 2010-present Advisor
MAT Erin Hayes 2010-present Advisor
MAT  Melissa Hootselle  2010-present  Advisor
MAT  Iris Feinberg  2010-2010  Advisor
MAT  Wenjin Wendy Tang  2010-present  Advisor
MAT  Amy Mercer  2010-present  Advisor
MAT  Lu Huang  2011-present  Advisor
MAT  Eun Kyung Kim-shin  2011-present  Advisor
MAT  Andrew Paetzhold  2011-present  Advisor
MAT  Cassandra Rose  2011-present  Advisor
MAT  Nina Sarkisyan  2011-present  Advisor
MAT  Tingting Wang  2011-present  Advisor

External Ph.D. Dissertation Committee: Committee member

·  Member, Jeongsoo Pyo (Tentative dissertation title: Korean bilingual children's family literacy practices and their connection to academic literacy practices) (Foreign and second language education at the Ohio State University) (attended a dissertation research proposal meeting at OSU on May 12, 2009)

b.  At the University of Alabama:

Ph.D. Committee Member:

·  Member, Francia Martinez (Modern Languages Department), Ph.D. Candidacy Exam taken Spring 2008
·  Member, Josie Prado (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching)
·  Member, Shine Lin (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching)
·  Member, Qiuhui Zhang (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching)
·  Member, Dohyung Ryang (Secondary Math Education)
Ed.S. Thesis Co-Chair:

• Leah Jones, Hispanic Parents Involvement in the General Education Process Through Traditional and Non-Traditional School Support Activities. (Spring 2006)

Master’s Examination Reader:

• Adina Pascalau (Modern Languages Department), Spring 2008
• Jenny Hall (Modern Languages Department), Spring 2008
• Adwoa Ulzen (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching), Fall 2007
• Sikharini Majumdar (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching), Fall 2007
• Laura Riley (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching), Fall 2007
• Rush Moody (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching), Spring 2007
• Latrina Thompson (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching), Spring 2007
• Beverly T. (Shook) Sims (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching), Fall 2006
• Rick Jill Baker (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching), Spring 2006
• Faith Clark (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching), Spring 2006
• Carrie Parr (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching), Spring 2006
• Marisol Parra (Modern Languages Department), Spring 2006
• Dona J. Benefield (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching), Fall 2005
• Marty P. Hatley (Second Language Acquisition and Teaching), Fall 2005

Impact on Students:

a. Evidence of student achievement (collaborative work with students):

Choi, J., & Yi, Y. (submitted in April 2010). The role and use of popular culture in
heritage language learning: A study of advanced learners of Korean. Foreign Language Annals, 35 pages. (refereed; international) (50% contribution)


Renea Bartlett (2010). Outstanding MAT Student Award Winner in the department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology.


b. Summary of student evaluations:

At Georgia State University:

Course Times
Taught Number
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Times Taught</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Instructor’s Grade</th>
<th>Course Grade Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 13 Questions1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDRD 8310</td>
<td>1 (Spring10)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSLE 7250</td>
<td>1 (Fall 09)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSLE 7250</td>
<td>1 (Fall 10)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSLE 7260</td>
<td>1 (Spring 08)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1Scale is from 1.0–5.0, with 5.0 = Very Descriptive/Effective.

Evaluations were not available for the practicum courses (EDCI 7660/7670/7680), except for EDCI 7670/7680 for Spring 2009. However, the score for EDCI 7670/7680 (Spring 2009) reflects the performance of three different instructors who supervised the students. Thus, it is not the indication of my sole performance.

At the University of Alabama:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Times Taught</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Instructor’s Grade</th>
<th>Course Grade Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIE 527/627</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE 562 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE 567 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE 576/676</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE 577 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE 390 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE/CIE 480</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Scale is from 1.0–5.0, with 5.0 = Strongly Agree. Two separate scores for the course and the instructor were available at the University of Alabama.

Two sections of CSE 3902 were team-taught with another instructor (Dr. Beth Thomson), and thus the evaluations for the two sections reflect both instructors’ teaching effectiveness.

At the University of Alabama numeric evaluations were not available for the practicum courses, such as CIE/CSE 497/597 and CIE/CSE 489/592.

SERVICE

Service to the Profession:

a. Membership:

• American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL)
• American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)
• American Educational Research Association (AERA)
• International Reading Association (IRA)
• National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)
• National Reading Conference (NRC)
• Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
• Georgia TESOL

b. National and international organization activities:
- American Educational Research Association (AERA)
  Session Chair, 2008, 2010

- Association Internationale De Linguistique Appliquee (AILA) (World Congress of Applied Linguistics)
  Conference Volunteer, 2005

- Intercultural Rhetoric and Discourse Conference
  Plenary Session Chair, 2007

- National Council of Teachers of English-Assembly for Research (NCTE-AR)
  Conference Volunteer, 2005

- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
  Doctoral Forum Mentor, 2006
  Energy Break Session Discussion Leader, 2006

Service to the Community:

- Observations and consultation with bilingual community liaisons & ESL teachers at Taylor Road Middle School, Spring 2010

- Translation of English materials into Korean for Korean ESL students’ parents in Tuscaloosa City Schools, Summer 2007

- Observations and consultation at the Tuscaloosa Korean Heritage School, Spring 2006
· ESL classroom observations and consultation at the Tuscaloosa Academy, Fall 2005
· Asian Pacific Americans Caucus, The Ohio State University, 2004-2005
· Interpretation for Korean ESL parents, Dublin, OH, Spring 2005
· Translation of a Dublin School ESL Parent Handbook, Dublin, OH, Fall 2004
· Volunteer bilingual classroom aide at Dublin Scioto High School, Dublin, OH, 2003-2004
· Adult basic literacy tutor, Columbus Literacy Council, Columbus, OH, 2003
· English-Korean interpreter at Kyungjoo Culture Exposition, Kyungjoo, Korea, September 1998

Service to the University:

a. At Georgia State University (Fall 2008 present):

Department/Unit Level:

Program coordinator for Teacher Education in English, ESOL, Mathematics, Middle Level Education, Social Studies, and Science (TEEMS)-English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Summer 2009–present

Member, Faculty Search Committee for Clinical Assistant Professor in ESOL, Fall 2009-Spring 2010

Revising portfolio standards, rubrics, and practicum and program handbook for a TEEMS-ESOL program

Revising doctoral comprehensive exams in Language and Literacy Unit
Interviewing prospective MA and doctoral students in Language and Literacy Unit

Conducting ESOL new Student and student teaching orientations, Fall 2009- present

Completing annual WEAVE online program assessment reports

Completing annual PAAR reports for Georgia Professional Standards Commission review of a RLL-MAT program

College/University Level:

Professional Education Faculty (PEF) Content Knowledge Committee, 2009-2011

Invited talk, Triple socialization in U.S. graduate program, to international students in the Cultural Exchange Program in the Department of Applied Linguistics and ESL at Georgia State University. (2010, July 28).

b. At the University of Alabama (Fall 2005 Spring 2008):

Department Level:

Member, Search Committee for Assistant Literacy Education Faculty, Spring 2008

Member, Graduate Student Research/Presentation Funding committee, Curriculum & Instruction, 2007-2008

Member, Search Committee for Clinical Assistant Elementary Education Faculty, Spring 2007

Member, Search Committee for Assistant Gifted and Talented Education Faculty, Spring 2006

Consulting with parents of prospective students for the Teacher Education Program.

College/University Level:

Member, Graduate Scholarship Committee, College of Education, 2005-2007

Mentoring University of Alabama exchange students from Korea and Korean students at the English Language Institute at the University of Alabama

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND BEHAVIOR

Conferences attended (but did not present):

6th Conference on Intercultural Rhetoric and Discourse, Atlanta, Georgia, June 2010

Korea TESOL Conference, Daegu, South Korea, May 2010

Annual Meeting at the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Denver, CO, April/May 2010
Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Boston, MA, March 2010


Workshops Attended:

“Research Wednesdays,” College of Education, GSU, Academic Year 2008-2010


“Qualitative Research Software (Nvivo 8.0)” Workshop, MSIT, GSU, 2008

“Race, Class, and Culture Brown Bag Series,” MSIT, GSU, Academic Year 2008-2009


“Exploring Problems and Solutions to Generation 1.5 Writing,” Energy Breaks (ticketed event), Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Tampa, Florida, March 15, 2006.

“Faculty Research Development Program” (Grant writing workshops included), College of Education, University of Alabama (2005-2008)
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Education

2007: Ph.D. in Language Education
The University of Georgia
Department of Language & Literacy Education
Peter Smagorinsky (chair), Mark Faust, Richard Siegesmund, Committee Members
Dissertation Title: Integrating visual and language arts: A case study of a teacher composing a curriculum
Interdisciplinary Graduate Certificate in Qualitative Studies

2003: M.A. in Curriculum & Teacher Education
Stanford University
Arnetha Ball, Advisor
Master’s Project: Constructing meaning through visual art in the English classroom: Toward an understanding of integration

1999: Teacher Certification, K-12 Art and Secondary English
The University of Iowa

Student teaching placements at Longfellow, Wood, & Twain elementary art programs in Iowa City, secondary Creative Arts and English programs at The Magna Carta School, Staines, England

1996: Honors B.A. in Art and English, German minor, magna cum laude
The University of Iowa

John Dilg, Advisor, School of Art and Art History
Honors Thesis in Art: A look at innocence: A project in painting
Peter Nazareth, Advisor, English Department
Honors Thesis in English: Exploring the text through illustration: The Maru experience

Professional Experience

Postsecondary Education

Fall 2008-Present: Georgia State University
Assistant Professor of English Education, tenure-track
Program Coordinator, English Education M.Ed. program

Fall 2007-Summer 2008: Georgia State University
Clinical Assistant Professor of English Education
Program Coordinator, English Education M.A.T. program

2003-2006: The University of Georgia
Graduate Teaching Assistant

Secondary Education

2000-2002: English and Journalism Teacher
Ed W. Clark High School, Las Vegas, Nevada

Spring 2000, Spring 2001: Teacher, Art Division
Inner City Games, Las Vegas, Nevada

Elementary Education

Jan 2000-Aug 2000: Art Specialist
John S. Park Elementary School, Las Vegas, Nevada

Aug 1999-Jan 2000: Itinerant Art Specialist
John S. Park Elementary, Helen M. Jydstrup Elementary, Rex Bell Elementary Schools,
Las Vegas, Nevada

Scholarship

Publications

International and National Refereed


State/Regional Refereed


Book Chapters


Reports

Multimedia Publications


Book Reviews


Conference Proceedings Refereed


Manuscripts under Review

Zoss, M. Composing an integrated curriculum: A teacher lays down a path for literacy and visual arts while walking. Manuscript invited to be revised and resubmitted with Research in the Teaching of English.
Zoss, M., Holbrook, T., McGrail, E., & Albers, P. Knotty articulations: Preservice Reflections on teaching literacy in urban schools. Manuscript invited to be revised and resubmitted with English Education.

