



May 31, 2022

James D. Fielder, Jr., PhD
Secretary
Maryland Higher Education Commission
6 N. Liberty Street, 10th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21201

Dear Dr. Fielder:

On behalf of Provost Kumar, I write to request your review and endorsement of the enclosed proposal. The School of Education proposes a new **Master of Education for Teaching Professionals**.

The program will prepare educators with a broad and sophisticated skillset that will help them succeed in the classroom and engender improved performance in their students. The program will take a holistic approach to address teacher retention by developing educators who have a deep understanding of themselves and their learners, and who possess extensive pedagogical and technological content knowledge.

The proposed program is consistent with the Johns Hopkins mission and the State of Maryland's Plan for Postsecondary Education. The proposal is fully endorsed by The Johns Hopkins University.

Should you have any questions or need further information, please do not hesitate to contact Westley Forsythe at (410) 516-0188 or wforsythe@jhu.edu. Thank you for your support of Johns Hopkins University.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Janet Simon Schreck".

Janet Simon Schreck, PhD
Associate Vice Provost for Education

cc: Dr. Sunil Kumar
Dr. Westley Forsythe

Enclosures



**Cover Sheet for In-State Institutions
New Program or Substantial Modification to Existing Program**

Institution Submitting Proposal	
---------------------------------	--

Each action below requires a separate proposal and cover sheet.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| New Academic Program | Substantial Change to a Degree Program |
| New Area of Concentration | Substantial Change to an Area of Concentration |
| New Degree Level Approval | Substantial Change to a Certificate Program |
| New Stand-Alone Certificate | Cooperative Degree Program |
| Off Campus Program | Offer Program at Regional Higher Education Center |

Payment Submitted:	Yes No	Payment Type:	R*STARS # Check #	Payment Amount:	Date Submitted:
Department Proposing Program					
Degree Level and Degree Type					
Title of Proposed Program					
Total Number of Credits					
Suggested Codes			HEGIS:	CIP:	
Program Modality			On-campus		Distance Education (<i>fully online</i>)
Program Resources			Using Existing Resources		Requiring New Resources
Projected Implementation Date			Fall	Spring	Summer Year:
Provide Link to Most Recent Academic Catalog			URL:		
Preferred Contact for this Proposal			Name:		
			Title:		
			Phone:		
			Email:		
President/Chief Executive			Type Name:		
			Signature: <i>Sunil Kumar R</i>		Date:
			Date of Approval/Endorsement by Governing Board:		

**The Johns Hopkins School of Education
Proposal for a New Academic Program
Master of Education (M.Ed.) for Teaching Professionals**

A. Centrality to Institutional Mission and Planning Priorities.

1. Provide a description of the program, including each area of concentration (if applicable), and how it relates to the institution's approved mission.

The Johns Hopkins School of Education (SOE) proposes to establish a new Master of Education (M.Ed.) for Teaching Professionals designed as a response to the widespread demand in Maryland (and nationally) to prepare educators with a broad and sophisticated skillset that will help them succeed in the classroom setting and bring about improved performance in their students. The program will take a holistic approach to address issues of teacher retention by developing professional educators who have a deep understanding of themselves and their learners, and who possess extensive pedagogical and technological content knowledge. The proposed program supports SOE's mission "to generate knowledge to inform policy and practice and educate society to address the most important challenges faced by individuals, schools, and communities" (<https://education.jhu.edu/about-us/fact-sheet/>). In turn, SOE's mission is fully aligned with the Johns Hopkins University's mission "to educate its students and cultivate their capacity for life-long learning, to foster independent and original research, and to bring the benefits of discovery to the world" (<https://www.jhu.edu/about/history/>).

The proposed master's degree will comprise between 39 and 42 credits, depending on the course of study selected by the student and will launch in summer 2023. The program will be delivered in a blended/hybrid format (i.e., primarily face-to-face instruction but with some online content).¹ The program will be structured following a cohort model. It is anticipated that candidates will complete the degree in four semesters (starting in the summer semester and finishing the following summer semester). The program is primarily targeted at individuals, including both recent graduates holding bachelor's degrees and career changers, who want to become educators and who are seeking certification.

The curricular content of the master's program will include three categories of coursework: (1) required certification courses that focus on pedagogical content area knowledge, design thinking and pedagogy, human development, learning, assessment, inclusive education, literacy, and experiential learning; (2) core content courses that focus on teacher wellness, social and emotional learning (SEL), and social/environmental justice; and (3) content area specialization courses focused on curricular knowledge.

Through a combination of distinct features—coursework that addresses the most pressing issues facing education today, targeted certification areas, experiential learning, and a Whole Teacher Support model (which are outlined further below)—that SOE is characterizing as "certification plus," the new M.Ed. program will support students to

¹ The intention is to offer the majority of courses in a face-to-face format, but with some courses delivered fully online (for example, the first three courses in the first summer semester).

develop the internal resources needed to thrive in any given classroom, school, community, or district in which they serve.

Initially, the program will recruit students who are committed to working in Baltimore City Public Schools (BCPS). SOE expects to partner with BCPS to address issues of teacher shortages and attrition—for example, by exploring financial incentives to hire and retain program graduates. The program will be anchored in a “whole-person” approach that program faculty will model, with the expectation that the candidates, in turn, will adopt and adapt a whole-student approach in their own teaching.

Content Area Specialization

In addition to required certification and core content area coursework, the proposed M.Ed. degree will also require students to take courses in a content area specialization. When the program launches in summer 2023, SOE will offer content area specializations in elementary education (with a focus on STEM [science, technology, engineering, and mathematics]) and secondary STEM, with the goal of offering other content area specializations focused on different certification subjects (for example, English as a Second Language of Instruction [ESOL], secondary social studies, etc.) once the program is established.

SOE has selected STEM as its initial focus at the elementary and secondary levels because there is a vital need to prepare educators who are knowledgeable about STEM subjects and STEM approaches (Wright et al., 2019). According to the Maryland State Department of Education’s (MSDE) Traditional Programs Annual Report (TPAR), Maryland colleges and schools of education produced only four earth/space science program completers, one computer science program completer, and no program completers in environmental science or physical science in 2020-2021 (Eccles, 2021). Additionally, this STEM focus aligns with the Johns Hopkins President’s initiative to support BCPS in strengthening STEM education by preparing a cadre of STEM master educators in BCPS who will work with SOE’s preservice teacher candidates.

Experiential Learning

SOE will build on its strong and longstanding partnerships with numerous BCPS schools to place and support teacher candidates, including its Professional Development School (PDS) partnerships with Patterson Park Public Charter School and Elmer A. Henderson: A Johns Hopkins Partnership School (commonly referred to as Henderson Hopkins). All candidates will participate in clinical experiences that have been established using the most current evidence-based approaches for preparing teachers who are persistent, effective, and professional. These clinical experiences will provide candidates with:

- Opportunities to engage with professionals in schools that have been identified as highly effective learning environments (i.e., schools with a record of better-quality teacher collaboration, histories of producing strong achievement gains and employing instructionally effective faculty, and higher rates of teacher retention).
- Support from a highly personalized and collaborative educational team that includes master educators, advisors, mentors, coaches, and educational specialists.

All team members will be selected based on successful experiences and knowledge of K-12 education and participate in ongoing professional development related to evidence-based practices in educator preparation.

- Opportunities to work in face-to-face and virtual placements.
- Experiential learning that aligns with all program dimensions. The quality of program experiences will be emphasized rather than quantity of experiences.

Social/Environmental Justice

Issues of social justice will be integrated into each course in the program and one core content course will focus exclusively on environmental justice. Training educators to teach environmental justice will require richer, more sophisticated training than is typical of current educator preparation programs. SOE expects that K-12 curricula nationwide will be increasingly populated with multidisciplinary subjects that will require educators to help students process emotions, manage strong student opinions/attitudes towards the subject matter, and ultimately impact students' behavior (for example, by emphasizing the public health dimension to K-12 education). By focusing on social and environmental justice—an exemplar of these modern interdisciplinary subjects—in SOE's proposed M.Ed. program, Johns Hopkins will become a leader in researching and executing the most effective pedagogical approaches for these subjects (Baker & Gehlbach, 2022).

