



**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW  
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

College	CEAS
Department	Teacher Education
Program Unit	Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs
Reporting for Academic Year	2014-2015
Department Chair	Eric Engdahl
Date Submitted	6/18/2015

**1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)**

**A. Five-year Review Planning Goals**

For purposes of national (CAEP) and state (CTC) accreditation, these two programs, like all programs in our PreK-12 Professional Education Unit, define goals/objectives biennially. Data is gathered every year. Every other year is an “Analytic Year,” in which two years of data are analyzed to determine Unit and Program improvement goals/objectives. The alternate year is an “Implementation Year,” in which program modifications are completed to meet the goals/objectives. New goals/objectives were defined during the 13-14 year. 2014-2015 is an “Analytic Year.”

**1. Objective Identified in Improvement Plan:**

Teaching Credentials Cluster Objective 14.1 Develop and provide professional development for university supervisors so that they can support candidates in their field placements to, a) better identify EL and special needs students in their placements and b) provide candidates with a broader range of EL and special needs strategies. UAO Outcome 1: Equitable Learning Outcomes.

Changes implemented in response to Improvement Plan: The October 1, 2014 supervisor meeting included professional development with a focus on SDAIE strategies for EL students. The February 4, 2015 supervisor meeting included a report on support for candidates in working with special needs student and a session on the subject. An additional PD on special needs to which supervisors were invited was held on March 11, 2015.

Data Source: We will look at supervisor evaluations of student teachers on TPE 7 when they are finally tabulated in June, 2015.

Summary of Achievement: As a baseline the objectives were met.

Explanation/discussion: While the objective of providing professional development was met it demonstrated the importance of continuing this as on-going work.

Implications for future: In order to support candidates in understanding how to meet the needs of special needs students we are implementing changes that support PD for supervisors. These include a change in the system of staffing the Special Education courses in the multiple and single subject programs as well as a strengthening of the master course outline. They include the addition of curriculum on SPED in all single subject methods courses. There will also be future PD for supervisors and a SPED tenure track faculty hire has been identified for 2018.

## 2. Objective Identified in Improvement Plan:

Teaching Credentials Cluster Objective 14.2 Develop an online training module for Multiple and Single Subject Credential Candidates on successful collaborative relationships with other school personnel, to be included in Multiple Subject Course TED 5351. UAO 3: Working Collaboratively.

Changes implemented in response to Improvement Plan: Due to scheduling factors this training module was not developed in time for summer implementation. As a pilot, one lesson in one section was devoted to focusing on collaboration. In addition, TED 5373 included a lesson on collaboration.

Data Source: We will look at supervisor evaluations of student teachers on TPE 11 when they are finally tabulated in June, 2015 and the CSU exit survey results when they are available.

Summary of Achievement: There is on-going work needed in this area in order to implement it across the program.

Explanation/discussion: As previously noted, scheduling factors prevented this from being fully implemented.

Implications for future: The take away from this is that TED 5373 is the best course for implementation of this training. That course includes a study of the Linked Learning Model, which will enable candidates to improve collaboration skills in context. TED 5373 is taken by both single and multiple subject candidates.

## 3. Objective Identified in Improvement Plan:

Teaching Credentials Cluster Objective 14.3 Develop an online training module for Multiple and Single Subject Credential Candidates on sound SDAIE strategies, to be included in Single Subject Course TED 5391. UAO Outcome 1: Equitable Learning Outcomes.

Changes implemented in response to Improvement Plan: All multiple and single subject candidates were given real time GLAD training during the summer of 2014.

Data Source: We will look at supervisor evaluations of student teachers on TPE 7 when they are finally tabulated in June, 2015.