Manuscripts in Preparation


Presentations

International Conferences

Refereed Presentations

Zoss, M., & White, A. M. (2011, Sep.). An expressive teaching moment: How a semiotic-rich project informed one teacher’s experience. Paper presentation at the triennial congress of International Society for Cultural and Activity Research Congress (ISCAR), Rome, Italy.


National

Refereed Presentations

Deming, M., Zoss, M., & Thompson, T. (2010, Nov.). Preparing graduate students to teach language arts in the time of a recession. Panel presentation at the National Council of Teachers of English Annual Convention, Orlando, Florida.


Zoss, M., & Smagorinsky, P. (2005, Jan.). Arts-based thinking in a high school interior design class: A case study of a senior’s design process. Paper presentation at 18th Annual Conference on Interdisciplinary Qualitative Studies (QUIG), Athens, Georgia.

Murphy, S. L., & Zoss, M. (2005, Jan.). Reclaiming the aesthetic experience as a way of knowing in Language Arts classrooms. Workshop presentation at 18th Annual Conference on Interdisciplinary Qualitative Studies (QUIG), Athens, Georgia.


State/Regional Conferences

Refereed Presentations


Academic Awards and Grants

Awards


2007: Georgia Association of Teacher Educators Distinguished Program in Teacher Education Award, honoring the TEEMS English Education MAT Degree Program Faculty: Drs. Peggy Albers, Dana Fox, Frances Howard, Ewa McGrail, and Michelle Zoss
2007: The University of Georgia Graduate School Travel Award

2007: The University of Georgia College of Education Travel Award

2006: The University of Georgia Department of Language & Literacy Education Carol J. Fisher Award for Excellence in Graduate Research

2006-2007: The University of Georgia Graduate School Dissertation Completion Assistantship Award ($36,861)

2005: Foreign Travel Award: The University of Georgia Research Foundation and Graduate School

2003-2005: University Wide Assistantship: The University of Georgia ($35,000 per school year)

2002: Southwest Region STAR Educator: Southwest Region, Clark County School District, Las Vegas, NV

(Chosen by the principal, awards given to 5 teachers within the school for outstanding contributions to the school and the community)

2002: Journalism Adviser of the Year: Class! Magazine, Las Vegas, NV

(Award given to one adviser each year for outstanding work with students in a journalism program in Clark County, Nevada)

1996: Presidential Citation: The University of Iowa

(Honor for students achieving 4.0 GPA for multiple, consecutive semesters)

1996: Susan B. Hancher Award: The University of Iowa

(Award given to one graduating woman who best exemplifies Susan Hancher’s qualities of leadership, motivation, concern, and dedication in her contributions to University and community life)

1996: Collegiate Scholar Award: The University of Iowa

(Award given to nominated graduating seniors for academic excellence and completion of honors program)

1993: Poetry Writing Finalist, Level II Award winner, National Foundation for the Advancement of the Arts YoungArts Week

(One of 150 of the nation’s 17-18 year olds chosen to participate in a week-long arts community experience; selection from 7,000 applicants in nine disciplines)

1992: Valedictorian, Elgin High School, Elgin IL
(Top graduate, ranked 1 in a class of over 600)

Grants

2009:  The Atlanta Institute for New Media and Learning (AINML) ($1M) proposed by Drs. Brendan Calandra, Dana Fox, Steve Harmon, and Michelle Zoss.

2009:  Georgia State University Fiscal Year 2010 Technology Fees Grant Program for “Teachers' Understanding of Urban” ($39,740 awarded) with uiCLAD Research Group: Drs. Peggy Albers, Teri Holbrook, Ewa McGrail, and Michelle Zoss.

2008:  Dean’s Graduate Research Assistantship for Georgia State University College of Education ($12,000 awarded) for work with Alisha White for 2008-2009.


2008:  Georgia State University Interdisciplinary Research Team Grant Program, University Research Services & Administration ($15,000 awarded) with uiCLAD Research Group: Drs. Peggy Albers, Melanie Davenport, John Decker, Teri Holbrook, Kevin Hsieh, Ewa McGrail, Melody Milbrandt, and Michelle Zoss

2007:  Georgia State University, College of Arts and Sciences CENCIA Grant ($3,000 awarded) with uiCLAD Research Group: Drs. Peggy Albers, Melanie Davenport, Teri Holbrook, Ewa McGrail, Melody Milbrandt, and Michelle Zoss

Evidence of Peer Recognition and Reputation

Editing

Web co-editor for Conference on English Education (CEE), a division of the National Council of Teacher of English (NCTE), 2007-2010

Publications editor Journal of Language and Literacy Education (JoLLE), a peer-reviewed, open-access academic journal based in the Department of Language and Literacy Education at the University of Georgia and founded in 2004; see: http://www.coe.uga.edu/jolle/ (Term as publications editor began with Volume 1, Issue 1)
Editorial review board member for Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education – English, 2007 – present

Keynote Addresses


Zoss, M. (2008, Apr.). Multimodal composition: Learning from the backpack lesson. Invited talk for the Annual Induction Ceremony for the University of Georgia Alpha Upsilon Alpha (AUA) Honor Society Chapter of the International Reading Association, Athens, GA.

Significant Professional Service

Elected Co-Chair with Dr. Peggy Albers for the Conference on English Education (CEE) Commission on Arts and Literacy Group 2010-2011

Invited participant for the Second Conference on English Education (CEE) Leadership and Policy Summit, Summer 2007, at Lake Forest College, Illinois, to continue work begun at the first summit in 2005. Invitations extended to only 100 CEE leaders in the field.

Manuscript review for the following scholarly journals (number of times):

- Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education – English (6)
- English Education (3)
- Journal of Language and Literacy Education (3)
- Journal of Teacher Education (2)
- Language Arts (1)
- Urban Education (4)
- Written Communication (1)
Manuscript reviewer for National Reading Conference Yearbook, 2008

Manuscript reviewer for TeachersBridge.org (Building Resources: Induction and Development for Georgia Educators): 19 manuscripts reviewed, 2004-2009

Invited proposal reviewer for Federal Teacher Quality Grants

- 2010 proposals reviewed in January 2010
- 2011 proposals reviewed in December 2010

Proposal reviewer for the following conferences:

- Annual Conference on Interdisciplinary Qualitative Studies (QUIG), 2004, 2005 (last conference held in 2005)
- Center for Latino Achievement and Success in Education: First Triennial Conference on Latino Education and Immigrant Integration, 2009
- Conference on English Education (CEE) Summer Conference, 2011

Teaching

Courses

Fall 2008-Present: Georgia State University

Assistant professor, tenure-track, English Education

Program Coordinator, English Education M.Ed. program (n=12 active students)

Graduate Courses Summer 2011

   EDCI 8970: Seminar in Teaching and Learning
   EDRD 9870: Advanced Research Seminar in Language & Literacy Education

EDCI 8810: Directed Readings Research in Teaching & Learning, Lauren Phillips

Graduate Courses Spring 2011
EDLA 7460: Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Writing (n=23)
EDRD 8550: Trends/Issues in Literacy Education: The Making of Meaning: Sociocultural Perspectives of Teaching and Learning (n = 15)
EDRD 9870: Advanced Research Seminar in Language & Literacy Education (n=2)
EDCI 9660: Research Internship, Apprenticeship with Alisha White & David Brown

Graduate Courses Fall 2010
EDLA 6550: Principles of English Instruction (n=30)
EDLA 7440: Theory and Pedagogy in the Study of Literature (n=13)
EDCI 9660: Research Internship, Apprenticeship with Alisha White & David Brown

Graduate and Undergraduate Courses Spring 2010
RGTR 0198: Regents’ Reading Skills (n=22)
EDCI 7670/7680: Practicum II & III in English Education (n=6)
EDCI 9660: Research Internship, Apprenticeship with Alisha White
EDCI 8810: Directed Readings Research in Teaching & Learning, Christi Moore

Graduate and Undergraduate Courses Fall 2009:
EDLA 6550: Principles of English Instruction (n=26)
RGTR 0198: Regents’ Reading Skills (n=20)
EDCI 9660: Research Internship, Apprenticeship with Alisha White
EDCI 9660: Teaching Internship, Apprenticeship with Alisha White

Graduate Courses Spring 2009:
EDLA 7550: Theory and Pedagogy of English Instruction (n=27)
EDCI 9660: Research Internship, Apprenticeship with Alisha White

Graduate Courses Fall 2008:
EDCI 7660: Practicum I in English Education (n=5)
EDRD 8310: Theoretical Models and Processes of Literacy: Writing as Composing: Theory, Research and Practice (n=10)
EDCI 9660: Research Internship, Apprenticeship with Alisha White

Fall 2007-Summer 2008: Georgia State University
Clinical assistant professor of English Education in Language and Literacy Division
Program Coordinator, English Education M.A.T. program (2007-08 cohort of 33 students)

Graduate Courses Summer 2008:
EDCI 6600: Introduction to Secondary Teaching (n=16)

Graduate Courses Spring 2008:
EDCI 7670/7680 (two sections): Practicum II & III in English Education (n=6)
EDLA 7550: Theory and Pedagogy of English Instruction (n=15)

Graduate Courses Fall 2007:
EDCI 7660 (two sections): Practicum I in English Education (n=9)

EDLA 6550: Principles of English Instruction (n=14)

2003-2006: The University of Georgia
Graduate Teaching Assistant

Undergraduate Courses
ELAN 4460: Supervised Field Experience in English Education (Fall 2005)
ELAN 4460: Arts-Based Approaches to Teaching English (Fall 2003, 2004)
ARED 3350: Basic Curriculum in Art Education (Fall 2004)

Impact on Students
Advising
5 PhD students, major professor, in progress:
David Brown, Vincent Fenimore, Christi Pace, Shekema Silveri, Alisha White

4 PhD students, committee member, in progress:
Leslie Bell, Adrienne Nicole Manry Pourchier, Amy Pelissero, Kelli Sowerbrower

1 PhD student, committee member, completed
Christi Moore, Allow the Music to Speak: A Portraiture Case Study of Pre-Service Teachers’ Experiences in a Music-Integrated Literacy Methods Course

5 MEd English Education students, in progress

2 MEd English Education students, completed:
   Jennifer Elmer, spring 2010
   Gayle Anderson Rueve, fall 2009

20 MAT English Education (TEEMS) students, in progress

27 MAT English Education (TEEMS) students, completed:
Neil Alhanti, summer 2009
David Rory Andrews, fall 2008
Krista Bowen, summer 2009
Kyra Caldwell, summer 2009
Crystal Carley, summer 2008
Alyssa Catalano, spring 2011
James Clark, spring 2011
Angela Bagley Fitzpatrick, summer 2008
Michelle Golden, summer 2008
Kendra Deans Hanson, summer 2008
Jacqueline Holubz, summer 2010
Alexis Horder, summer 2009
Zachary Hunt, summer 2009
Ann Lewis, summer 2009
Debra Lydon, summer 2010
Haniyyah Nu’Man, spring 2010
Renita Okon, summer 2010
Laura Olson, summer 2008
Erika Parker, spring 2010
Julia Raposo, spring 2010
Melanie Shaw, summer 2009
Joshua Shuster, summer 2008
Gale Skipworth, summer 2010
Lauren Snyder, summer 2008
Michael Tillman, spring 2011
Melissa Bogle Tulloch, summer 2008
Amanda Lee Williams, spring 2011

1 Non-Degree Student, completed
Virginia Clark, 2010
Evidence of Student Achievement

Collaborative Work with Students

Zoss, M., & White, A. M. (2011, Sep.). An expressive teaching moment: How a semiotic-rich project informed one teacher’s experience. Paper presentation at the triennial congress of International Society for Cultural and Activity Research Congress (ISCAR), Rome, Italy.