Social and Emotional Learning

The proposed program will help candidates to develop SEL competencies that will support teacher success with the broader goal of reducing attrition and addressing retention challenges. Dozens of recent empirical studies and reports signal growing calls for policy adaptations that embrace SEL's short- and long-term benefits for teachers, students, families, schools, and society (Corcoran et al., 2018; Mahoney et al., 2018; National Education Association, (n.d.); Taylor et al., 2017; Vega, 2017). SEL presents a unique opportunity for teacher education. With the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, SEL has become more visible than ever. The topics of well-being and mental health permeate discussions about the future of K-12 education post-pandemic, and there is increased recognition regarding the unprecedented hardships facing teachers and school leaders resulting in burnout and mental and physical health issues that currently impact millions of educators. Even before the pandemic, teachers reported the highest levels of stress of people in helping professions in the United States, with staggeringly high attrition rates of nearly 40 percent in the first five years in the profession (Kush et al., 2021). Reports reveal that teachers most often leave the profession due to chronic stress and burnout (Sutcher et al., 2019). In short, teachers need social and emotional competencies (SECs) so they can manage their stress through this pandemic and the rapidly evolving educational landscape. The program will provide coursework that specifically addresses the development of SECs that teachers can use for managing their personal and professional lives and the tools needed to develop these same competencies in their students.

This focus also aligns with BCPS's *Building a Generation: City Schools' Blueprint for Success* (n.d.), which prioritized student wholeness as one of its three major priorities, and, in doing so, identified SEL as one of the important pathways to develop student wholeness. The Blueprint defines expectations for all members of the school community, including

students, teachers, other adults working in schools, and families, and outlines how to build environments that are warm, welcoming, and support students' self-expression; competencies to engage students in activities that promote positive behavior without using punitive measures; and dispositions to view parents as advocates for their children's education. For new teachers, these expectations require specific knowledge and competencies related to student and teacher wholeness. Teachers prepared in degree programs that focus on SEL will most likely have greater success as they begin their careers. SOE plans to collaborate with BCPS to ensure that the new M.Ed. program aligns its curriculum with the Blueprint for Success' initiatives.

Teacher Wellness

One of the key features that distinguishes the proposed program—and why SOE is using the “certification plus” moniker to describe the program—will be the teacher wellness support provided to teachers during the degree and four years post-graduation. The School is implementing a Whole Teacher Support model designed to support each candidate through the challenges and transitions of becoming an educator, and support which will continue as they become teachers of record in their own classrooms (Madigan & Kim, 2021). Through a team approach that includes advisors, mentors, and coaches, the program will provide candidates with support and opportunities to develop practices that lead to healthy and balanced professional lives (Hagermoser Sanetti et al., 2021). The program will transparently acknowledge that for professional growth and wellness to occur, “an experience needs to be discomfoting, disquieting, or puzzling enough for us not to reject or ignore it, but to attend to it and reflect on it. It is then that learning takes place” (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999).

SOE's support model builds from and will be integrated with Life Design (Burnett & Evans, 2016) and coaching principles. Life Design is an approach to future planning and vocational wayfinding that provides people a toolkit of mindsets and methods to build one's way toward a life and career. Life Design encourages and cultivates openness to failure and learning from mistakes, resiliency, and resourcefulness towards creating innovative solutions (Burnett & Evans, 2016). A team of SOE faculty and staff will develop the model. SOE faculty will also be trained in Life Design practices through the Stanford University Life Design Lab and will, in turn, train advisors, coaches, and mentors in the practices of Life Design. SOE will also collaborate with the University's own Life Design Lab, where the mission is to cultivate the mindsets and skills to pursue lifelong personal and professional development for Johns Hopkins students and alumni through education, access to opportunities, and experiences that leverage a powerful network of alumni, employers, faculty, parents, and the greater Baltimore community (<https://studentaffairs.jhu.edu/life-design/>). Roles within the support model include:

- Advisors
 - Faculty members trained in Life Design, tasked with supporting candidates to find their best path through the program. This can include a broad range of issues, such as course selection, financial aid, employment, professional identity, work/life balance, or wellness strategies.

- These could also be Ph.D. students who become Life Design-certified to support candidates.
- Mentors
 - Faculty members with subject-matter expertise in the content area specializations will serve as masters of their content to make deeper meanings with candidates.
- Coaches
 - Faculty or other trained support such as K-12 master teachers or adjuncts, for example, who will support candidates in their classroom context using observation and feedback cycles.

The proposed M.Ed. for Teaching Professionals will address an acute need to prepare whole-person educators and contains a number of innovative elements, and thus accords fully with the goals, priorities, and institutional mission of the Johns Hopkins University.

2 Explain how the proposed program supports the institution’s strategic goals and provide evidence that affirms it is an institutional priority.

The proposed new M.Ed. degree seeks to prepare educators capable of thriving in disparate educational contexts and who are equipped with practical tools to address the defining issues facing education today, including supporting diverse learners and advancing equity and social justice. In doing so, the program supports the University’s and School’s institutional missions outlined above.

Additionally, [SOE’s vision statement](#) highlights the following as specific challenges in education that the School seeks to address through its academic programs and research activities: addressing mental health, social and emotional well-being and growing societal and racial inequity—particularly in cities like Baltimore. These elements lie at the core of the M.Ed. for Teaching Professionals, and thus the proposed program’s purpose aligns fully with the School’s goals and priorities.

Furthermore, the proposed program, by preparing candidates committed to teach in Baltimore, also supports the University’s goals and priorities, such as the President’s goal outlined in the University’s *Ten by Twenty* Strategic Plan to “enhance and enrich our ties to Baltimore, the nation and the world, so that Johns Hopkins becomes the exemplar of a globally engaged, urban university” (<https://10x2020progress.jhu.edu/2020/>).

Finally, the proposed program promotes the Johns Hopkins President’s long-standing *One University* commitment by fostering opportunities for cross-divisional collaboration. For example, SOE will draw on the expertise of faculty in the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences (KSAS) and Whiting School of Engineering (WSE) to provide experiential learning opportunities connected with the STEM pedagogy coursework. SOE will also work with the KSAS and WSE faculty to provide laboratory activities to enact the pedagogy that will support the preservice teachers in their classrooms. Additionally, SOE will collaborate with faculty from the Bloomberg School of Public Health and the School of Medicine to infuse teacher and student wellness within the curriculum.

3. Provide a narrative of how the proposed program will be adequately funded for at least the first five years of program implementation.

The School of Education’s leadership is committed to the proposed program and is prepared to devote the necessary resources during the planning and development stage to ensure its success. This support includes allocating a dedicated marketing budget line for student recruitment purposes and staff resources to assist faculty in developing the new coursework. While administrative/staffing resources have been allocated to support the program, no additional faculty appointments are necessary to implement the program until the program launches in summer 2023. All course development activities, teaching, program administration, etc., undertaken by full-time faculty will be covered under existing faculty budget lines. Appendix C (in support of section L) provides a fuller explanation of the projected expenditures necessary to support program implementation.

SOE intends to provide funding support to all students when the program first launches. To that end, SOE is looking to partner with BCPS and various philanthropic organizations, as well as seeking to access State and federal resources, to provide this funding support. As the program grows, it is possible that the M.Ed. program will recruit some students that are self-funded, but the goal is for SOE to underwrite the tuition costs for all students to the greatest extent possible.

4. Provide a description of the institution’s commitment to:

a. Ongoing administrative, financial, and technical support of the proposed program.

Unlike many new programmatic initiatives, in which the recruitment of faculty with expertise in the subject area runs parallel with the development of a new degree program, SOE already has the necessary faculty expertise and administrative personnel in place to support the program during its development phase (Year 1). Support staff for program and course design will be hired during the development phase. Following the program’s launch in summer 2023, and as the program grows, SOE will hire additional faculty and administrative support as needed. As outlined in Appendix C (in support of section L), the School is also committing additional resources—for example, additional faculty with STEM expertise; additional advisors, coaches, and mentors; etc.—on an ongoing basis across the first five years of the program.

b. Continuation of the program for a period of time sufficient to allow enrolled students to complete the program.

