Institutional Effectiveness Report
2021-22

Program: Secondary Education

College and Department: College of Education, Curriculum & Instruction

Contact: Jeremy Wendt, Chairperson

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

Mission Brief Le

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

Program Goals

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

Student Learning Outcomes

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

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

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

knowledge of the subjects they teach. The subject assessments measure subject-specific teaching skills and content knowledge. Validity for the assessments is evidenced through multiple means, including job analysis; item writing and reviewing; standard-setting studies; test reviews; and ongoing reviews. Reliability is addressed via the standard error of

content exam prior to entering residency I/student teaching. Praxis summary reports show EPP scores compared to State and N

2018-2019	2	t	t	70	81.43	162.54
2019-2020	2	t	t	48	79.17	162.85
2020-2021	3	t	t	70	85.71	165.09

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

	TTU			State		
Year	N	Pass Rate	Mean	N	Pass Rate	Mean
2017-2018	20	60	157	255	85.75	158.58
2018-2019	18	55.56	156.67	310	84.43	159.01
2019-2020	10	60	159.7	247	79.78	157.11
2020-2021	16	93.75	164.06	355	66.48	159.81

For the 2020-2021 academic year, TTU had 5 or less candidates take the Chemistry, Government/Political Science, Economics, and Earth and Space Science PRAXIS exams. Therefore, no statistical information was reported. A total of 17 TTU candidates completed PRAXIS for Biology: Content Knowledge. The total mean score was 157.65, with a pass rate of 82.35 percent. At the State level, a total of 150 candidates completed PRAXIS for the same content area. The total mean score was 156.55 with a pass rate of 77.33 percent. A total of TTU candidates completed PRAXIS for Mathematics. The total mean score was 156.33, with a pass rate of 33.33 percent. At the State level, a total of 273 candidates completed PRAXIS for the same content area. The total mean score was 151.11 with a pass rate of 39.93 percent. A total of 22 TTU candidates completed PRAXIS for English Language Arts. The total mean score was 177.41, with a pass rate of 95.45 percent, which is considerably higher than the prior year. At the State level, a total of 438 candidates completed PRAXIS for the same content area. The total mean score was 174.71 with a pass rate of 79.68 percent. Lastly, a total of 16 TTU candidates completed PRAXIS for World and U.S. History: Content Knowledge. The total mean score was 164.06, with a pass rate of 93.75 percent. At the State level, a total of 355 candidates completed PRAXIS for the same content area. The total mean score was 159.81, comparatively lower with a pass rate of 66.48 percent.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Program candidates will demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge and skills by meeting or exceeding a passing score on the respective performance-based subject specific assessment as set by the State Board of Education. edTPA: edTPA is a performance-based assessment used to measure pedagogical skills and pedagogical content knowledge. It shows what candidates can do, rather than what they plan to do. It is holistic and reflective as candidates integrate learning from across the curriculum and examine teaching practices. The portfolio includes 15 rubrics across 3 tasks (planning, instruction, and assessment) to demonstrate teacher effectiveness. In 2017, the Tennessee State Board of Education voted to require edTPA of all teacher candidates seeking licensure in the state. This requirement will go into effect January 1, 2019; however, Tennessee Tech progressively implemented edTPA in 2012 for all programs with strong support for both candidates and faculty. Currently, candidates complete the edTPA during the residency II/student teaching clinical experience; each rubric is scored on a 5-point scale. Over the past three years (2018-2019, 2019-2020, 2020-2021),

2019-2020	15	39.1	2019-2020	116	39.9	2019-2020	2,576	39.6
2020-2021	9	40.4	2020-2021	122	41.0	2020-2021	1,562	39.4

Table 5. edTPA data for Secondary Science

TTU			State			National		
Year	N	Mean	Year	N	Mean	Year	N	Mean
2017-								

InTASC standards 1-5. Second, the TEAM domain of Planning (3 components) aligns to InTASC standards 6-8. Lastly, the TEAM domain of Environment (4 components) aligns to InTASC standards 2-3. TEAM rubric scores at and above expectations demonstrate candidate mastery of InTASC standards 1-8. See Tables 1-2 for TTU and SEED TEAM data.

Table 1. TEAM data

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

Appendices

1. Curriculum Map

Appendix 1: Curriculum Map

	Learner Development	Learning Differences	Learning Environment	Content Knowledge