Deming, M., Zoss, M., & Thompson, C. (2010, Nov.). Preparing graduate students to teach language arts in the time of a recession. Panel presentation at the National Council of Teachers of English Annual Convention, Orlando, Florida.


Published work by students: National Refereed Articles

Published work by students: Multimedia Publications


Published work by students: Conference Proceedings


Student Awards and Grants

Alisha White: 2009-2012 Doctoral Fellow, Double the Double Grant $15,000/year; 2009-2010 Margaret A. Staton Scholarship, GSU, Office of Disability Services $500; Summer 2009 After School All Stars Research Assistantship Grant, GSU, $1300; 2008-2009 Margaret A. Staton Scholarship, GSU, Office of Disability Services $1500; 2008-2009 Dean’s Graduate Research Assistantship Grant, GSU, College of Education $12,000.

Emily Decker: $1000 Grant Winner, Georgia Power’s New Teacher Assistance Grant Program (2009); Outstanding Master of Arts in Teaching English Education Award, MSIT Department

Kyra Caldwell: Georgia Council of Teachers of English Teacher of Color Award (2008-09)

Students in National Elected Positions

Shekema (Holmes) Silveri: 2009 Secondary Nominating Committee, National Council of Teachers of English

Professional Service

Service to the Profession

Membership

American Educational Research Association (AERA)
National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)
Conference on English Education (CEE)
National Conference on Research in Language and Literacy (NCRLL)
International Society for Cultural and Activity Research (ISCAR)
National Association of Teachers of English (England) (NATE)
National Art Education Association (NAEA)
International Reading Association (IRA)
Alpha Upsilon Alpha, honor society chapter of International Reading Association (AUA)

Service to the University

Professional Education Faculty

Co-Author, 2010 Induction Committee Report for PEF, Georgia State University, 2010
Co-Chair, NET-Q Summer Institute (formerly New Educator Induction Conference), Georgia State University, 2009
Chair, New Educator Induction Conference, Georgia State University, 2008

Member, Ad hoc committee: Middle-Secondary Teacher Preparation, Georgia State University, 2008

Host and Technology “Go To” Person for New Educator Induction Conference, Georgia State University, 2007

Member, Induction Committee, Georgia State University, 2007 – present

College of Education

Faculty Secretary for College of Education, Georgia State University, 2008-2009

Student Representative and Graduate Student Coordinator, Steering Committee for the annual Conference on Interdisciplinary Qualitative Studies (QUIG), University of Georgia, 2005-2007

Department

Member, Search Committee for Clinical Assistant Professor in Special Education, a position for EPSE & MSIT, January 2010-present

Coordinator, English Education Master’s of Education Degree (MEd) Program, Georgia State University, fall 2008 – present

Member, TEEMS English Education Master’s of Arts in Teaching Degree (MAT) Program, Georgia State University, fall 2008 – present

Member, Annual Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Review Guidelines Writing Committee, MSIT Department, Georgia State University, 2008

Member, Mission Statement Writing Committee, MSIT Department, Georgia State University, 2008

Member, Language & Literacy Education Unit, MSIT Department, Georgia State University, Doctoral Candidates Interview and Dissertation Committees, fall 2007 – present

Member, TEEMS English Education Education Specialist Degree (EdS) Program, Georgia State University, fall 2007 – present

Coordinator, TEEMS English Education Master’s of Arts in Teaching Degree (MAT) Program, Georgia State University, fall 2007 – summer 2008
Member, Annual Review Committee, Language Literacy & Social Studies Division, MSIT Department, Georgia State University, 2007-2008

Member, Marketing Committee, Language Literacy & Social Studies Division, MSIT Department, Georgia State University, 2007-2008

Student Liaison, Department of Language and Literacy Education Faculty, University of Georgia, 2005-2006

Service to the Community

Poetry Judge for Maynard Jackson High School’s NEA Poetry Out Loud! Competition, 2011

Literacy Liaison for Visual Literacy Project at Chase Street Elementary in coordination with the Art Education Program at the University of Georgia, 2008

Workshop Leader: Ndebele Art and Symbols, an art and literacy workshop presented at The Study Hall in Atlanta, Georgia, in conjunction with the Georgia State University Urban Literacy Clinic, 2008

Mentor for an early career teacher in Barrow County School District, 2003 – present

Professional Development

Grants Management Workshop with URSA, Georgia State University, April 2011

Advanced Training Program: Research Design Course, Georgia State University, Fall 2010

Research Wednesday Speaker Series, Georgia State University, 2008 – present

LiveText User Workshop, Georgia Tech University, November 2008


Guide to Internal Grants Workshop with URSA, Georgia State University, November 2007

LiveText Portfolio for Instructors Workshop with Dr Mary Ariail, Georgia State University, November 2007

Finding Funding Using an Online Database with URSA, Georgia State University, October 2007

LiveText Portfolio for Students Workshop with Dr Mary Ariail, Georgia State University, October 2007
Faculty Luncheon Seminar for New Faculty, Center for Teaching and Learning, Georgia State University, September 2007

Podcasting Workshop with Tim Merritt, Georgia State University, September 2007

Research Interests

Integration of arts with English language arts and literacy education

Aesthetic experience and experience in education

Teacher education

Novice teacher mentorship

Teaching Interests

Teacher education: Undergraduate and graduate levels of language and literacy education

Teacher education: General classroom teachers and the role of art in curriculum and pedagogy

Arts-based approaches to the teaching of English language arts

Qualitative research methods
App. F4: Process of faculty approval of this self-study

MSIT’s Process of Developing Department’s Five-year Goals in Research, Teaching and Service

The Department of Middle Secondary and Instructional Design and Technology was dedicated to a thorough assessment of how well we met the goals of our 2004-2011 review. The results from this review indicate that MSIT has been successful to meeting almost all these goals. Working from the success of these goals and in light of Georgia State University’s and the College of Education’s Strategic Plans, we were very systematic and intentional in designing the 2011-2014 goals. The faculty as a whole met several times to work on these goals:

- Each faculty member brainstormed a written list of possible goals in Research, Teaching and Service during the MSIT Department Meeting, December 10, 2010.
- We compiled and analyzed all individual brainstormed goals and presented results of this analysis to faculty at MSIT Department Meeting on February 25, 2011, and to the MSIT Leadership Team on March 11, 2011.
- The MSIT APR Self-study Committee was established with faculty representing each MSIT unit. The Committee began to meet regularly to plan the steps needed to complete the report and to delegate sections for units to complete.
- Committee members led further discussion and development of goals in MSIT Units in Spring 2011.
- All MSIT faculty were divided in five small groups and worked to align MSIT goals with the five major GSU Strategic Plan Goals and the three major COE Strategic Plan Goals at the MSIT Retreat, May 5-6, 2011.
- APR committee members met three times early in the Fall 2011 semester to craft the departments’ goals.
- APR Self-study Committee members finalized a draft of goals and presented the draft to the MSIT faculty for a vote on September 9, 2011. The draft was accepted and forwarded to the Chair and the Dean.
- APR Committee members met regularly during the Fall 2011 semester. Committee members provided various data including the history of their programs, a description of faculty and student accomplishments, and student assessment results. Committee members also helped in the analysis of the student and faculty surveys.
- The APR report was sent to the MSIT faculty and staff February 10th for comments and questions.

The APR report was accepted....

The completed APR report was sent to the Dean February and to the University APR committee....

The APR Committee planned the Review Team’s schedule and activities.

App. F5: Evidence for discipline-appropriate rationale and criteria for evaluation of scholarly and creative work.
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Revised May 11, 1994
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Revised January 12, 1998
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Revised May 8, 2000
Revised December 9, 2003
Revised May 9, 2004
Revised, April 28, 2006
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PREAMBLE

The College of Education is a metropolitan professional school with a special commitment to excellence in preparing persons to work in a variety of urban educational and other settings and to advancing and disseminating knowledge. The mission of the College incorporates three components: teaching, research, and service. Given the nature of a professional school, this mission is achieved by having faculty who serve diverse roles and who have unique responsibilities. Some faculty are hired to serve in traditional tenure track positions, while others are hired to serve in non-tenure track clinical positions. The valuation of the faculty within the College recognizes the diversity of roles and acknowledges that there are multiple paths to excellence.

This having been stated, the College of Education exists within Georgia State University. There is therefore the expectation, which permeates the entire hiring, evaluation, and promotion and tenure process that research and scholarly activity are an essential part. This research and scholarly activity is intended to enhance and expand the body of knowledge and to push forward the limits of that knowledge. These research and scholarly activities in no way are intended to replace the elements of service and teaching but are considered to be significantly more representative of progress as far as expectations of faculty are concerned.

Promotions and tenure are integral components of a faculty member's professional growth and development at an academic institution. This growth and development begins when a faculty member is hired. At that time the faculty role and responsibilities are defined and expectations for performance delineated. Professional goals are set and plans for meeting those goals explored and established. To ensure growth and development, faculty must be evaluated each year in a meaningful way to determine if responsibilities have been met and to measure progress toward professional goals. Promotion is granted on the basis of a faculty member's accomplishments. It is a statement that the individual has met the established responsibilities and achieved personal goals.

Granting of tenure is a statement that an individual has demonstrated the kinds of abilities the University community values and holds the promise of continuing to develop and manifest those abilities. These guidelines are intended to clarify the requirements for promotion and tenure consistent with these expectations for research and scholarly activity. Included in this document are guidelines for promotion and tenure, third-year review of tenure-track faculty, cumulative review of tenured faculty, and emeritus status.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to know and follow the guidelines set forth in this document, to present a professional record clearly and accurately, and to allow the reviews to proceed according to the rules established. Similarly, it is the responsibility of all members of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (ACFPT) to know and follow those same guidelines and all established procedures, while conducting their reviews and deliberations carefully, with open minds and under strict standards of confidentiality. Each person, whether a candidate, a member of the ACFPT, or an otherwise uninvolved member of the College of Education faculty, must respect and protect the parameters in this document and the independence of the process. Doing so allows each participant to pursue his/her responsibilities freely and fully, facilitating the review process to the benefit of all.
Part 1
Promotion and Tenure

1.0 Eligibility for Promotion and/or Tenure

1.10 Eligibility for Promotion
All candidates for promotion shall hold an earned doctoral degree or its equivalent as adjudged by the Dean of the College and must be full time members of the faculty of the College of Education. Prior to application, the candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor must have served at the rank of Instructor for a minimum of three (3) years, the candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must have served at the rank of Assistant Professor for a minimum of four (4) years; and the candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor must have served at the rank of Associate Professor for a minimum of five (5) years. All years counting toward promotion must be served at Georgia State University. (See BOR 4.03.01) The number of required years in rank prior to the effective date of promotion is one year more than cited above for each rank. When moving from a non-tenure track to a tenure-track line, time in rank in a non-tenure track position may not be used to meet these requirements. The maximum time that may be served at the rank of full-time instructor is seven (7) years.