The School of Education is committed to providing all enrolled students the opportunity to complete the degree program, including under circumstances of low demand. Although the School is confident that the proposed program will be a success, should the program be suspended or discontinued, SOE will “teach out” the program and provide the necessary courses and resources so students can graduate on schedule. The School has prior experience in teaching out programs and will follow the same approach as previously adopted, including developing plans for each remaining student to complete the degree, and modifying course schedules to allow for on-time graduation, even if that means running courses with low enrollments.

B. Critical and Compelling Regional or Statewide Need as Identified in the State Plan.

- 1. Demonstrate demand and need for the program in terms of meeting present and future needs of the region and the State in general based on one or more of the following: a) The need for the advancement and evolution of knowledge, b) Societal needs, including expanding educational opportunities and choices for minority and educationally disadvantaged students at institutions of higher education, and, c) The need to strengthen and expand the capacity of historically black institutions to provide high quality and unique educational programs.**

This program will provide advancement and evolution of knowledge related to educator preparation for recent graduates holding bachelor's degrees and career changers seeking to enter the teaching profession. The education sector is one of the largest employers in Maryland, as well as regionally and nationally, and self-evidently the role that this sector has in terms of meeting the present and future needs of the region and the State cannot be understated. Additionally, a significant portion of the Maryland economy is based in cyber security, defense, and other technology fields that require strong STEM knowledge and skills. The program will support the development of this knowledge and skills by providing STEM education preparation for elementary and secondary students who subsequently will be college-ready to study in the STEM fields and work in these industries.

Furthermore, the profound impact that social movements such as Black Lives Matter and events such as the COVID-19 pandemic have had on students and educators in recent years have only reinforced the need to move educator preparation programs beyond a simple pedagogical focus and to incorporate knowledge and understanding of how environmental factors, SEL, mental health, physical well-being, etc., are all vital components in supporting students and promoting equity in education. A high-quality education system, one in which educators are holistically trained in modern pedagogies, is fundamental to preparing the students of today and tomorrow to fill Maryland's employment needs and address broader societal issues.

- 2. Provide evidence that the perceived need is consistent with the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education.**

The new M.Ed. program is aligned with the three primary goals outlined in the *2017-2021 State Plan for Postsecondary Education: Student Success with Less Debt*. These goals, in turn, accord fully with the mission of both the School of Education and the Department of Innovative Teaching and Leadership, which will house the proposed program. If the program, through the performance of its graduates, is successful, it will lead to improvements in Maryland's education system, thereby helping to "promote and implement practices and policies that will ensure student success" (the Success goal articulated in the Maryland State Plan) at all levels. As outlined above, one of the core tenets of the proposed program is its focus on promoting social/environmental justice, which is consistent with the Maryland State Plan's Access goal of ensuring "equitable access to affordable and quality postsecondary education for all Maryland residents." Ultimately, the goal of the master's program (and SOE as a whole) is to produce highly trained educational professionals who, through their work, can affect real educational change in Maryland. This approach aligns with the Maryland State Plan's fostering

Innovation goal “in all aspects of Maryland higher education to improve access and student success.”

C. Quantifiable and Reliable Evidence and Documentation of Market Supply and Demand in the Region and State.

1. Describe potential industry or industries, employment opportunities, and expected level of entry for graduates of the proposed program.

The proposed master’s program is intended to prepare recent graduates with bachelor’s degrees in subjects other than education and career changers from other fields who want to become teachers at all levels (elementary, middle, and high school). Initially the program will recruit candidates seeking certification to work in BCPS, which is currently experiencing the highest levels of teacher shortages in the State (Steward, 2022).

As indicated previously, the education sector is one of the largest employers in Maryland. The MSDE reports that there were 62,767 K-12 public school teachers employed statewide in October 2020, the most recent date for which comprehensive statewide data are available, of whom 5,069 were employed in BCPS (<https://www.marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/DCAA/SSP/20202021Staff/2021ProfStaffbyRace.pdf>). Additionally, there are many thousands more teachers employed outside the public-school sector in private schools and elsewhere. According to the Maryland Long Term Occupational Projections (2018-2028) data produced by Maryland Department of Labor (<http://www.labor.maryland.gov/lmi/iandoproj/maryland.shtml>), the number of K-12 teaching positions at all levels (elementary, middle, and high school, but excluding special education) in Maryland is expected to increase by approximately 14 percent (equating to nearly 9,000 new positions created) during this time period. Nationally, the total number of elementary, middle, and high school teaching positions (excluding special education) is projected to grow by approximately 7.5 percent from 2020 to 2030, from approximately 2,968,400 positions to more than 3,193,200 positions, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (<https://data.bls.gov/projections/occupationProj>).

The full impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the teaching profession has yet to be fully realized, but all the early indicators suggest that the problems associated with teacher shortages and retention have only been exacerbated over the past two years. In addition to the existing high levels of attrition among new teachers highlighted previously, experienced teachers are leaving the profession at above typical attrition rates for this group of teachers. Urban districts such as Baltimore City are even more likely to be affected by these teacher shortage trends, hence the need to prepare new teachers with all the tools necessary to succeed in this difficult and demanding role (MD’s P-12 Dashboards, n.d.).

2. Discuss and provide evidence of market surveys that clearly provide quantifiable and reliable data on the educational and training needs and the anticipated number of vacancies expected over the next 5 years.

In 2021, SOE commissioned a report from an outside vendor to identify future growth in graduate education programs. The report recommended moving forward with an educator preparation program that emphasized unique features: for example, by providing

coursework in social and emotional learning for educators, content specializations, etc., coupled with a flexible delivery format. The report indicated that between 2015 and 2019 student demand for educator preparation master's programs had grown in Maryland and that the employment outlook for teachers in Maryland is positive, which is supported by the data presented in C.1. In light of the State's current and anticipated teacher shortage, it is likely that teachers who are trained in multiple dimensions of instruction will be in high demand. The MSDE is also urging institutions of higher education to develop innovative pathways to address teacher shortages.

3. Provide data showing the current and projected supply of prospective graduates.

SOE anticipates recruiting 22 candidates for its first cohort, due to launch in summer 2023, and 44 students in subsequent cohorts. Table 1 in Appendix C (in support of section L) provides a complete breakdown of the enrollment projections for the program. If the M.Ed. for Teaching Professionals proves successful, these enrollment projections may be revised upwards.

D. Reasonableness of Program Duplication.

1. Identify similar programs in the State and/or same geographical area. Discuss similarities and differences between the proposed program and others in the same degree to be awarded.

Appendix D details other Maryland institutions currently offering teacher preparation master's degrees. While the proposed SOE degree shares similar characteristics and goals to these existing programs, Johns Hopkins believes that the many distinguishing features of its proposed M.Ed. for Teaching Professionals—as outlined in D.2 and elsewhere—coupled with the State's ongoing (and undeniable) need for high quality teachers, justify the establishment of a new teacher preparation, and thus any duplication with existing programs in Maryland is reasonable.

2. Provide justification for the proposed program.

The proposed M.Ed. for Teaching Professionals stands out in Maryland in terms of its “certification plus” approach. Given the ever evolving and complex nature of the education field across the United States, there is a need for educator preparation programs to take a holistic approach to developing teachers who are committed to understanding what it means to be a professional educator. Consequently, in addition to rigorous certification and subject content coursework, there is a significant emphasis in the M.Ed. degree on whole-person educator preparation, focusing on teacher wellness, SEL, and social/environmental justice. Additionally, recognizing that quality educators are key to student success, *House Bill 1300: Blueprint for Maryland's Future – Implementation* (passed by the Maryland General Assembly in 2020; <https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2020RS/bills/hb/hb1300E.pdf>) seeks to re-establish the teaching profession. The Blueprint for Maryland's Future specifically calls for the implementation of a career ladder with increases in salaries for teachers on various steps in the ladder, while also increasing the rigor and depth of teacher preparation programs in an effort to attract and retain the highest performing teachers. We believe that the proposed program aligns well with the initiatives outlined in the Blueprint for Maryland's Future's, especially related to re-establishing the teaching profession.