Summary of Achievement: An online module was not developed, but this was because the opportunity to have GLAD trainers in classrooms presented itself. While GLAD and SDAIE are not the same the overlap is significant. The candidates found the workshops extremely valuable. The candidate responses from the workshops rated them on an average of 4.5 on a 5 point scale. A summary of their comments states:

1. The vast majority of the opinions indicated that the GLAD Strategies, as a whole, would benefit all students.
2. The visual aspects of the GLAD tools were unquestionably the most impressive aspect of the training.
3. It was noted that through the use of all the tools, an excellent flow of information and learning can be conducted. The only exception was for music studies; other than the chants, the responder saw little application of GLAD in a music classroom.
4. The specific tools most mentioned in the responses were the Graphic Organizer and Input Charts. The Inquiry Chart (KWL application) is thought to be an excellent tool for the teacher to understand the current state of classroom knowledge and can, therefore, better construct lesson plans for a specific class.
5. The majority of primary grade teachers and student teachers saw the value of the chants.
6. Many of the responses focused on how the GLAD components would help the teachers better understand the English Language Learners from the prospective of their cultural backgrounds as well as pertinent subject matter content.
7. It was also noted that the use of GLAD strategies would help hook the ELLs to participate and share their individual ideas.
8. Mentioned by several responders was that the use of GLAD tools would benefit the whole classroom, not just the ELLs. This is viewed as a real positive.
9. Also noteworthy is that the GLAD techniques are viewed by many as a classroom management tool to assure the teachers of a positive learning environment.

Explanation/discussion: The GLAD training sessions were able to reach candidates in both the multiple and single subject programs.

Implications for future: The usefulness of the training has led us to repeat it this upcoming year.

### **B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress**

Based on the bi-annual cycle of an “Analytic Year” and an Implementation year mandated by the accreditation bodies an explanation of the goals is contained in the previous response.

### **C. Program Changes and Needs**

A new faculty member in English Language Development was hired. Search has been approved for 15-16 for a faculty in Reading/Literacy. Two FERP faculty have completed their cycle and one additional faculty is retiring in September. At the same time our student applications for 15-16 almost doubled over applications in 14-15. The partner school districts in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties are experiencing the beginning of a dire teacher shortage. Last year we had 25% of our candidates working under intern credentials. This year, we anticipate 40-50%. We have also added one multiple subject cohort. We are in the process of developing a growth plan ss that we can meet the needs of the school districts and maintain quality.

## **2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)**

### **A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

The Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential have two sets of Program Student Learning Outcomes: (1) The four Unit Assessment Outcomes (UAOs) shared by all programs in our PreK-12 Professional Education Unit; unit outcomes are required by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and our national accrediting agency, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP); and (2) the 13 Teaching Performance Expectations defined by the CTC

#### Unit Assessment Outcomes

Our candidates will:

UAO1: Demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions aligned with professional standards to implement universal design and research-based programs to achieve equitable learning outcomes.

UAO2: Demonstrate the ability to create environments, systems, and practices in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust, and fairness.

UAO3: Work collaboratively with students, parents, and professional colleagues to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments.

UAO4: Know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

#### CTC Teaching Performance Expectations

- 1 Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction
- 2 Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction
- 3 Interpretation and Use of Assessments
- 4 Making Content Accessible
- 5 Student Engagement
- 6 Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices
- 7 Teaching English Learners
- 8 Learning About Students
- 9 Instructional Planning
- 10 Instructional Time
- 11 Social Environment
- 12 Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations
- 13 Professional Growth

Attached as Appendix “A” – Multiple Subjects Curriculum and Assessment Map

Attached as Appendix “B” - Single Subjects Curriculum and Assessment Map

### **B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

As required by CTC, data is gathered every year on the four shared UAOs and the 13 CTC TPEs.

### C. Summary of Assessment Process

Overview: As part of the CTC/CAEP PreK-12 Professional Education Unit, these programs follow the Unit Assessment Plan. Data is gathered every year. Every other year is an “Analytic Year,” in which two years of data are analyzed and program improvement goals/objectives are written. The alternative year is an “Implementation Year,” in which program modifications are made to achieve goals/objectives. The Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs continue to use TaskStream for data collection and analysis. We are looking forward to a visit from our accreditors in 2017.

### D. Summary of Assessment Results

Each year, extensive data is collected on the candidates (post-baccalaureate university students) who complete the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs, including: (1) the results of the CTC-mandated PACT exam; (2) results of field work (student teaching or internship) evaluations completed by University field supervisors and School District master teachers; (3) exit surveys required by CTC of every program completer; and (4) surveys of graduates and their employers two years after program completion.