1.101 Exceptions to the Requirement to Furnish a Brief
1.1011 Promotion to Assistant Professor
A candidate for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor is not required to submit a brief but is required to submit notification of intent to be considered for promotion and to document with an official transcript the completion of the doctoral degree.

1.1012 Promotion for Secondary Appointment in the College of Education
A candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor and who holds secondary appointment in the College of Education is not required to submit a brief but is required to submit notification of intent to have the recommendation of the College of their primary appointment apply to their joint appointment in the College of Education.

1.20 Eligibility for Tenure
To possess tenure at a university is to authenticate and validate one's position at that institution. To recommend that a fellow faculty member be granted tenure is a statement that a colleague has demonstrated the kinds of abilities the University community values and holds the promise of continuing to develop and manifest those abilities. Among the abilities examined for purposes of assessing faculty members are those traditionally associated with promotion: teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service. Promotion is generally granted on the basis of one's past accomplishments in these areas; tenure takes one's past accomplishments into account and considers as well one's ability to contribute to the culture of a particular institution and to larger academic and social communities. Thus, while the granting of promotion does not necessarily or explicitly entail a consideration of an individual's promise for future performance, the granting of tenure does do so.
According to the policies of the College of Education regarding tenure, the standards upon which faculty are to be considered include: success in carrying out the faculty responsibilities of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service; and evidence of professional development and behavior in dealing with students, colleagues, and the community. A person granted tenure by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia is entitled to full-time employment for two out of three academic semesters until retirement, dismissal for cause, or release because of financial exigency.

All candidates for tenure shall hold an earned doctoral degree or its equivalent as adjudged by the Dean of the College, must be full time members of the faculty of the College of Education, must hold the rank of Assistant Professor or higher, and must hold a tenure-track line. Clinical faculty are not eligible for tenure. Prior to application, the candidate seeking tenure must have served as a full time faculty member in a tenure-track line at Georgia State University for a minimum of four (4) academic years, except that credit may be granted for up to three years' previous service at another university or as an instructor at Georgia State University. No credit may be granted for time served in a non-tenure track position. The maximum time that may be served at the rank of Assistant Professor or above without the award of tenure is seven years. If an institutional recommendation for tenure is denied during a faculty member's seventh year, a terminal one year contract may be offered for an eighth year. The maximum time that may be served in any combination of full-time instructional appointments (lecturer, instructor, professorial) without the award of tenure is ten years. In the event an institutional recommendation for tenure is denied during the candidate's tenth year, a terminal, one-year contract may be offered. The maximum time that may be served at the rank of full time instructor is seven (7) years.

Tenure or probationary credit towards tenure is lost upon resignation from an institution, or written resignation from a tenured position in order to take a non-tenured position, or written resignation from a position for which probationary credit towards tenure has been given to take a position for which no probationary credit is given. In the event such an individual is again employed as a candidate for tenure, probationary credit for prior service may be awarded in the same manner as for service at another institution.

2.0 Advisory Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (ACFPT)

2.10 Committee Purpose

The Advisory Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (ACFPT) is a standing subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the College of Education. Its purpose is to recommend to the Dean through the Faculty Affairs Committee of the College of Education those faculty members the Committee agrees have met the standards for promotion and/or for the granting of tenure. Two other sources of recommendation to the Dean are (a) the chair of the candidate's Department and (b) the promotions and tenure committee within the candidate's department. Based upon these three sources of recommendation and an independent review of the candidate's brief, the Dean forwards a recommendation to the Provost. The Dean's recommendation may be accompanied by recommendations from the Department Chair, the department’s promotion and tenure committee, and the ACFPT.
Subsequently, the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the President of the University, and the Board of Regents are involved in the decision.

2.20 Committee Membership
The ACFPT shall consist of six members, at least one of whom must be a full professor. Each Department of the College of Education shall elect from among its faculty one representative (1) who has been a full time faculty member of the College of Education for three academic years, (2) who holds the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, and (3) who has been awarded tenure. Faculty members so elected shall serve a term of two years. A faculty member may not serve two consecutive full terms on the ACFPT. Faculty members who are candidates for promotion or tenure may not serve on the ACFPT. Any committee member who is a relative of the candidate, or has a relationship that constitutes a conflict of interest with the candidate, must withdraw from the committee. A schedule for each department's election has been established so that half the members of the committee will be elected each year. Departments should hold elections for representatives during the fall semester. The Department Chair will notify the Dean and the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the results of the election according to the timeline in Appendix D. The term of office will be January 1 - December 31. Should a vacancy occur before a person has completed a full term, the affected Department will fill that vacancy by holding a special election. A quorum consists of three-fourths of the full committee membership; no committee action is official unless a quorum is present.

2.30 ACFPT Procedures

2.301 Notification of Eligibility for Promotion and/or Tenure
The Dean will notify faculty members of their eligibility for promotion and/or tenure. It is the clear and unequivocal responsibility of candidates to notify their chairs, the Dean and the chair of the ACFPT of the intent to submit their credentials for consideration according to the timeline in Appendix D.

2.302 The Advisory Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure will have its initial meeting at the call of the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee according to the timeline in Appendix D. The committee will have three orders of business: the election of a chair, the review of this document, and the planning of informational sessions for faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure. These informational sessions are to be held according to the timeline in Appendix D.

2.303 Initial Review of Candidate's Brief for Proper Formatting
The committee, or its designate, will peruse any submitted briefs for proper format according to the timeline in Appendix D. As a courtesy the committee will return its suggestions according to the timeline in Appendix D.

2.304 First Fall Meeting of ACFPT
Committee members will meet to form themselves into interview teams for the purpose of reading the briefs, interviewing references, reading the external reviewers’ comments of assigned candidates, and the
recommendations from the Department Chair and promotion and tenure committee.

2.305 Second Fall Meeting of ACFPT
The committee will meet to hear the findings of the interview teams in preparation for scheduling interviews with the candidates. In establishing the interviews with the candidates, the committee will make the candidates aware of any additional information or clarification necessary during the interview.

2.306 Interviewing Candidates
Each candidate will be interviewed by ACFPT to ensure the committee's full understanding of the candidate's accomplishments. At this time the committee may ask for further information regarding criteria about which the committee yet has questions. Candidates will have the opportunity to share with the committee the likely direction of their future research and other aspirations regarding the further development of their careers.

2.307 Third Fall Meeting of ACFPT
After the interviews, the committee will meet for the purpose of considering the candidates. Members will rate candidates in each performance area. Committee members, by simple majority vote, make their determination of the promotability or tenurability of the candidates. The Chair, on behalf of the committee, informs the candidates of the committee’s decision in writing. This letter includes a rating for each category along with the rationale for that particular rating.

Rating profiles will be determined as follows:

2.3071 Each area of consideration (research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service) will be rated on a scale of inadequate, adequate, outstanding, or superior.

2.3072 A tenure track candidate will be recommended to the rank of Associate Professor if the rating profile includes a rating of not less than outstanding in research and scholarly activity, and not less than adequate in each of the other two areas.

2.3073 A non-tenure track candidate (Clinical faculty) will be recommended to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor if the rating profile includes a rating of not less than outstanding in teaching, and not less than adequate in each of the other two areas.

2.3074 A tenure track candidate will be recommended to the rank of Professor if the rating profile includes a rating of not less than superior in research and scholarly activity, not less than outstanding in a second area and not less than adequate in the third area.

2.3075 A non-tenure track candidate (Clinical faculty) will be recommended
to the rank of Clinical Professor if the rating profile meets the same standard as required in 2.3074 (i.e., a rating of not less than superior in research and scholarly activity, not less than outstanding in a second area and not less than adequate in the third area).

2.3076 Tenure track candidates will be considered to have met the initial requirements for recommendation for tenure if they meet the promotion rating profile for the rank of Associate Professor. Clinical faculty are not eligible for tenure.

2.308 Fourth Fall Meeting of ACFPT
The ACFPT makes recommendations to the FAC on the entire process. This may involve recommendations regarding revisions of these Guidelines.

3.0 Criteria for Promotion

Information for evaluation by the ACFPT is to be submitted for each of three areas: research and scholarly activity; teaching; and service. These categories subsume the Board of Regents' indices for promotion of (1) academic achievement, (2) superior teaching, (3) outstanding service to the institution, and (4) professional growth and development. These criteria are defined below.

3.10 Research and Scholarly Activity
Tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor requires that a faculty member be recognized by scholars outside Georgia State University as a person who has contributed to the advancement and development of his or her area of expertise and seems likely to continue doing so. Promotion to the rank of professor is a recognition by the Department and the university that a faculty member’s scholarship is of such high quality and importance that the faculty member has achieved a national reputation as a leading scholar in his or her field.

The College of Education views scholarly activity as encompassing any activity that advances education and human development by creating, extending, integrating, applying, or promoting knowledge and modes of inquiry. In addition to inquiry, scholarly activity may include other activities that support or enhance scholarship. Scholarship comes in many forms and employs a variety of methods. Debates over the relative merits of basic versus applied research, theoretical versus empirical work, scholarship of discovery versus scholarship of integration, qualitative versus quantitative methods, and primary versus secondary analyses are misguided struggles. Each topic, method, approach, and technique should be judged on whether it is appropriate to the stated goal and whether it produces a valuable product.

Success in scholarly activity can be achieved in many ways and no one approach or technique is inherently superior to another. Scholarly activity will be evaluated on the basis of its impact on the candidate’s identified area(s) of scholarship. This preamble elaborates on some of the complexities involved as candidates develop and present their briefs and committees evaluate the briefs and accompanying documents.

3.101 Publications
Candidates may choose mainly to write articles for refereed journals or to publish in books whose publication process has comparable peer review scrutiny. Candidates who pursue a mixture of publication media (e.g., articles, authored or edited books, electronic media, videotapes, and chapters in books) will be evaluated on the whole body of work, as are those who specialize in one form of scholarly expression. Peer review is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship, however it is recognized that there are various levels of rigor in the peer review process. It is the candidates’ responsibility to provide evidence of the process and rigor of the reviews of their works, such as journal acceptance rate and review policy process.

The College recognizes that informal prestige hierarchies of scholarly journals exist within the fields of education and human development but cautions against rigid adherence to such rankings. Very valuable work that offers innovative approaches, new ideas, or evidence that challenges existing knowledge may not be published in the best-known journals. Important contributions to scholarship also may appear in non-traditional forms of refereed media such as CD-ROMs, Internet journals, and edited databases.

Scholarly books and book chapters constitute valuable contributions to knowledge. Publications with a prestigious press that conducts a rigorous review process is an indicator of the quality of a book or a book chapter in an edited volume. Publication of a scholarly book is more common in some fields than others and authoring a book of high quality may temporarily decrease other scholarly publications. In general, textbooks will be considered a contribution to instruction unless the text can be shown to make significant or seminal contributions to the scholarship of the field.