In terms of content area specializations, SOE's proposed program will initially focus on areas of high need where there are significant teacher shortages, especially in BCPS—secondary STEM and elementary education (with a focus on STEM)—with other content areas being introduced once the program becomes established. According to the MSDE's 2020-2021 TPAR, the number of certificate-eligible students graduating from Maryland's traditional educator preparation programs between 2017 to 2021 fell from 1,782 to 1,362. Additionally, while the TPAR reported higher numbers of program completers for elementary education and secondary mathematics (484 and 54 respectively), the number of program completers in the sciences was alarmingly low: earth/space science (4); computer science (1); environmental science (0); and physical science (0) (Eccles, 2021). Even in areas where the completer numbers are relatively strong, Maryland has historically imported 50 percent of its teachers from other states to fill position vacancies, and the State expects that teacher shortages will continue to persist for the foreseeable future (<https://teach.in.maryland.gov/Pages/Certified-Out-of-State-Teacher.aspx>).

Furthermore, the program will work to address issues of teacher attrition and retention through a focus on teacher wellness and SEL. The TPAR data also revealed that an increasing number of candidates who complete internships exit their programs without being certification eligible. This data suggests that candidates in educator preparation may need additional supports during their programs. The proposed M.Ed. program will exceed the traditional educator preparation program training model by providing a Whole Teacher Support model for candidates both during enrollment in the master's degree and post-graduation for four years.

SOE views completion of the one-year (four-semester) master's degree as merely a midpoint in the preparation of the candidate. Upon graduation and subsequent employment in BCPS, SOE will provide four additional years of support through the development of a strong professional community that includes M.Ed. faculty and staff, SOE alumni, school, and community partners. During these four years of coaching/mentoring support, candidates will have opportunities for continued professional development related to National Board Certification, aligned with the Blueprint for Maryland's Future, and other teacher advancement pathways designed to develop, retain and recognize accomplished teachers and to generate ongoing improvement in schools nationwide (<https://news.maryland.gov/msde/maryland-state-department-of-education-introduces-the-maryland-national-board-certified-teacher-in-low-performing-school-program-for-2022-23/>).

E. Relevance to High-demand Programs at Historically Black Institutions (HBIs).

1. Discuss the program's potential impact on the implementation or maintenance of high-demand programs at HBIs.

It is not anticipated that the proposed program will have any impact on the implementation or maintenance of high demand programs at HBIs, especially given the State need for and concomitant challenge facing all colleges and schools of education in Maryland in preparing high quality teachers.

F. Relevance to the identity of Historically Black Institutions (HBIs).

1. Discuss the program’s potential impact on the uniqueness and institutional identities and missions of HBIs.

It is not anticipated that the proposed program will impact the uniqueness and institutional identities and missions of HBIs.

G. Adequacy of Curriculum Design, Program Modality, and Related learning outcomes (as outlined in COMAR 13B.02.03.10).

1. Describe how the proposed program was established, and also describe the faculty who will oversee the program.

As indicated above, the School of Education commissioned a 2021 report from an outside vendor that identified developing a new “holistic” educator preparation master’s program as a promising program area for the School. Following the release of this report, Dr. Mary Ellen Beaty-O’Ferrall, Chair of SOE’s Department of Innovative Teaching and Leadership, and Debbie Hollick, SOE’s Director of Partnerships, have taken the lead in developing the proposed program, and they will continue to oversee the program for the foreseeable future.

(See also Appendix B [in support of section I] for a list of faculty who teach in the program.)

2. Describe educational objectives and learning outcomes appropriate to the rigor, breadth, and (modality) of the program.

The primary education objective of the program is to prepare graduates to become professional educators who, through a deep understanding of themselves and their learners, and who possess extensive pedagogical and technological content knowledge, can provide meaningful learning experiences for all learners.

Goals and Learning Outcomes

The program will prepare educators who are able to:

- Demonstrate expertise in content, curriculum, pedagogy, and technology to enhance student engagement and learning, including:
 - Critically analyzing and evaluating educational resources.
 - Implementing effective pedagogical approaches for increasingly complex and multidisciplinary curricula.
 - Applying appropriate technological content knowledge within the discipline.
 - Applying strategies to support K-12 students to process emotions and manage strong opinions/attitudes.
- Serve as models for social justice and advocates for inclusivity and equity, including by:
 - Developing asset-oriented mindsets to reach all learners, with special focus on learners who have been minoritized, speak multiple languages, and/or represent some form of neurodiversity.

- Applying culturally sustaining pedagogies.
- Recognize the importance of continuous learning informed by evidence from research, practice, and reflection, who can further:
 - Enact healthful professional practices.
 - Engage various stakeholders in a student's life to provide collaborative, holistic, personalized support.

3. Explain how the institution will:

a. Provide for assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes in the program.

Aligned with SOE's vision, mission, and dispositions, the School's Comprehensive Assessment System (CAS) guides learning assessment practices and addresses all SOE program goals, professional and national standards, and State standards that are appropriate to each program. Developed through collaboration with faculty, staff, and key stakeholders from the community, the CAS promotes reflective practice, critical thinking, and inquiry-based learning through a robust review of performance-based assessment measures, which ultimately drive program and unit-level improvements and aim to increase student learning outcomes, satisfaction, and impact on their community.

At the core of the CAS is the course-based assessment focusing on knowledge, skills, and behaviors in courses within a program. The M.Ed. program faculty will collaborate with the Office of Innovative Learning, Design, and Assessment (OILDA) to establish program learning goals and objectives and create a well-rounded curriculum alignment map in which all course learning outcomes are aligned with appropriate program learning goals and objectives.

Building upon this solid foundation, program faculty will work closely with instructional designers and the assessment specialist in OILDA to design and develop courses with well-constructed learning outcomes, identify key assessments from courses that are suitable in the program curriculum, create robust assessment rubrics, facilitate learning assessment data collection, analyze/review assessment data, and consistently engage in continuous curricular improvement activities.

It is SOE's as well as the M.Ed. program's goal to create an integrated, evidence-based, and data-driven assessment culture.

b. Document student achievement of learning outcomes in the program.

Starting in fall 2022, SOE and all other Johns Hopkins schools will move to Canvas, the University's new learning management system (LMS). Additionally, a new learning assessment management system, AEFIS (Assessment, Evaluation, Feedback, and Intervention System), will be implemented to support and manage the School's learning assessment effort. As an industry leader, AEFIS provides a comprehensive set of solutions to strengthen and facilitate SOE's goal of building an integrated, evidence-based, and data-driven assessment culture.

To achieve this goal, OILDA has dedicated experts in program development, learning assessment, data analytics, and data visualization to collaborate with program faculty and provide ongoing training and support. Course-based learning assessment data are collected, analyzed, and reported each semester. At the end of each assessment cycle or academic year, the OILDA Director and the assessment specialist will prepare an assessment report, create an assessment data dashboard powered by Microsoft Power BI, and review the results with the program lead faculty and the department chair at a working session. Collaboratively, areas of improvement are identified, and an action plan is formulated. The action plan will then be implemented and incorporated into the next assessment cycle.

In addition to course-based assessment data, course evaluation data collected and analyzed each semester, annual alumni survey data, and annual employer surveys will provide an indirect data source to measure program effectiveness, student achievement of learning outcomes, as well as insights on continuous program improvements.

5. Provide a list of courses with title, semester credit hours and course descriptions, along with a description of program requirements.

At minimum, to be eligible for admission to the proposed M.Ed. degree program, candidates must: (1) hold a bachelor's degree in an appropriate discipline from an accredited college or university, and (2) have earned a minimum cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 (on a 4.0 scale) in all previous undergraduate and graduate studies.

Students will be required to complete a minimum of 39 credits and a maximum of 42 credits to earn the M.Ed. degree, depending on the certification option pursued. Participants must maintain a cumulative grade point average of at least 3.0 (on a 4.0 scale) to receive approval for graduation. Courses are categorized under three areas: (1) required certification courses (24-30 credits, including 3 credits of internship, depending on the certification area), (2) core content courses (3-6 credits), and (3) content area specialization courses (9 credits). Initially, SOE will deliver two content area specializations (STEM and elementary education [with a STEM focus]), but will offer additional content area specializations once the program becomes established and based on demand.

Although some courses will draw on existing SOE curricular content, most courses will be new. A full course listing (with course titles, descriptors, and credit hours) is provided in Appendix A.

The program will be delivered following a cohort model, starting in the summer semester, and finishing the following summer (four semesters in total). The table below presents a sample course sequence that students could take.