Below are some of the data for (1) the results of the CTC-mandated PACT exam. We saw scores go up in 2013-2014 over 2012-2013, (which was our first year of PACT implementation) and dip slightly in 2014-2015.

Multiple Subject Credential Program

Single Subject Credential Program

PACT Exam scores

2014-2015 Cohorts with 2013-2014 and 2012-2013 scores for comparison

There are twelve rubrics for the PACT, three that cover instructional planning, two that cover delivery of instruction (included 20 minute video), three that cover assessment (including student work samples) two that cover reflection, and two that cover the use of academic language.

	2014-2015	2013-2014	2012-2013
R1 (Planning)	2.81	2.79	2.64
R2 (Planning)	2.65	2.6	2.53
R3 (Planning)	2.69	2.71	2.6
R4 (Instruction)	2.37	2.38	2.34
R5 (Instruction)	2.33	2.39	2.25
R6 (Assessment)	2.39	2.52	2.35
R7 (Assessment)	2.16	2.3	2.19
R8 (Assessment)	2.53	2.56	2.27
R9 (Reflection)	2.27	2.35	2.19
R10 (Reflection)	2.25	2.37	2.21
R11 (Academic Language)	2.2	2.29	2.11
R12 (Academic Language)	2.18	2.26	2.12
	n=177	n = 139	n = 154

### 3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page)

#### a) Student Demographics

**CAPR Table 1**

**California State University, East Bay**

Credential Program		Fall 2009			Fall 2010			Fall 2011			Fall 2012			Fall 2013		
		Degree Level		TOT AL	Degree Level		TOT AL	Degree Level		TOT AL	Degree Level		TOT AL	Degree Level		TOT AL
		Bach elor	PostBaccala ureate		Bach elor	PostBaccala ureate		Bach elor	PostBaccala ureate		Bach elor	PostBaccala ureate		Bach elor	PostBaccala ureate	
Female	Black, non-Hispanic		6	6		5	5		2	2		8	8		12	12
	American Indian or Alaska Native		2	2		1	1		1	1						
	Asian		23	23		19	19		23	23		31	31		28	28
	Pacific Islander															
	Hispanic		15	15		22	22		28	28		32	32		22	22
	White		146	146		87	87		85	85		69	69		87	87
	Multiple ethnicity		7	7		5	5		13	13		8	8		7	7
	Race/ethnicity unknown		25	25		17	17		12	12		13	13		20	20
	Nonresident aliens									2	2		3	3		1
Male	Black, non-		4	4		2	2		7	7		7	7		3	3

	Hispanic															
	American Indian or Alaska Native	2	2													
	Asian	10	10	10	10	16	16	21	21	10	10					
	Pacific Islander															
	Hispanic	12	12	13	13	9	9	11	11	16	16					
	White	59	59	56	56	63	63	52	52	51	51					
	Multiple ethnicity	7	7	4	4	7	7	3	3	6	6					
	Race/ethnicity unknown	14	14	15	15	5	5	13	13	10	10					
	Nonresident aliens															
Total	Black, non-Hispanic	10	10	7	7	9	9	15	15	15	15					
	American Indian or Alaska Native	4	4	1	1	1	1									
	Asian	33	33	29	29	39	39	52	52	38	38					
	Pacific Islander															
	Hispanic	27	27	35	35	37	37	43	43	38	38					
	White	205	205	143	143	148	148	121	121	138	138					
	Multiple ethnicity	14	14	9	9	20	20	11	11	13	13					
	Race/ethnicity unknown	39	39	32	32	17	17	26	26	30	30					
	Nonresident aliens					2	2	3	3	1	1					

b) Degrees Conferred by the program

The credential programs are non-degree conferring post-baccalaureate programs.