The College values both individual and collaborative scholarship without automatically assigning higher value to one over the other. Interdisciplinary inquiry is supported and often results in publications with multiple authors or in scholarly outlets of multiple fields. Furthermore, candidates who choose to collaborate may be able to publish a greater number of items than those working alone. In different fields, order of authorship conveys different information about relative contribution to the work. It is incumbent upon candidates to make all this clear in their narratives.

The College resists the idea that evaluations can be defined solely by the number of publications or other scholarly activity. A smaller number of works of outstanding quality, or those requiring time-consuming methodologies, may be evaluated as equal or superior to a greater number of works. Candidates will demonstrate their scholarly productivity through both the quality and quantity of their publications and other scholarly activity.

3.102 Presentations
Presentations are another important avenue for dissemination of scholarship. Presentations at meetings of national and international organizations reach a wider audience and typically require more rigorous peer review than presentations at state and regional meetings. Invited addresses, keynote presentations, and organization of important symposia are indicators of a candidate’s standing in the community of scholars. In general, workshops will
be considered as a contribution to service or instruction unless they can be shown to make a significant contribution to the scholarship of the field.

3.103 Grants

Obtaining extramural grant support for one's research is a valued scholarly activity, and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources, offers significant evidence of scholarly reputation. Evaluation of external grant funding records will be considered in light of available sources and processes within the candidate’s field. It is recognized that writing proposals and implementing grants is a time-consuming and demanding activity and may temporarily decrease other scholarly activity. It is incumbent upon the candidates to document the impact of their grant support.

3.104 Other Scholarly Activity and Professional Recognition

Leadership in professional organizations (e.g., officers, program chairs, committee chairs) and the editorial process of publication (e.g., editorial boards) are indicators of the scholarly reputation of the candidate. Other activities, such as organizing sessions for professional meetings and reviewing the works of others are valued activities for any scholar and may also reflect scholarly reputation. These activities also may be considered scholarly activity, if the candidates can show how they advance scholarship in the field.

3.105 Conclusion

The goal of the College is to foster the production of high-quality scholarship, acknowledging that the candidates’ work must be judged holistically in the context of their fields. The quality of scholarship will be assessed on: (a) the impact or effect of the work on the field, (b) the scope or extent of the work, and (c) the depth or intensity of the work. Judgment for this will be based on candidates’ evidence of scholarship, their narrative explanation of the importance of the work, the professional judgment of external reviewers, the recommendations of chairs and departmental promotion and tenure committees, and the Committee’s independent assessment of the work.

3.20 Teaching

Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and typically involves teaching in the university classroom. Teaching activities may also include the delivery of instructional workshops and the like to professional peers and practitioners, as well as the development of new courses, programs, instructional approaches, textbooks, and other curricular materials for both university and other students. Judgments of the quality of teaching activities are based on student or other participant evaluations, examination of course syllabi and other course materials, peer evaluations when available, and critical review and acceptance of teaching products.

3.30 Service

Service represents professional activities directed toward the development and maintenance of University and professional organizations, as well as activities that are undertaken on behalf of the University or the profession which do not entail systematic
instruction (e.g., manuscript reviewing, design and development of professional conferences). Judgments of the quality of service are based on the breadth and impact of professional contribution and on participation at the national, regional, state and local levels.

4.0 Guidelines for Evaluating the Candidate's Accomplishments
Because of the diversity of activities engaged in by faculty members, the committee will consider each set of materials individually using the following guidelines based on the quality of the candidate's research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service as attested by clear evidence of continuing development. The committee will utilize as a guide, the impact of the whole of the candidates’ contributions at the University, regional, national, and international levels.

4.10 Associate Professor
A recommendation for Associate Professor will rest on a continuing establishment of a reputation, which shows through the criteria of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service to have capability and promise for the professorate.

4.20 Professor
The recommendation to Professor will be based entirely on the corroboration of a reputation at the highest levels in the candidate's field of study. Highest levels refer to the acceptance by, and the interaction with, colleagues at the contributing and enhancing levels of the candidate's profession.

5.0 Criteria for Tenure
In addition to the candidate's demonstration of competent performance in the areas of research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service, the tenure recommendation will require evidence of professional behavior in dealing with students, colleagues, and the community.

Professional development and behavior refers to the following. Members of a profession are commonly characterized by (1) a sense of identity, (2) a permanent or near permanent commitment to the work they do, (3) a set of values they share with their colleagues, (4) an agreed upon pattern of conduct and ethics among members and between members and non-members, (5) a common language, (6) control over the conduct of members, and (7) control over the selection and training of new members. It is incumbent on the candidate and the ACFPT to present and seek evidence that a professional orientation is being (and will continue to be) pursued. One way of thinking about professional development and behavior is to identify domains of activity. Faculty are active in at least three such domains: students, colleagues, and associates located both within and outside the University. In considering a candidate’s tenure qualifications, the ACFPT is interested in the extent to which the candidate can demonstrate growth toward professional behavior. Pertinent activities demonstrating professional behavior include, but are not limited to, activities designed to attract promising non-members, engaging in professionally sanctioned behaviors, maintaining currency in the training of non-members, demonstrating strategies for enhancing communications with colleagues, and representing the University in a positive manner to professional and nonprofessional constituents.

5.10 Tenure Review at the Time of Initial Appointment
5.101 Applicability
The Board of Regents authorizes the award of tenure upon appointment to outstanding senior faculty. The award is made in recognition of exceptional achievement and distinction. The stature of the candidate being considered is of prime consideration. The dossier of such candidates, with the approval of the Dean, may be reviewed at the time of initial appointment at the academic unit and college levels in accordance with the tenure review procedures of the College as stated in these Guidelines.

5.102 Eligibility
Normally, tenure review at the time of initial appointment should be restricted to faculty being hired at the rank of Professor who are presently tenured at institutions with academic reputations equal, or superior, to the reputation of Georgia State University. Candidates must meet all tenure requirements with the exception of the length of service requirement.

5.103 Review Procedures
In recruiting a candidate for a senior position, a request is made by the head of the academic unit prior to the formulation of an offer for the Dean's permission to conduct a tenure review at time of initial appointment. If the Dean concurs that the candidate is eligible for such a review, the review is not initiated until other aspects of an offer to the candidate have been formulated and agreed to by the Dean.

5.1031 External Review Letters
The procedures contained in the Criteria for Tenure section 5.00 are to be followed as closely as possible. Thus, external review letters are required as part of the candidate's dossier, which will be reviewed within the academic unit and at the College level under the same procedures (with different time deadlines) as specified in these guidelines.

5.1032 College-Level Review
If the recommendations of the faculty review committee of the academic unit, the head of the academic unit, ACFPT, and the Dean are all positive, the Dean will recommend to the Provost and President that tenure be granted at the time of initial appointment.

5.1033 University-Level Review
Under special circumstances, the President may agree to make a University-level recommendation with respect to a tenure review at time of initial appointment. University-level assurances are used very sparingly for achieving long range and continuing institutional goals.

6.00 External Evaluations of Candidate's Readiness for Promotion and/or Tenure

6.10 Rationale for External Review
External reviews will be solicited for any candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure above the level of Assistant Professor. These reviews should address the candidates' commitment to the development and extension of knowledge in their chosen fields.
and the candidates’ reputation at regional, national, and international levels commensurate with their status and rank. New letters from external reviewers are required each time candidates submit a brief for promotion and/or tenure.

6.20 Sources of External Reviewers

6.201 Candidate's Suggested List
In the academic year preceding a candidate's review and according to the timeline in Appendix D, the candidate will submit to the Dean and to the candidate's Department Chair and Department promotion and tenure committee a list of three to five names, addresses, phone numbers, professional affiliations, and current positions of potential external reviewers.

6.202 Department Chair's Suggested List
According to the timeline in Appendix D, the Department Chair in consultation with the department’s promotion and tenure committee will submit to the Dean a list of three to five additional names, addresses, professional affiliations and current positions of potential reviewers.

6.203 Dean's Selection of External Reviewers
The Dean may contribute up to three additional nominations for external reviewers. The Dean will select up to ten external reviewers. At least two reviewers will be selected from the list provided by the candidate. At least one reviewer will be selected from the Department Chair/departmental promotions and committee list. The candidate will be given an opportunity to review the final proposed list of external reviewers and to strike one potential reviewer.

6.30 Criteria for External Reviewers

6.301 The external reviewer cannot be on the faculty of Georgia State University as a regular faculty member, adjunct faculty member, or part-time faculty member.

6.302 The external reviewer cannot be a relative of or have a significant other (non-professional) relationship with the candidate.

6.303 The external reviewer cannot be a current student at Georgia State University.

6.304 The external reviewer cannot have an employee/employer relationship with the candidate.

6.40 Communication with External Reviewers

6.401 Submission of Sample Publications
According to the timeline in Appendix D, the candidate will submit to the Dean a sample of not more than eight of the candidate's research and scholarly activity and a current and complete vita. Each external reviewer will be sent a solicitation letter, the sample of items, and the current vita.

6.402 Request for Reviewer's Participation
Preceding each candidate's review and according to the timeline in Appendix D, the Dean of the College will solicit reviews of the candidate's work (through a standardized letter, suggestion included in Appendix A), and will subsequently receive the written reviews from the reviewers. It should be made clear to all parties that external reviews will deal predominantly with research and scholarly activity for tenure track faculty and predominantly teaching for clinical faculty, and, when applicable, with service to the profession.

6.403 Appreciation to Be Extended to Reviewers
No honoraria will be paid to external reviewers. The Dean of the College, however, will send a letter of appreciation to all external reviewers.

6.50 Distribution and Confidentiality of External Reviewers' Reports

6.501 Distribution of the Reports
In accordance with the timeline in Appendix D, the Dean will forward copies of the external reviews to the Department Chair, the department’s promotion and tenure committee, and to the ACFPT.

6.502 Confidentiality of External Reviewers' Reports
To ensure confidentiality, external reviewers' letters will be accessible only to the Dean, Department Chair, Department promotion and tenure committee members and ACFPT members. Reviewers will be informed of the existence of the Open Records Law of Georgia (see Appendix A).

7.0 Reviews within the Candidate's Department
The Department’s promotion and tenure committee’s recommendation will be forwarded to the Department Chair, who will then make a recommendation. The Department Chair will forward both recommendations to ACFPT according to the timeline in Appendix D.

8.0 References Selected by the Candidate
The ACFPT may decide to interview additional references. Candidates should include in their briefs the names of two people who will be available to serve as references in each of the areas in which the candidate is being evaluated. These references can be either internal or external to the University. The same person may be listed as a reference for more than one area, but not more than two areas. When possible it is recommended that the candidate select persons from both inside and outside the University. In its fall meeting, the ACFPT will decide how many references and in what areas they will interview. An interview team will interview the references either in person or by telephone.