*Sample Secondary STEM Course Sequence – 39 credits
(All courses are three credits unless indicated otherwise)*

Summer Semester 1	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Summer Semester II
<i>Human Development</i> (Certification course)	<i>Teaching Methodologies</i> (Certification course)	<i>Assessment of Students</i> (Certification course)	Content Area Specialization Course III (STEM Area Example: <i>Foundational Concepts of STEM</i>)
<i>Human Learning</i> (Certification course)	<i>Inclusion of Special Needs Student Populations</i> (Certification course)	<i>Internship</i> (Certification course – 2 credits)	<i>Teacher Wellness and Social and Emotional Learning</i> (Core content)
<i>Literacy course</i> (Certification course)	<i>Internship</i> (Certification course – 1 credit)	<i>Literacy course</i> (Certification course)	
Content Area Specialization Course I (STEM Area Example: <i>STEM Integration from a Learning Sciences Perspective</i>)	<i>Issues of Social Justice</i> (Core content)	Content Area Specialization Course II (STEM Area Example: <i>Specialized Methods of Teaching</i>)	
Total credits = 12	Total credits = 10	Total credits = 11	Total credits = 6

*Sample Elementary Education (with a focus on STEM) Course Sequence – 42 credits
(All courses are three credits unless indicated otherwise)*

Summer Semester 1	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Summer Semester II
<i>Human Development</i> (Certification course)	<i>Teaching Methodologies</i> (Certification course)	<i>Assessment of Students</i> (Certification course)	<i>Literacy course</i> (Certification course)
<i>Human Learning</i> (Certification course)	<i>Inclusion of Special Needs Student Populations</i> (Certification course)	<i>Internship</i> (Certification course – 2 credits)	<i>Teacher Wellness and Social and Emotional Learning</i> (Core content)
<i>Literacy course</i> (Certification course)	<i>Literacy course</i> (Certification course)	<i>Literacy course</i> (Certification course)	Content Area Specialization Course III (Elementary STEM Area Example: <i>STEM Content course</i> [based on student needs])
Content Area Specialization Course I (Elementary STEM Area Example: <i>STEM Integration from a Learning Sciences Perspective</i>)	<i>Internship</i> (Certification course – 1 credit)	Content Area Specialization Course II (Elementary STEM Area Example: <i>Foundational Concepts of STEM</i>)	
Total credits = 12	Total credits = 10	Total credits = 11	Total credits = 9

6. Discuss how general education requirements will be met, if applicable.

Not applicable.

7. Identify any specialized accreditation or graduate certification requirements for this program and its students.

The proposed M.Ed. degree program is intended to prepare graduates for initial certification. For secondary education, the certification areas will include mathematics, biology, chemistry, environmental science, and physics, (as part of the secondary STEM content area specialization). For elementary education, the certification area will be Elementary – Grades 1-6. Additional certification areas may be added once the program is established and based on student demand or State need. SOE will work with the MSDE to ensure that the coursework content in the M.Ed. degree meets the State's current initial certification requirements.

8. If contracting with another institution or non-collegiate organization, provide a copy of the written contract.

Not applicable.

9. Provide assurance and any appropriate evidence that the proposed program will provide students with clear, complete, and timely information on the curriculum, course and degree requirements, nature of faculty/student interaction, assumptions about technology competence and skills, technical equipment requirements, learning management system, availability of academic support services and financial aid resources, and costs and payment policies.

The School of Education will provide students enrolled in the proposed M.Ed. program with clear, complete, and timely information. New candidates entering the program will participate in an orientation that provides a program overview detailing the curriculum and program requirements, guidance on the use of all technologies involved with Canvas and the University's student information system, and information about the entire range of student services available to students, including registration, financial aid, and student accounts. In addition, SOE offers online training modules for students on conducting library searches, formatting papers and references, and understanding and avoiding plagiarism, among other topics.

Additionally, all essential course-related information (for example, course learning outcomes and requirements, assignments, deadlines, technology requirements, etc.) will be detailed in the syllabus for each course, which will be posted on the Canvas course site prior to the course start date. Program-related information (for example, degree requirements, learning management system information, availability of academic support services, financial aid resources, and tuition and cost payment policies, etc.) can be found both on the SOE website (<https://education.jhu.edu/>) and the School's Academic Catalog (<https://education.jhu.edu/academics/academic-catalog/>).

10. Provide assurance and any appropriate evidence that advertising, recruiting, and admissions materials will clearly and accurately represent the proposed program and the services available.

The School of Education regularly reviews its advertising, recruiting, and admissions materials to ensure that: (1) they clearly and accurately represent the program and services available, and (2) there is content alignment across different modes of communication: the SOE website, the School's Academic Catalog, print and other forms of marketing materials, etc. The School affirms that these materials represent a good faith effort to be clear and transparent in all communications with current and prospective students, and that the proposed program will be held to the same standards as other SOE programs.

H. Adequacy of Articulation.

Not applicable.

I. Adequacy of Faculty Resources (as outlined in COMAR 13B.02.03.11).

1. Provide a brief narrative demonstrating the quality of program faculty. Include a summary list of faculty with appointment type, terminal degree title and field, academic title/rank, status (full-time, part-time, adjunct) and the course(s) each faculty member will teach (in this program).

Dr. Mary Ellen Beaty-O'Ferrall, Chair of SOE's Department of Innovative Teaching and Leadership, with support from Debbie Hollick, SOE's Director of Partnerships, will oversee the proposed M.Ed. degree program during its development and initial implementation. Both have extensive experience managing educator preparation programs, including SOE's Master of Arts in Teaching and the School's partnership program with Teach For America.

The School of Education is fortunate to possess a core of expert full-time faculty members who are available to teach and advise in the program. SOE faculty have a long history of educator preparation (Drs. Mary Ellen Beaty-O'Ferrall, Yolanda Abel, and Laura Quaynor) and more specifically STEM teacher education (Drs. Stephen Pape and Karen Karp). The School can also draw upon the expertise of Drs. Hunter Gehlbach and Lieny Jeon for the areas of student and teacher SEL and Dr. Odis Johnson, Director of the Center for Safe and Healthy Schools, for the health and wellness aspects of the program. The proposed program can also connect with the research being undertaken across SOE through its various research centers, including the Baltimore Area Research Consortium (Dr. Marc Stein), the Center for Research and Reform in Education (Drs. Steven Ross and Jennifer Morrison), Center for Technology in Education (Dr. Linda Carling), the Center for Social Organization of Schools (Dr. Robert Balfanz), and the Institute for Education Policy (Drs. David Steiner and Ashley Berner). Additionally, as part of a world-class research University, SOE is able to access expertise from across the institution in the fields of STEM, public health, and wellness, etc. through its relationships with the Schools of Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Public Health, and Medicine. As such, no further full-time faculty hires are necessary to develop and launch the program.

Furthermore, utilizing SOE's longstanding network of relationships with Maryland schools and school systems, the School can draw on a pool of highly qualified and experienced practitioners in the field to serve as adjunct faculty, mentors, and coaches to support the delivery of the program.

Given the extensive expertise available to SOE, the School is confident that it possesses the requisite faculty resources to successfully deliver the program. See Appendix B for a table of current full-time faculty who will be involved in the development of the program and/or who will teach courses once it launches.

2. Demonstrate how the institution will provide ongoing pedagogy training for the faculty in evidenced-based best practices, including training in: a) Pedagogy that meets the needs of the students, b) The learning management system, and c) Evidenced-based best practices for distance education, if distance education is offered.

During fall 2018, the Office of Diversity and Faculty Development (ODFD) was created in an effort to provide professional development support for full-time and adjunct faculty. One major initiative within the ODFD is the planning and development of a comprehensive faculty support system that includes onboarding orientations, workshops, book clubs, and individual coaching.

In addition to these faculty development initiatives, SOE is implementing a new faculty evaluation system. This faculty evaluation system serves two primary purposes: (1) to provide meaningful feedback that can enhance professional performance and identify opportunities for growth, and (2) to provide accurate and reliable summative information based on a pattern of performance over time in four specific areas: scholarship, teaching, service, and program administration.