c) Course History

California State University, East Bay

COURSE HISTORY

By Quarter from Summer 2009 through Spring 2013

Discipline Area: TED

		Summer					Fall					Winter				Spring			
		Sumr 2009	Sumr 2010	Sumr 2011	Sumr 2012	Sumr 2013	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Wntr 2010	Wntr 2011	Wntr 2012	Wntr 2013	Sprg 2010	Sprg 2011	Sprg 2012	Sprg 2013
Upper Division	Number Sections	1.0	2.0	.	.	.	2.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
	Total Enrollment	26	30	.	.	.	26	66	122	86	88	83	11	78	88	71	44	49	25
	Avg Section Size	26.0	15.0	.	.	.	13.0	33.0	24.4	17.2	17.6	20.0	11.0	15.6	22.0	17.5	11.0	16.3	8.0
Graduate	Number Sections	96.0	64.0	61.0	67.0	53.0	106.0	65.0	54.0	53.0	46.0	83.0	57.0	45.0	51.0	76.0	49.0	53.0	55.0
	Total Enrollment	2,018	1,479	1,571	1,608	1,387	2,418	1,757	1,521	1,151	1,011	1,821	1,363	1,315	1,057	1,649	1,147	1,189	1,440
	Avg Section Size	22.6	27.4	29.5	27.9	28.2	21.5	27.3	32.2	22.0	20.7	24.2	27.1	29.8	20.3	23.4	26.0	26.6	28.1
DISCIPLINE TOTAL	Number Sections	97.0	66.0	61.0	67.0	53.0	108.0	67.0	59.0	58.0	51.0	88.0	58.0	50.0	55.0	81.0	53.0	56.0	58.0
	Total Enrollment	2,044	1,509	1,571	1,608	1,387	2,444	1,823	1,643	1,237	1,099	1,904	1,374	1,393	1,145	1,720	1,191	1,238	1,465
	Avg Section Size	22.6	26.9	29.5	27.9	28.2	21.3	27.5	31.4	21.6	20.3	24.0	26.8	28.1	20.4	23.1	24.7	25.9	27.7

Source: CSU Academic Planning Data Base (APDB); Section Master File (BKPD SMF) and Faculty Master File(BKPD FMF)

Number of Sections may be less than one for cross-listed courses. When Number of Sections is less than 1, Average Size may be invalid

\*Average Section Size includes all course classification types except supervised individual study courses per CO APDB reporting definition. Average Section size for cross-listed courses may differ for individual sections due to rounding

Location: Cal State East Bay Course History Report csu/pgm/csusystem/apdb/section.tables.crshis.sas

Office of Planning and Institutional Research



d) APR Summary Data

**California State University, East Bay**  
**APR Summary Data**  
**Fall 2010 - 2014**

<b>Teacher Education</b>					
	<b>Fall Quarter</b>				
<b>Item</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>A. Students Headcount</b>					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate (Credential)	256	273	271	273	273
3. Graduate	159	119	75	76	73
4. Total Number of Majors	415	392	346	349	346
	<b>College Years</b>				
<b>B. Degrees Awarded</b>	<b>09-10</b>	<b>10-11</b>	<b>11-12</b>	<b>12-13</b>	<b>13-14</b>
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	138	149	107	131	80
3. Total	138	149	107	131	80
	<b>Fall Quarter</b>				
	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>C. Faculty</b>					
<b>Tenured/Track Headcount</b>					
1. Full-Time	14	14	13	11	11
2. Part-Time	1	3	2	4	3
3a. Total Tenure Track	15	17	15	15	14
3b. % Tenure Track	34.9%	42.5%	31.3%	31.9%	28.6%
<b>Lecturer Headcount</b>					
4. Full-Time	1	1	0	0	0
5. Part-Time	27	22	33	32	35