9.00 Candidate's Withdrawal or Appeal

9.10 Candidate's Withdrawal
If a candidate elects to withdraw from the review process at any time prior to the due date for submission of briefs to the ACFPT, the candidate will immediately inform in writing the Department Chair, the chair of the ACFPT, and the Dean of the College. At that time all review processes related to that candidate will be terminated. New letters from external reviewers are required each time a candidate submits for promotion and/or tenure.
9.20 Candidate's Appeal

A candidate who believes that the ACFPT was unfair in its application of the promotion and/or tenure review procedures must inform the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the College of Education in writing of intent to appeal or to request that ACFPT reconsider a recommendation, and must file the written appeal or request according to the timeline in Appendix D. The Faculty Affairs Committee Chair will forward the sealed recommendations of the ACFPT to the Dean of the College of Education, with notification of any appeal or reconsideration pending. In the event an appeal is filed, the Faculty Affairs Committee Chair will forward the appeal to the Faculty Appeals Committee. Following College of Education Faculty Grievance Procedures with the exception of time frames, the Faculty Appeals Committee will form a Hearing Panel and conduct a hearing regarding the written appeal according to the timeline in Appendix D. Hearing Panel recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Education and the candidate according to the timeline in Appendix D.

In the event the candidate requests the ACFPT to reconsider a recommendation, the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee will forward this request to the Chair of the ACFPT. The ACFPT will reconsider the recommendation according to the timeline in Appendix D. The ACFPT will forward its final recommendation to the candidate and the Dean of the College according to the timeline in Appendix D.
Part 2
Third Year Review for Tenure-Track Faculty

20.00 Promotion and Tenure Procedures
20.10 Third Year Review for Tenure-Track Faculty

A formal review of the progress made toward promotion and tenure will be made during the third year so that all tenure-track faculty members have a clear idea of how adequately they are progressing toward successfully achieving promotion and tenure. This review will be conducted by a committee of at least three faculty of the appropriate rank elected from the tenured faculty. Normally these faculty members will be from the candidate’s Department; in small units, however, faculty of appropriate rank from outside the Department may be elected. This committee may be the same as the departmental promotion and tenure committee. This third year review should address professional development and accomplishment: in research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service.

In accordance with the timeline in Appendix E, the Department committee should meet with faculty who will be reviewed during the year to clarify procedures and items to be submitted for review. Such review should complement efforts to implement mentoring programs within each department. The third year review is distinguished from the annual review in that it encourages a longer-term perspective on accomplishments while still permitting time for changes in orientation and activity of the individual involved. Guidelines for the third year review shall be specified in writing by each Department with a copy on file with the Faculty Affairs Committee.

The faculty member may want to read the Promotion and Tenure Document (Part 1) carefully to be aware of expectations for promotion and tenure and to consider these expectations when preparing the brief for third year review.

Faculty may be hired with prior credit towards promotion and tenure. Those faculty with three years of credit will not be reviewed. Faculty with two years of credit will be evaluated in the spring of their first year. Faculty with one year of credit will be evaluated in the spring of their second year. Faculty with no credit will be evaluated in the spring of their third year.

In accordance with the timeline in Appendix E, the report of the department’s third year review committee will be reviewed and commented on by the Department Chair, the Dean and the Provost. All letters and comments will be forwarded to the non-tenured tenure-track faculty member in accordance with timeline in Appendix E.
30.0 Eligibility for Cumulative Review
This review should begin five years after the most recent promotion or tenure and continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further promotion or impending candidacy for promotion within a year.

31.0 Committee on Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty (CCRTF)

31.10 Committee Purpose
The CCRTF is a standing subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the College of Education. Its purpose is to conduct a rigorous formative review of tenured faculty members. Such review provides an opportunity to assess faculty development goals and achievements and provides feedback to faculty in ensuring continuous intellectual and professional growth to help the departments fulfill their missions. The cumulative review is distinguished from an annual review in that the cumulative review assesses achievements and goals over a longer period (e.g., multi-year projects and research direction) and may facilitate longer-term growth and development. This committee serves as one of several levels of review. The CCRTF review will be reviewed and commented on by the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost. All letters and comments will be forwarded to the tenured faculty member in accordance with the timeline in Appendix F.

31.20 Committee Membership
The CCRTF shall consist of six members. Each Department of the College of Education shall elect one representative from among its faculty (1) who has been a full time faculty member of the College of Education for three academic years, (2) who holds the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, and (3) who has been awarded tenure. Faculty members so elected shall serve a term of two years. A schedule for each department’s election has been established so that half the members of the committee will be elected each year. Departments should hold elections for representatives during the fall semester. The Department Chair will notify the Dean and the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the results of the election according to the timeline in Appendix F.

The term of office will be January 1 - December 31. Should a vacancy occur before a person has completed a full term, the affected Department will fill that vacancy by holding a special election. A faculty member may not serve two consecutive full terms on the CCRTF. Faculty members who are candidates for cumulative review may not serve on the CCRTF. Any committee member who is a relative of or has a significant other relationship with an applicant for cumulative review must withdraw from the committee. A quorum consists of three-fourths of the full committee membership; no committee action is official unless a quorum is present.
31.30 Committee Procedures

The Dean will notify faculty members who will receive a cumulative review according to the timeline in Appendix F.

The CCRTF will have its initial meeting at the call of the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee according to the timeline in Appendix F. The committee will have three orders of business: (1) the election of a chair, (2) the review and familiarization of the guidelines and supporting documents essential to the process, and (3) the declaration of informational sessions for the purpose of explaining the guidelines and acknowledging any nuances to the process which might be proper. These informational sessions are held according to the timeline in Appendix F.

In accordance with the timeline in Appendix F, the committee will meet to review the information submitted by the faculty being reviewed. If deemed necessary, the committee will make the reviewee aware of any additional information or clarification needed.

32.0 Criteria for Review

This cumulative review should address accomplishments in: research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service. In accordance with the timeline in Appendix F, the faculty member being reviewed will submit a narrative of that individual’s quality and scope of goals and accomplishments in research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service. The review will be based on available information such as annual reports, evaluations of teaching, curriculum vitae, and publications. An individual being reviewed should not be expected to prepare additional materials solely for the purpose of the cumulative review.
Part 4
Guidelines for Emeritus Status

40.00 Emeritus Faculty Appointments
In compliance with the Board of Regents' policy, the President may recommend for approval by the Board of Regents the title of "emeritus" for any retired and tenured professor, associate professor or assistant professor, or Board-approved non-tenure track faculty of equivalent rank, who, at the time of retirement, had ten years or more of honorable and distinguished service in the University System. In making recommendations for emeritus appointments, academic units should be specific with respect to the emeritus title (e.g., associate professor emeritus, professor emeritus or Department Chair emeritus).

Candidates for emeritus faculty status may be nominated by faculty in their own departments or may nominate themselves to be considered. The nominations should be brought before the Department faculty for a vote. If the faculty recommends the candidate for Emeritus status, the recommendation goes to the Department Chair, then to the ACFPT Committee, the Dean, and from the Dean to the Provost. In order for the Provost to act the following must be provided:

40.10 A current vita
40.20 Evidence of a vote of support by the department.
40.30 Evidence of a vote of support by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.
40.40 A letter of recommendation from the Department Chair to the Dean.
40.50 A letter of recommendation from the Dean to the Provost.
Appendix A
Sample Letter to External Reviewers

Dear xxxxxxxx:

I am writing to ask for your professional assistance in the review of a colleague, (Name of candidate), who is being considered for (promotion to [rank], and/or tenure). We appreciate very much your willingness to assist us in this process. We are interested in your appraisal of research and scholarly activity and, where applicable, service to the profession of Doctor xxxxx. (For non-tenure track clinical faculty seeking promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor, substitute the sentence We are interested in your appraisal of the teaching and, where applicable, research and scholarly activity and service to the profession of Doctor xxxxx).

A sample of materials provided by the candidate is enclosed, along with a current academic vita.

In your evaluation, we ask that you address the overall quality of the candidate's scholarship (substitute teaching for non-tenure track clinical faculty seeking promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor) and, as appropriate, the impact of that scholarship (teaching) on the field. We also are interested in the candidate's professional standing in the field. It would be particularly helpful to us if, in assessing the candidate's achievements, you could give us some idea of the number of scholars working in this area of specialization, the relative position of the candidate in this area, and how the candidate's accomplishments compare to those of outstanding scholars in the same field at a similar stage in their careers.

The evaluation you provide will be considered confidential. It will be accessible only to appropriate administrators and to Georgia State University faculty members responsible for advising the academic administrators on the promotion and/or tenure of the candidate. You should be aware, however, that the Georgia Open Records Law might result in your review becoming public. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia has maintained that letters of evaluation are exempt from the Georgia Open Records Law, but the issue has yet to be adjudicated.

Please return your evaluation as quickly as is convenient for you. In order to complete the candidate's total review in a timely fashion, we need your response by June 30. We sincerely appreciate your time and effort in helping us with this very important decision. Yours, etc.
Appendix B
Format for Briefs Submitted for Promotion and/or Tenure

1.00 Standard Format
To assist the committee's review, candidates are expected to submit information in a
standard format as described in this section. Evidence presented in the brief will be
supplemented by interviews with the candidate and with information from references. As far
as possible, all information is to be typed on standard (8 1/2 x 11) stock paper and assembled
in sections, as described below, in a three-ring loose-leaf binder. All briefs should contain
the following sections:

1.10 Section 1: The Candidate
This section should include a) cover sheet, b) listing of educational and professional
experience, c) current and complete vita, and d) listing of two references for each area
being evaluated. Tenure candidates with probationary credit toward prior service at
another institution must supply documentation from the Dean outlining the number of
years awarded upon initial appointment at GSU.

1.20 Section 2: Research and Scholarly Activity
This section should include a) Narrative Statement, b) Listing, and c) Exhibits.

1.30 Section 3: Teaching
This section should include a) Narrative Statement, b) Listing, and c) Exhibits.

1.40 Section 4: Service
This section should include a) Narrative Statement, b) Listing, and c) Exhibits.

1.50 Section 5: Professional Development and Behavior
NOTE. This section is required only for candidates seeking tenure.

2.00 General Rules for Preparing the Brief

2.10 The brief should be a complete summary of a candidate's professional activity
whether or not a particular type of activity is specifically mentioned in this guide.

2.20 Detailed information regarding any activity or product should be listed in one section
only; however, an activity or product may be cited in the narrative statement for two
or more sections when appropriate.

2.30 Explanations of unusual academic roles and/or assignments should be included when
appropriate.

2.40 Those seeking promotion to the rank of Professor should mark current activities with
an asterisk (*) at the left of each entry. The Faculty Affairs Committee has defined
"current activities" as work done since the candidate last applied successfully for
promotion at any university.
Appendix C  
Instructions for Preparing Each Section of the Brief

1.0 Section 1: The Candidate

1.10 Cover Sheet  
The first page of the brief is the cover sheet and should include the following:

1.101 Name of candidate  
1.102 Present rank of candidate  
1.103 Department of candidate  
1.104 Effective date of appointment to Georgia State University  
1.105 Effective date of last promotion  
1.106 Signature of candidate  
1.107 Date brief is submitted to the committee.