The School requires instructors to undertake training in how to teach an online course prior to teaching one. Through its Office of Innovative Learning, Design, and Assessment, SOE offers an online training course (How to Teach Online), which is customized as needed for specific programs, and which trains faculty on how to teach online and how to effectively manage the course—for example, how to oversee an online discussion—as well as how to use the technology involved with the LMS. In addition, the School also develops and offers ongoing training sessions for faculty on specific technologies and processes—on everything from grading in the LMS to effective use of technologies including Panopto, VoiceThread, and Zoom. Faculty have access to a growing online bank of resources related to online instruction, including policies, forms, tutorials, library resources, and technology resources.

J. Adequacy of Library Resources (as outlined in COMAR 13B.02.03.12).

1. Describe the library resources available and/or the measures to be taken to ensure resources are adequate to support the proposed program.

The Johns Hopkins Sheridan Libraries have a history of strong and continued support for the School of Education. Significant resources are allocated to build collections and provide academic liaison services that support the research and teaching of the faculty and help students with the knowledge they need to become effective educators. In addition to more than 4.2 million books, the libraries provide 24/7 access to a rich collection of electronic resources, including over 154,000 print and e-journals and more than 1.6 million

e-books. Included in the Libraries' special collections are rare books, manuscripts, digital collections, and archival materials. The library's materials and services reflect the development and increasing diversification of resources used for teaching, research, and scholarship. Librarians are available to assist students remotely and the library maintains an extensive website to take visitors through all its services and materials. Furthermore, the interlibrary loan department allows students access to resources at any other university in the nation.

Additionally, the School is served by dedicated academic liaison librarians with subject area expertise who provide research consultation and instructional services to faculty and students, and who help build electronic and print collections to support the teaching and research needs of the University.

K. Adequacy of Physical Facilities, Infrastructure and Instructional Equipment (as outlined in COMAR 13B.02.03.13).

- 1. Provide an assurance that physical facilities, infrastructure and instruction equipment are adequate to initiate the program, particularly as related to spaces for classrooms, staff and faculty offices, and laboratories for studies in the technologies and sciences. If the program is to be implemented within existing institutional resources, include a supportive statement by the President for adequate equipment and facilities to meet the program's needs.**

SOE has determined that the proposed M.Ed. degree can be delivered in its entirety using the institution's existing physical facilities/campus resources. In terms of technology infrastructure, the proposed program will use Canvas as its LMS. The University's central IT office provides technical maintenance and system-wide updates for the LMS. The School's OILDA also has a dedicated team to support the LMS and many other instructional technology needs. SOE has successfully delivered hundreds of online, blended, and web-enhanced courses annually using different learning management system platforms over the years. As part of the program's development, the School's OILDA and Office of Finance and Operations have determined that SOE possesses the necessary technology infrastructure and instructional equipment in place to support successful delivery of the proposed program.

- 2. Provide assurance and any appropriate evidence that the institution will ensure students enrolled in and faculty teaching in distance education will have adequate access to: a) an institutional electronic mailing system, and b) a learning management system that provides the necessary technological support for distance education.**

All SOE students and faculty have access to an Office 365 account that includes email capabilities (built on Outlook Live), which is managed and supported by a central University IT office. The email account is accessible from a variety of browsers on both PC and Mac systems.

As indicated previously, the proposed program will launch in a blended/hybrid format. For all instructional delivery modes, SOE uses Canvas as its LMS. Canvas is one of the world's

leading providers of e-learning systems for higher education institutions. The system's software focuses on educational outcomes and provides a highly flexible learning environment for students. Both the University, which supports the LMS centrally, and SOE are outfitted with suitable technical and professional staff to provide technical assistance to students taking online and blended/hybrid courses. Additionally, all participants have full access (both in-person and remotely) to counseling and student support services, IT support services, and other administrative resources.

L. Adequacy of Financial Resources with Documentation (as outlined in COMAR 13B.02.03.14).

Please see Appendix C.

M. Adequacy of Provisions for Evaluation of Program (as outlined in COMAR 13B.02.03.15).

1. Discuss procedures for evaluating courses, faculty and student learning outcomes

At the individual course level, SOE conducts end-of-semester summative evaluations of every course. The course evaluation focuses on three primary areas: quality of course design, quality of instructor, and quality of student experience. The results of every course evaluation are analyzed to determine if changes to the course content or course delivery mechanisms are necessary, and results are also shared with department chairs and program leads.

As part of an annual performance review process, SOE faculty are evaluated, among other things, on both the effectiveness of their teaching; their service to the School, community, and the intellectual field; and their scholarship in their areas of expertise.

As outlined under G.3.a, the School of Education houses a long-established teaching and learning support unit, OILDA, that is staffed by personnel with expertise in curriculum development, instructional design, technology integration, learning assessment, program evaluation, data analysis and visualization, and learning analytics.

Program faculty will: (1) work with OILDA's instructional designers to ensure that program curriculum and courses are designed and developed to align closely with program learning outcomes; (2) collaborate with the OILDA Director and learning assessment specialists to develop a robust assessment plan with key assessments mapped onto every program learning outcomes; (3) construct rigorous assessment rubrics that are directly and closely connected to the corresponding target program learning outcomes to be measured; and (4) support OILDA assessment staff on learning assessment data collection; and (5) annually review assessment results, identify areas of improvement, and develop and implement an action plan, in collaboration with the OILDA Director and assessment specialists.

Through this iterative and continuous improvement cycle, the program director and faculty will systematically and methodically evaluate how well the program learning outcomes are achieved and how the program curriculum can be improved for more optimal student learning outcomes.

2. Explain how the institution will evaluate the proposed program’s educational effectiveness, including assessments of student learning outcomes, student retention, student and faculty satisfaction, and cost-effectiveness.

Evaluation of the program’s educational effectiveness will be guided by SOE’s Comprehensive Assessment System (CAS). As elaborated in G.3.a., the School aims to promote reflective practice, critical thinking, and inquired-based learning through a robust review of performance-based assessment measures to drive program improvement and increase student learning outcomes, satisfaction, and impact on their community.

The effectiveness of the program will primarily be determined by benchmarking how well student learning outcomes are achieved, drawing from a variety of assessments and data sources, both direct and indirect.

Through semester and/or annual review of both direct and indirect assessment data (e.g., course-based assessment results, course evaluation results, alumni and exit survey responses, feedback from faculty and instructors, etc.), the program director will collaborate with OILDA’s assessment team to identify areas of improvement, develop an action plan to address those areas of improvement, and implement the action plan.

With regards to student retention, SOE is able to run regular reports detailing student retention data for its programs. More importantly, faculty advisors will serve as the first point-of-contact for students should any problems (whether academic or non-academic) arise, and can direct their advisees to appropriate student support services as needed.

As part of the program’s development, SOE has determined (as outlined in Appendix C) that the proposed program will be cost effective. SOE is looking to partner with BCPS and various philanthropic organizations, as well as State and federal agencies, to provide full funding support (tuition and a living stipend) for all students during the initial program implementation phase, and subsequently for as many students as possible depending on program growth in later years.

The program’s revenues and expenses will be monitored closely in the future to ensure that the program is being delivered in a cost-effective manner. For example, should newer, cheaper, and more effective technologies emerge in the online space that would enhance program quality, they will be adopted.

N. Consistency with the State’s Minority Student Achievement Goals (as outlined in COMAR 13B.02.03.05).

The Johns Hopkins University follows all stipulations of Title VI, Title IX, and Section 504. Accordingly, race and ethnicity are not considered in the administration of the School’s academic programs. Nonetheless, in accordance with both the Johns Hopkins University’s and School of Education’s stated commitment to diversity, and the program’s commitment to producing graduates who will seek to promote educational equity and social justice, the program will employ recruitment strategies and offer student support services to attract and sustain a diverse student body. The program, through its “certification plus” commitment to an

extensive coaching/mentoring model while candidates are enrolled in the degree and post-graduation, will work to help all admitted students improve their professional goals, an aim consistent with the State's minority student achievement goals.

Additionally, the funding support model SOE is seeking to implement for the proposed program will ensure that any financial burden placed on all candidates, including minority students, who enroll in the program is extremely limited, thereby helping to address equity issues when it comes to accessing higher education. Furthermore, by making the program highly affordable for all students, this should alleviate student debt concerns and improve teacher retention rates.

O. Relationship to Low Productivity Programs Identified by the Commission:

Not applicable.