6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	28	23	33	32	35
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	65.1%	57.5%	68.8%	68.1%	71.4%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	43	40	48	47	49
<b>Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)</b>					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	9.7	9.1	9.3	9.4	6.7
9. Lecturer FTEF	3.0	2.5	1.8	1.8	4.3
10. Total Instructional FTEF	12.7	11.6	11.1	11.2	10.9
<b>Lecturer Teaching</b>					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	236.8	215.0	207.2	193.8	149.0
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	74.1%	76.2%	81.0%	86.5%	62.2%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	82.7	67.2	48.5	30.3	90.5
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	25.9%	23.8%	19.0%	13.5%	37.8%
13. Total FTES taught	319.5	282.2	255.7	224.1	239.5
14. Total SCU taught	4792.0	4233.0	3836.0	3362.0	3593.0
<b>D. Student Faculty Ratios</b>					
1. Tenured/Track	24.4	23.8	22.2	20.6	22.3
2. Lecturer	27.5	26.8	26.7	17.3	21.3
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	25.1	24.4	23.0	20.1	21.9
4. Lower Division	.	.	.	.	.
5. Upper Division	35.9	28.1	9.4	18.0	25.4
6. Graduate	24.9	24.1	24.6	20.2	21.8
<b>E. Section Size</b>					
1. Number of Sections Offered	67.0	59.0	58.0	51.0	63.0
2. Average Section Size	27.5	31.4	21.6	20.3	20.5
3. Average Section Size for LD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Average Section Size for UD	33.0	24.4	17.2	17.6	20.4
5. Average Section Size for GD	27.3	32.2	22.0	20.7	20.5
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	2	2	3	4	4
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	53	41	44	38	39
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	0	3	2	1	1
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	14	13	9	8	19

Source and definitions available at:

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/apr/summary/definitions.pdf>

### APPENDIX “A”

#### Multiple Subjects Curriculum and Assessment MAP

COURSES	ILO						UAO				CTC STANDARD (or PSLO)												TPE MULTIPLE & SINGLE ONLY																				
	T	CO	DI	C	SU	SE	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1												
	R	M	V	OL	S	D	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3							
TED 5110	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X				X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
TED 5211	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X						X			X	X	X		X	X		X										
TED 5212	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X						X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							
TED 5213	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												
TED 5214	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
TED 5311	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X		X										X	X	X		X	X		X										
TED 5350	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X								X		
TED 5351	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X										X		X													
TED 5352	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							
TED 5354	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
TED 5355	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X		
TED 5356	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
TED 5357	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
TED 5359	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
TED 5360	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
TED 5361	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
TED 5366	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
TED 5372	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X







TED 5355: ESA Assignment: SDAIE Lesson	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X									
TED 5355: Reflection/Self-Assessment	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X								X
TED 5356: Vocabulary/Academic Language, & Bkgd Know. LP & Teach Exp.	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
TED 5356: Comprehension Lesson Plan and Teaching Experience	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
TED 5356: Case Study	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
TED 5356: Midterm	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
TED 5357: Group Presentation / Lesson Plan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
TED 5357: Bugscope across the curriculum assignment	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
TED 5357: Project Learning Tree jigsaw activity	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				

TED 5357: Stop Waste Curriculum and Summary	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X		X	X	X								
TED 5357: Health Science Pair-Share activity	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X		X	X	X								
TED 5357: NASA Space Science Curriculum Summary	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X		X	X	X								
TED 5357: Final project which includes PACT planning	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
TED 5359: TPE Final Evaluation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TED 5360: Content-Area Reading Lesson Plan	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TED 5360: Writing Assignment	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TED 5360: Social Studies Unit of Study	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TED 5361: TPE Final Evaluation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TED 5366: Written and Oral Response to End-of-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X











TED 5320: Content Lesson Plans	X	X	X				X	X		X	X	X		X										X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
TED 5320: Case Study Learning About Students	X	X	X				X	X		X					X													X			X							X	X	
TED 5320: Case Study Academic Language	X	X	X					X		X					X											X		X			X	X								
TED 5226: Signature Assignment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X									X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TED 5326: Quiz						X	X	X			X					X											X			X								X		
TED 5326: SDAIE Lesson	X		X			X	X	X		X			X													X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							
TED 5372: PACT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TED 5373: PACT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TED 5374: PACT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TED 5375: PACT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TED 5380: Program Assessment		X	X	X	X			X	X	X																X												X	X	
TED 5380: Group Assignment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X																X								X	X	
TED 5380: Lesson Plan	X	X	X		X			X		X				X	X		X										X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
TED 5381: Summative Evaluation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X										X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TED 5382: Summative Evaluation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X										X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