1.20 Educational and Professional Experience  
In this section, beginning on a separate page, the candidate is to list educational institutions attended (including date attended, degrees and/or certificates awarded, and areas of specialization) and professional employment history. The lists are to be presented in reverse chronological order.

1.30 Current and Complete Vita

1.40 References  
Candidates should list two references for each of the areas being evaluated (i.e., teaching, research, service for everyone; and professional development and behavior for candidates for tenure). The same person may serve as a reference in more than one area, but not more than two areas. For each reference, list the person's name, institutional affiliation, and daytime phone number.

2.0 Research and Scholarly Activity

This section is concerned with information about scholarly activity directed toward the development and extension of knowledge, which is typically demonstrated by publications and presentations designated for professional and public audiences. Research and scholarly activity include books and texts, reports of quantitative and qualitative research, theoretical discussion and debate, and the development of solutions to significant problems of theory and practice, and creative works and performances.

2.10 Narrative Statement  
In this narrative, candidates explain the quality, scope, and impact of their scholarly activity and the connections among them. Candidates should describe the nature and quality of their work with reference to the appropriate points in Section 3.10 of the brief. The narrative will not exceed 5 typed, double-spaced pages.

2.20 Listing  
Scholarly activity is to be listed within categories in the order shown below. Categories for which candidates have no entries may be omitted. Entries are to be listed in reverse chronological order. In addition to the information requested below, each entry is to include whether the publication is refereed or non-refereed and its intended audience.
(e.g., national, regional, state). Authors and editors are to be listed in the order shown on the published documents. Documentation (e.g., letters of acceptance, proof of submission) should be provided in Appendix A.

2.201 Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, and Reviews

2.201.1 Published Articles
Candidates should provide a list of articles that are published or accepted for publication. This list should include for each article: author(s), title, journal, volume, date (or projected date) of publication.

2.201.2 Chapters in Books
Candidates should provide a list of chapters that have been published in edited books and those accepted for publication. This list should include for each chapter: author(s), title of the chapter, title of book, the book’s editor(s), publisher, and the date (or projected date) of publication. Only chapters that are completed and scheduled for publication on a definite date should be included.

2.201.3 Books and Monographs
Candidates should provide a list of books or monographs published or accepted for publication. This list should include: author(s), title, publisher, and date (or projected date) of publication. For works accepted but not yet published, clear documentation should be given of whether the item is a completed book manuscript in press and scheduled for publication at a definite date, or a book project for which a contract has been awarded for a manuscript to be submitted to the publisher in the future and the projected date of completion.

2.201.4 Book Reviews
Candidates should provide a list of book reviews published or accepted for publication, including: author(s) and title of the book reviewed, place of appearance, and date (or projected date) of publication.

2.201.5 Published Abstracts or Proceedings
Candidates should include author(s), title, name of professional organization or conference, date of publication, and number of published pages. A presentation that has a published abstract or is included in published proceedings should only appear once in the listings.

2.201.6 Submitted Scholarly Writings
Candidates should include author(s), title, type of publication, publisher or journal to which submitted, month/year submitted, number of typed, double-spaced manuscript pages. Only submitted work should be listed.

2.201.7 Other
Candidates should list any other type of publication (e.g., ERIC documents). Author(s), title, publisher, date (or projected date) of publication.
2.202 Presentations at Professional Meetings
Candidates should provide a list of presentations at professional meetings. This list should include the title of the presentation, author(s), the type of presentation (e.g., paper, poster, invited paper or speech, symposium presentation, or roundtable discussion), the name, location, and date of the meeting. Works that have been accepted but not yet presented may be listed. Proof of acceptance must be included.

2.203 Awards and Grants
Candidates should provide a list of all research grants and contracts received and all scholarships, fellowships, travel awards, and personal developments awards that supported the candidate’s scholarly activity. This list should include the title of each project supported, the awarding agency, the amount and period of the award, and the precise role of the investigator and any other co-investigators in the project. When the candidate is not the PI, a letter from the PI describing the candidate’s role in the project should be included. Candidates also should provide copies of official letters of award for funded projects. Separate headings should be created, when appropriate, for: Funded external awards; Funded internal awards; and Submitted and/or unfunded external awards. Listings of submitted grants and awards should include the date of submission and the funding agency. Listings of unfunded external awards the candidate chooses to submit must include the date(s) of submission and documentation of the evaluation received.

2.204 Media Products
Candidates should provide a list of titles, dates of publication or completion, and the following additional information as appropriate for each product: (a) developer(s) in order of relative contribution or by specific role, (e.g., writer, producer); (b) descriptive information (product medium or media; viewing or listening time; amount and kind of supplementary material; specific content if not expressed in title; purpose and intended audience; and (c) product distributor.

2.205 Evidence of Peer Recognition and Reputation
Candidates should provide a list of professional activities that are evidence of the candidate’s scholarly recognition and reputation.

2.2051 Significant Professional Services
Significant professional services include serving as a journal editor or associate editor, member of an editorial board, referee for scholarly journals or granting agencies, member of a proposal review panel or study section, consultant for professional organizations and public agencies, and officer in professional organizations. Candidates should provide a list that includes the activity, organization, and dates of service.

2.2052 Recognition by Scholarly and Professional Associations
Honors, such as fellow status, invitations received for colloquium presentations or workshops at professional associations or other universities, reviews of published works, and awards from scholarly and professional associations that result from the candidate’s research
contributions will be viewed as evidence of scholarly reputation. Candidates should provide a list that includes the type of recognition, organization, and dates.

2.30 Exhibits
Appendix A of the brief should include all documentation requested to support listings as well as not more than eight written scholarly activities (media products impossible to attach are excepted). Candidates should select scholarly activities that represent the impact, scope, and depth of their work.

3.0 Section 3: Teaching
The purpose of this section of the brief is to provide the committee with information regarding the candidate's teaching effectiveness. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and typically involves teaching in the university classroom. Teaching activities may also include the delivery of instructional workshops and the like to professional peers and practitioners, as well as the development of new courses, programs, instructional approaches, textbooks, and other curricular materials for both university and other students. Additional activities may also include non-written products such as transparency sets, films, slide programs, and other media products. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness may be listed as indicated below.

3.10 Narrative Statement
Candidates discuss the quality, scope, and impact of their professional teaching. The narrative will not exceed 5 typed, double-spaced pages.

3.20 Listing
Information regarding teaching is to be listed in the order of the categories below. Course listings are to include departmental course designation (e.g., EPY 9000) and complete course title in addition to other information as indicated at each category heading below.
3.201 Georgia State University Teaching Assignments: should include number of times taught since appointment or last successful application for promotion or tenure; average enrollment.
3.202 Courses Taught at Other Institutions: should include name of institution(s); date(s); number of times taught since appointment or last promotion.
3.203 Courses Developed at Georgia State University: specify role in development; date of college approval or year of first Bulletin listing.
3.204 Graduate Student Committees: include number by degree level; role title, date, and author of dissertations, theses, and projects directed to completion.
3.205 Other Information
3.2051 Products developed for teaching: include type of product; brief description; course(s) for which product is useful; date of development. List textbooks or textbook series written or edited, publisher, date of publication.
3.2052 Honors and Awards for Teaching: include date; source; type of competition, if applicable; further details as appropriate.
3.206 Impact on Students
3.2061 Evidence of student achievement
3.2062 Summary of student evaluations. For each course taught at Georgia State University, include the College of Education computerized summary evaluation form.

3.30 Exhibits
Syllabi and written student evaluation forms for each of two or more offerings of the same course are to be submitted as Appendix B of the brief. Additional document sets may also be submitted. For a course taught more than once, submit the most current syllabus and one other. For a course taught more than once, submit two sets of written student evaluations.

4.00 Section 4: Service
The purpose of this section of the brief is to provide the committee with information regarding the candidate's professional service activities. Service represents professional activities directed toward the development and maintenance of University and professional organizations, as well as activities that are undertaken on behalf of the University or the profession which do not entail systematic instruction (e.g., manuscript reviewing, design and development of professional conferences).

4.10 Narrative Statement
Candidates discuss the quality, scope, and impact of their professional service activities that contribute to the candidate's value in the university, in the community, and in professional affiliations. The narrative will not exceed 5 typed, double-spaced pages.

4.20 Listing
Service activities include the following: offices held; meetings chaired, attended or organized; programs and materials developed; workshops conducted or attended; consultancies; committees chaired or served; student advisement, and so forth. Concise but complete details should be provided. Any activity presented more than once with little or no substantive change (e.g., a speech or workshop) should be indicated in one entry, which shows place and date of each presentation. Information regarding service activities is to be presented using the following categories:

4.201 Service to the Profession
4.202 Service to the Community
4.203 Service to the University

4.30 Exhibits
If candidates wish to provide exhibits to support achievement of professional service, they may be submitted as Appendix C of the brief.

5.00 Section 5: Professional Development and Behavior

5.10 Narrative Statement
Candidates discuss the quality, scope, and impact of their professional development and behavior. The narrative will not exceed 5 typed, double-spaced pages. The narrative should contain the following:

5.101 Definition of Professional Development and Behavior
5.102 How the candidate has fulfilled this definition using illustrative examples
5.103 Goals for extending collegial relations in the future