P. Adequacy of Distance Education Programs (as outlined in COMAR 13B.02.03.22).

Not applicable.

Appendix A Course Listing

New courses are indicated with an ED.XXX.XXX prefix. Unless otherwise indicated, the courses listed below will be taken by both elementary education and secondary education candidates.

Required Certification Courses (elementary education: 30 credits; secondary education: 24 credits)

Human/Adolescent Development

ED.XXX.XXX Connecting Education and Health through Human Development, Learning Sciences, and Public Health – 3 credits

In this course, students will explore human development across the lifespan and its implications for learning with focus bidirectionally. That is, students will examine the impact of human development on learning and the impact of context, including health issues such as physical, mental, social, emotional, economic, and environmental impact on human development and learning. Candidates will develop competencies needed to support students, families, and their communities. Special attention will be given to applications aimed at the promotion of health, positive development, and social justice among diverse people.

Human Learning

ED.XXX.XXX Human Learning – 3 credits

In this course, students will explore a broad spectrum of learning theories, including historical perspectives leading toward more in-depth study of contemporary theories and their applications. Students will focus on cognitive, social cognitive, sociocultural theories and their applications to teaching and learning. Applications will include topics such as situated learning and cognitive apprenticeship. Finally, students will examine the learning sciences and neuro-educational initiatives.

Teaching Methodologies

ED.XXX.XXX Teachers as Learning Designers – 3 credits

Teachers are learning designers, as they are constantly creating and re-creating opportunities for their students to learn. As learning designers, teachers must learn, practice, and embody designerly ways of knowing. In this course, through design-thinking approaches, candidates will develop competencies needed to create and re-create opportunities for their students to learn. Candidates will develop knowledge and skills needed to deliver instruction in multiple modalities and how to match modalities with learning technologies. Topics will include instructional design, problem-based learning, argumentation, Universal Design for Learning, and Understanding by Design. Through lesson design and curriculum review assignments, candidates will develop competencies needed to be critical consumers of educational materials. (In this course, elementary candidates will apply learning design elements to the content areas of STEM, English language arts, social studies, and the arts.)

Inclusion of Special Needs Student Populations

ED.XXX.XXX Teaching for All (Issues of Equity, Diversity, Differentiation, UDL) – 3 credits

This course will prepare educators in inclusive education practices for all learners. Candidates will learn practices that promote a safe and welcoming classroom and school community where

individual differences are valued, embraced, and evident. They will learn to implement practices where all students, regardless of cognitive or academic level, have opportunities to be included in the general education classroom, participating in standards-based curriculum. In addition, multiple aspects of diversity will be explored. Candidates will develop competencies in Universal Design for Learning and differentiation.

Assessment of Students

ED.XXX.XXX Assessment and Data Analysis for Improved Teaching and Learning – 3 credits

Teachers must be able to design, implement, and critique assessments. They must also be able to analyze and interpret data and use it for making important decisions that impact student outcomes and teacher improvement. Through a comprehensive exploration of assessment types and strategies, candidates will develop skills to critique commercially-prepared assessments and design their own formative and summative assessments. Candidates will learn basic research design and analytic methods and apply this knowledge to learning design. They will develop skills and dispositions needed to engage students and families in understanding assessment information.

Internship and Experiential Learning

ED.XXX.XXX Internship – 1 or 2 credits

This school-based experience is designed to provide candidates with an opportunity to work with public school students in diverse settings. Hosting sites (PDS and Partnership Schools) serve as clinical laboratories for a minimum 100-day internship where candidates can observe how pupils learn, discover appropriate teaching strategies, plan lessons, implement teaching methods, and develop supportive environments. This course is aligned with the expectations of the Maryland State Department of Education assessment requirements. This course provides an opportunity to practice clinically in collaboration with a team of teachers and educator specialists while being guided by experienced mentors. Seminar meetings provide candidates with opportunities to reflect on their experiences in the internship and to focus on their own professional identities.

Literacies (for secondary candidates only)

ED.884.508 Literacy in the Content Areas: Part I – 3 credits

This course is intended to present the reading process from initial to proficient adult levels for teachers of content subjects in middle or high school. Organizing principles of learning development, differences, and environments will be introduced, and connected with principles of content knowledge and application. Additionally, the uses of assessment will be explored and joined to evidence-based practices of planning and multimodal instruction. Finally, issues of professional practice and ethics will be discussed.

ED 884.510 Literacy in the Content Areas: Part II – 3 credits

Candidates will extend their understanding of the adolescent learner as they explore, apply, and discuss literacy skills across the disciplines. Candidates will demonstrate understanding and the ability to design, implement and assess effective literacy instruction in the content classroom.

Literacies (for elementary candidates only)

ED.884.501 Processes and Acquisition of Literacy – 3 credits

This course is designed to provide a deep understanding of the component processes associated with reading and writing (with mention of speaking and listening) and the ways that students develop into skilled readers and writers. There are five major themes: the component processes of reading and writing; the nature and structure of the English language; the ways that native English speakers and English learners differ in the ways they read and write; the developmental phases associated with learning to read and write for native English speakers and English learners; and the many factors that influence literacy development. Where appropriate, candidates will explore how to assess literacy processes and acquisition.

ED 884.502 Assessment of Literacy – 3 credits

This course is designed to assist teacher candidates and in-service teachers in becoming proficient consumers and users of classroom-based assessment and assessment data. Participants will explore the purposes for assessment and the types of assessment tools, learn how to administer and use valid and reliable, formal, and informal assessments of literacy and related skills, examine how to effectively interpret the results of assessments, and learn how to communicate assessment results in a variety of contexts.

ED 884.505 Materials for Teaching Literacy – 3 credits

This course focuses on evidence-based evaluation and selection of materials for a comprehensive literacy program. Candidates will explore and evaluate characteristics of effective literacy programming and instruction, and apply that knowledge to selecting, evaluating, and organizing print and multimedia materials that reflect engagement and respect for student diversity. Diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, learning differences, leveling systems, intervention and family support, and student interest and motivation will receive specific focus.

ED 884.507 Instruction in Literacy – 3 credits

This course is designed to prepare candidates with the knowledge and skills to design and deliver effective literacy instruction for a diverse community of learners. The course is focused on the core components that lead to proficient and motivated reading and writing behavior, as well as managing speaking and listening opportunities that lead to more active, equitable and academically oriented conversations. In addition, candidates will understand the role of classroom literacy instruction in a multi-tiered system of support and learn how to work with colleagues to provide evidence-based interventions for students who struggle as readers and writers.

Core Content Courses (3-6 credits)

ED.XXX.XXX Teacher Wellness and Social and Emotional Learning for Educators and Learners – 3 credits

Social and emotional learning, or SEL, involves the processes through which individuals acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage their emotions, feel and show empathy for others, establish and achieve positive goals, develop and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions. Growing evidence supports the importance of SEL competencies for educators and learners. In this course, candidates will explore key concepts of SEL and the application of concepts to their own development as educators and

to the development of their learners. Connections between SEL and equity will be explored in depth. Through case studies, lesson critique, journaling, role play, and virtual reality experiences, candidates will develop competencies needed to develop and maintain their own social and emotional well-being and the social and emotional well-being of their learners.

ED.XXX.XXX Issues of Social Justice – 3 credits *(for secondary candidates only)*

This course will examine the construct of social justice as it has evolved over time to encompass the core values of equal rights, equal opportunity, and equal treatment for all. In addition, the course will explore social justice as a call to action. The course will focus on particular issues related to social justice, depending on the program core content. The initial offering of this course will focus on environmental justice.

Content Area Specializations (by Certification Area) (9 credits)

ED.XXX.XXX STEM Integration from a Learning Sciences Perspective – 3 credits

This course will examine STEM integration from a science of learning perspective at the theoretical, empirical, and applied level. Students will explore the ways in which STEM integration supports memory, conceptual understanding, active learning, metacognition, conceptual understanding, and transfer of knowledge from multidisciplinary perspectives on learning. Specifically, the course examines the process and environments in which STEM integration can promote learning. This course will address social justice/environmental justice for elementary candidates.