5.20 Exhibits
If candidates wish to provide exhibits to support achievement of professional development and behavior, they may be submitted as Appendix D of the brief.
## Appendix D
### Timeline for Promotion and/or Tenure Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Fall Semester</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Departments elect representatives to the ACFPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Monday in November</td>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>The Department Chairs notify the Dean and the Chair of the FAC of the result of the above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No later than January 31</td>
<td>Chair of FAC</td>
<td>The Chair of FAC convenes the ACFPT. The purpose of the initial meeting is to elect a chair of ACFPT, review the P&amp;T document, and establish date(s) for the informational session(s) for those faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7</td>
<td>ACFPT</td>
<td>The date for the informational session(s) is submitted by the ACFPT to the Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>The Dean notifies faculty of their eligibility for consideration for promotion and/or tenure and of the date of the relevant informational session(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between late February and early March</td>
<td>ACFPT</td>
<td>ACFPT holds informational session(s) for faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Faculty eligible for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Candidate notifies in writing the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Chair of ACFPT of the intent to be considered for promotion and/or tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Candidate submits to the Dean, the Department Chair, and the Department promotion/tenure committee a list of 3-5 nominations for external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* If the University is closed on a specific date, then by the end of the next business day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Candidate submits to the Dean a sample of publications and a current and complete vita to be forwarded to external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Department Chair in consultation with the department’s promotion and tenure committee will submit to the Dean a list of three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to five additional names, addresses, professional affiliations and current positions of potential reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean sends materials to external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean receives outside letters regarding candidates for promotion and/or tenure and if necessary solicits additional reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 30</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Last day for candidates for promotion and/or tenure to submit brief for optional format review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 10</td>
<td>ACFPT</td>
<td>ACFPT returns feedback concerning brief format to candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Last day for the candidate to submit brief for formal consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No later than September 18</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean forwards external reviewers letters to Chair of ACFPT, Department Chairs, and Department promotion/tenure committees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* If the University is closed on a specific date, then by the end of the next business day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 10</td>
<td>Department Chair, Department promotion/tenure committees</td>
<td>Recommendations with rationale due to ACFPT and respective candidates from Department Chair and Department promotion/tenure committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between October 10 and November 15</td>
<td>ACFPT</td>
<td>Interview teams are formed. Interview teams read briefs and external reviews of the candidates assigned to them, and interview the candidates' references. Interview teams present their findings to the ACFPT. The ACFPT discusses and identifies and need for clarification at least one week prior to interviewing the candidate. Each candidate is interviewed by the ACFPT. ACFPT meets to consider and evaluate candidates for promotion and tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>Chair of ACFPT</td>
<td>ACFPT chair submits sealed report of promotion and/or tenure recommendations with rationale to the Chair of the FAC and respective candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 3 working days of delivery of ACFPT report</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>Last opportunity for candidates to submit to Chair of FAC notice of intent to appeal or intent to request a reconsideration of recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 4 working days of delivery of ACFPT report</td>
<td>Chair of FAC</td>
<td>If no intent to appeal or intent to request a reconsideration of recommendation is received, Chair of FAC sends report of recommendations to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 7 working days of delivery of the ACFPT report</td>
<td>Candidates for promotion and/or tenure, ACFPT</td>
<td>Last opportunity for candidate to submit written appeal or request for reconsideration of recommendation. At the end of 7 working days, the Chair of FAC forwards the sealed report of the ACFPT to the Dean of the College of Education with notification of any appeal or reconsideration pending.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. If the University is closed on a specific date, then by the end of the next business day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 10 working days of receipt of written appeal</td>
<td>Chair of FAC</td>
<td>Chair of FAC forwards appeal to Faculty Appeals Committee which will form a Hearing Panel and the Hearing Panel conduct appeals hearings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Appeals Committee</td>
<td>Recommendations by the Faculty Appeals Committee will be forwarded to Dean and candidate by the end of the next working day after the hearing by the Hearing Panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 10 days of receipt of written request to reconsider recommendation</td>
<td>Chair of FAC</td>
<td>Forwards the request to reconsider the recommendation to the ACFPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACFPT</td>
<td>ACFPT reconsiders its decision. ACFPT notifies the individual(s) and the chair of the FAC of its action. Chair of the FAC submits the sealed final report of the ACFPT to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean's recommendations due to Provost/Academic Vice President and respective candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the month of December</td>
<td>ACFPT</td>
<td>ACFPT will make recommendations to the FAC on changes in the process and/or document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. If the University is closed on a specific date, then by the end of the next business day.*
# Appendix E
## Timeline for Pre-Tenure, Third Year Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean notifies non-tenured tenure track faculty who are to receive third year review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No later than January 31</td>
<td>Department review committee</td>
<td>Department review committee has information session(s) for non-tenured tenure track faculty who are to receive third year review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Monday in March</td>
<td>Non-tenured tenure track faculty</td>
<td>Last date for non-tenured tenure track faculty to submit materials to Department review committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Department review committee</td>
<td>Results of the third year review of non-tenured tenure track faculty submitted by Department review committee to the non-tenured tenure track faculty member, to the Department Chair, and to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Comments concerning third year review of non-tenured tenure track faculty submitted by Department Chair to the Dean and respective faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Comments concerning third year review of non-tenured tenure track faculty submitted by the Dean to the Provost/Academic Vice President and respective faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon receipt from the Provost</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean forwards to the non-tenured tenure-track faculty member any comments from the Provost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. If the University is closed on a specific date, then by the end of the next business day.*
## Appendix F
Timeline for Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Fall Semester</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Departments elect representatives to the CCRTF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean notifies faculty who are to receive five-year cumulative review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1 or earlier</td>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>The Department Chair notifies the Dean and the Chair of FAC of the elections described above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early in January</td>
<td>Chair of FAC</td>
<td>Chair of FAC will convene the CCRTF. The purpose of the initial meeting will be to elect a chair of CCRTF and to establish a date for the information session(s) for those tenured faculty who are to receive five-year cumulative review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No later than January 31</td>
<td>CCRTF</td>
<td>CCRTF holds information session(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Monday in March</td>
<td>Faculty undergoing five-year cumulative review</td>
<td>Last date for tenured faculty receiving five-year cumulative review to submit materials to CCRTF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>CCRTF</td>
<td>Results of five-year cumulative review of tenured faculty submitted by CCRTF to the tenured faculty, to the Department Chair, and to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30</td>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>Comments concerning five-year cumulative review of tenured faculty submitted by Department Chair to the Dean and respective faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* If the University is closed on a specific date, then by the end of the next business day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 20</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Comments concerning five-year review of tenured faculty submitted by Dean to the Provost/Academic Vice President and respective faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After June 20</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean forwards to tenured faculty any comments from the Provost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. If the University is closed on a specific date, then by the end of the next business day.*

---

### G: Resources

**App. Table G1: Summary data on student/faculty ratios and credit hour generation from the Office of Institutional Research.**

**APPENDIX TABLE G-1**

**MIDDLE SECONDARY EDUCATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY**

**STUDENT/FACULTY RATIOS, FY 2009-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># TT Faculty</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Undergraduate Majors</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Graduate Majors (All)</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG/TT Ratio</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/TT Ratio</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Graduate Faculty*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Ph.D. Students</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D./Grad Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*According to the GSU FACULTY HANDBOOK (306.07), graduate faculty status is determined by each college and such status enables faculty to teach doctoral courses and research-oriented masters’ courses and to serve as chair, member or reader of doctoral dissertation committees and to direct masters’ theses. A member of the graduate faculty must hold appropriate terminal degrees and be actively engaged in scholarly and creative activities.*
Summary: Strengths and Weaknesses of the University Library Collection and Services

University Library’s middle-secondary education & instructional technology collection effectively supports the research areas of the faculty and graduate degree candidates in the Middle-Secondary Education & Instructional Technology (MSIT) department of the College of Education.

Notable monograph strengths include titles in the areas of teaching principles & practice, school management & discipline, and secondary education. The following tables comparatively illustrate monograph holdings of GSU-designated peer institutions based on call number ranges for middle-secondary education & instructional technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GSU Designated Peer Institutions and Number of Monograph Titles Added to Collection by in the last 12 months (by call number range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois-Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida-Tampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama-Birmingham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to monographs, University Library houses a strong collection of electronic databases and journals to support the needs of MSIT faculty, students, and staff. The electronic databases used by the department are provided by University Library subscriptions and by GALILEO, a Georgia initiative of database collections. MSIT-related journals are available in both print and online formats, with increasing emphasis on electronic access as many databases increase their full-text content. Although 85 journal titles have been cancelled over the last three fiscal years, most are currently available via electronic journal aggregators.
Based on the number of library instruction and individual research consultations conducted in the last fiscal year, there is effective usage by faculty, students, and staff of the services provided by the Education librarian.

Relevant Library Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>STATISTIC</th>
<th>COMMENTS/NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of journal titles supporting program</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of related journal titles added in last three fiscal years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of related journal titles cancelled in last three fiscal years</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of related databases added in last three years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of related databases cancelled in last three years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of monograph titles supporting program</td>
<td>LB 1025-1050.75 [Teaching Principles &amp; Practice]: 5701 LB1603-1696.6 [Secondary education. High school]: 885 LB3011-3095 [School management &amp; discipline]: 1735 LC215-238.4 [Community and the school]: 377 LC1099-1099.5 [Multicultural]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Number Range</td>
<td>Education Topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC215-238.4</td>
<td>Community and the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC3701-3740</td>
<td>Immigrants or ethnic and linguistic minorities. Bilingual school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC3701-3740</td>
<td>Immigrants or ethnic and linguistic minorities. Bilingual school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB 1025-1050.75</td>
<td>Teaching Principles &amp; Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB1603-1696.6</td>
<td>Secondary education. High school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB2165-2278</td>
<td>Teacher training in universities &amp; colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB3011-3095</td>
<td>School management &amp; discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC1099-1099.5</td>
<td>Multicultural education (General)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC3701-3740</td>
<td>Immigrants or ethnic and linguistic minorities. Bilingual school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of monograph titles in key call number ranges added in last two years (01/2008-01/2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9456</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of monograph titles in key call number ranges added in last two years (01/2008-01/2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>447</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of available universe of related monograph titles purchased through approval plan during previous fiscal year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>23.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
services

Number of library instruction courses taught for department during previous fiscal year.

6

Number of library consultations held with students from department during previous fiscal year.
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Electronic Resources

Students and faculty in Middle-Secondary Education & Instructional Technology rely heavily on database content to conduct research and complete assignments. The following section provides an overview of some of the major databases relevant to the discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GSU Library Subscription Databases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Database</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Full Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Citation Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web of Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GALILEO Databases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERIC</td>
<td>Covers all aspects of education, providing abstracts of published and unpublished material in the form of articles and documents from 1966-2003. Includes Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Search Complete</td>
<td>Offers access to over 3,200 peer-reviewed journals, including those in education. Significant full-text coverage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H: Goals & Objectives

H-1 MSIT Goals and Objectives

Research

Goal R1: Continue to increase quality, quantity, diversity and visibility of our research focusing on the most relevant and challenging education issues and problems in local, national, and global contexts.
   a. Continue to increase level of external funding in light of the reduction of federal funding and shifts in funding priorities.
   b. Continue to increase publications in top-tier journals.
   c. Further develop a conducive environment for increased research productivity.
   d. Continue to invest multifariously (time, tools, skills, and support) in our capacity to do relevant and meaningful research.

Goal R2: Use and conduct research linking to the community to contribute to the greater good.
   a. Expand interdisciplinary and collaborative research
   b. Extend the scope of urban-focused research
   c. Leverage existing partnerships and initiatives to maximize our impact

Teaching

Goal T1: To provide the appropriate support for students to successfully complete their chosen program of study.
a. Improve the consistency and quality of advising for students in all programs.
b. Increase frequency and examine appropriate scheduling of graduate course offerings.
c. Increase undergraduate course offerings.
d. Increase online and/or hybrid course offerings.
e. Coordinate with other departments/colleges with regard to course offerings.
f. Examine the viability of programs to meet market needs

**Goal T2:** To graduate productive students with the requisite skills and dispositions needed to work successfully in a globalized society.

a. Ensure standards in each respective field of study are represented throughout all programs.
b. Examine course offerings with respect to urban education issues and global perspectives.
c. Infuse critical thinking opportunities to develop engaged urban leaders and global educators.
d. Integrate ESOL principles throughout all programs.
e. Embed technology expertise throughout all programs.

**Service**

**Goal S1:** To be a department in which access to information related to programs and services is readily available

a. Improve our department website to facilitate access to information for potential and current students
b. Continue to improve our visibility as a department among university and community members through committee representation, community and university partnerships, and in the media and through our presence on the Web

**Goal S2:** To be a department whose outreach to the surrounding communities is meaningful, purposeful, and strategic.

a. Increase the integration of our community service with teaching and research
b. Share our community work with members of the community; increase the mutually beneficial effectiveness of the work we conduct within the community by increasing mechanisms for feedback
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