ED.XXX.XXX Foundational Concepts of STEM – 3 credits

This course will build upon student understanding of the science of learning related to the integration of STEM disciplines. Students will be challenged to apply the understanding of integration by deepening their understanding of STEM instructional strategies. Students will examine STEM instructional programs and their opportunities for supporting learning through an opportunity to learn perspective. That is, students will be able to articulate how they would create STEM instructional units and programs with the focus on both the affordances and barriers to developing STEM curriculum. Students will enact this learning by developing technology-enhanced, problem-based, and student-centered instructional programs. Participants will learn to create an integrated, inclusive, and equitable STEM approach to support student learning and positive affect toward STEM.

ED.XXX.XXX Specialized Methods of Teaching – 3 credits *(for secondary candidates only)*

This course will address specialized methods within disciplinary domains, as determined by needs of each cohort.

Specialized Content Courses (for elementary candidates only; course options are provided to meet cohort needs. During program development, the following courses will be adapted to focus on grades 1-6.)

ED.840.601 Mathematical Foundations in the PreK-6 Classroom – 3 credits

The goal of this course is to support PreK-6 content knowledge for teaching related to the following topics: patterns; number and operation; measurement and data. Connections of these topics to an integrated approach to curriculum and instruction will be emphasized.

ED.840.672 Advanced Topics in the PreK-6 Mathematics Classroom – 3 credits

The purpose of this course is to develop teachers' content knowledge for teaching (knowledge of mathematics content, pedagogy, and student learning) in the context of advanced mathematics. This course builds on the previous courses: Mathematical Foundations in the PreK-6 Classroom and Algebraic and Geometric Thinking in the PreK-6 Classroom.

ED.840.650 Physical Science in an Integrated PreK-6 Classroom – 3 credits

The goal of this course is to provide PreK-6 teachers a rich understanding of foundational physical science concepts and their applications in an integrated science, technology, engineering, and mathematical world. Topics will include: structure, properties, and interactions of matter; physical and chemical properties of materials; mechanics, force, and motion; gravity, energy transformation, energy sources, electricity, magnetism, light, sound, and wave interactions. Problem-based inquiries will be organized to engage the participants in planning investigations, gathering and analyzing data, offering plausible explanations, and developing a deeper knowledge base in the physical sciences. The engineering design process will be integrated throughout the course.

ED.840.671.91 Algebraic and Geometric Thinking in the PreK-6 Classroom – 3 credits

This course will model the process standards of problem-solving, reasoning and proof, representations, connections and communication within the context of algebraic and geometric thinking. The goal of this course is to support PreK-6 content knowledge for teaching related to the following topics: patterns; number and operation; measurement, statistics, and probability. Connections of these topics to an integrated approach to curriculum and instruction is emphasized.

ED.840.652 Life Science in an Integrated PreK-6 Classroom – 3 credits

The goal of this course is to provide PreK-6 teachers with a rich understanding of life science content and pedagogy. Topics will include living organisms and their interactions, diversity of life, genetics, evolution, flow of matter and energy, and ecology. The applications and impact of technology on human life will be an important feature of the course. Problem-based learning (PBL) inquiries will be organized to engage the participants in planning investigations, gathering and analyzing data, offering plausible explanations, and developing a deeper knowledge base of Life Science. The scientific method will be integrated throughout the course; if applicable, the design process for engineering will be integrated as well.

**Appendix B
Faculty Listing**

The following full-time Johns Hopkins School of Education faculty will contribute to the program:

Faculty Name	Academic Rank/ Title	Highest Degree	Degree Field	Specialization(s)	Likely Course Assignments
Yolanda Abel	Associate Professor, Research & Department Chair	Ed.D.	Teacher Development and Leadership	Family-School- Community Partnerships	Issues of Social Justice
Annette Anderson	Assistant Professor, Clinical & Program Lead	Ph.D.	Education Policy	Educational Equity and Advocacy	Issues of Social Justice
Mary Ellen Beaty-O’Ferrall	Associate Professor, Clinical & Department Chair	Ph.D.	Curriculum and Instruction	Teacher Preparation, Teacher Wellness, SEL	Teachers as Learning Designers; Internship; Teacher Wellness and Social and Emotional Learning for Educators and Learners
Carey Borkoski	Associate Professor, Clinical	Ph.D.; Ed.D.	Education Policy; Learning Theory	Coaching, Professional Identity Development	Internship
Rebecca Cruz	Assistant Professor, Research	Ph.D.	Special Education	Inclusive Education	Teaching for All (Issues of Equity, Diversity, Differentiation, UDL)
Hunter Gehlbach	Professor, Research & Vice Dean of Academic Affairs	Ph.D.	Educational Psychology	Environmental Education, SEL	Issues of Social Justice
Lieny Jeon	Professor, Research	Ph.D.	Human Development and Family Science, minor in Quantitative Methods	Early Childhood, Teacher Wellness, SEL	Teachers as Learning Designers; Internship; Teacher Wellness and Social and Emotional Learning for Educators and Learners

Stephen Pape	Professor, Research	Ph.D.	Teaching and Learning – Mathematics	Mathematics, STEM Education	Human Learning; STEM Integration from a Learning Sciences Perspective; Foundational Concepts of STEM; Mathematical Foundations in the PreK-6 Classroom; Advanced Topics in the PreK-6 Mathematics Classroom; Algebraic and Geometric Thinking in the PreK-6 Classroom
Eric Rice	Assistant Professor, Clinical & Program Lead	Ph.D.	Anthropology	Urban Education, Equity	Issues of Social Justice; Connecting Education and Health through Human Development, Learning Sciences, and Public Health
Alexandra Shelton	Assistant Professor, Research	Ph.D.	Special Education	Special Education, General Education Literacy Instruction, Urban Education, Coaching	Literacy in the Content Areas: Parts I & II

In addition to a core of full-time faculty, the program will be supported by qualified adjunct faculty who have previous teaching experience as SOE instructors and extensive clinical experience in the field of educator preparation. At the time of writing, the faculty teaching assignments have not yet been determined for every course.

**Appendix C
Budget**

TABLE 1: PROGRAM RESOURCES					
Resource Categories	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
1. Reallocated Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2. Tuition/Fee Revenue (c + g below)	\$0	\$660,000	\$1,320,000	\$1,320,000	\$1,320,000
a. Number of F/T Students	0	Cohort 1=22	Cohort 2=44	Cohort 3=44	Cohort 4=44
b. Annual Tuition/Fee Rate	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
c. Total F/T Revenue (a x b)	\$0	\$660,000	\$1,320,000	\$1,320,000	\$1,320,000
d. Number of P/T Students	0	0	0	0	0
e. Credit Hour Rate	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
f. Annual Credit Hour Rate	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
g. Total P/T Revenue (d x e x f)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3. Grants, Contracts & Other External Sources	\$317,448	\$1,235,123	\$1,747,797	\$1,806,690	\$1,877,272
4. Other Sources	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL (Add 1 – 4)	\$317,448	\$1,895,123	\$3,067,797	\$3,126,690	\$3,197,272

Program Resources and Narrative Rationale

Reallocated Funds

No funds will be reallocated from existing campus resources so there will be no impact on the School of Education's existing programs and departments.

Tuition and Fee Revenue

Year 1 is a planning year and generates no revenue. In Year 2, the program will launch with a cohort of 22 students, budgeted at a tuition rate of \$30,000 per student. In Years 3-5, the cohort size will increase to 44 students, budgeted at a tuition rate of \$30,000 per student. While the budgeted tuition rate is \$30,000 per student during the first five years of the program, SOE is designing the program's funding model such that students will not pay any tuition fee out-of-pocket. Instead, as outlined in the next section, the School is exploring various funding opportunities to cover the tuition cost for each student.

Grants, Contracts, and Other External Sources

SOE is exploring a multi-pronged approach to provide all students with tuition and stipend funding for this program. This includes exploring philanthropic opportunities and federal/state/local funding sources.

SOE's Development Office is identifying potential sources of philanthropic support from private foundations and individuals, with the goal of creating an endowed fund. The School is also pursuing future funding through estate gifts from individuals. Additionally, faculty are reviewing existing STEM-related grants that provide support for students who are pursuing STEM content area specializations.

In addition to using external funding to provide tuition and stipend support for students, SOE will also seek external funding support to cover the faculty/staff salaries and other expenses outlined in Table 2 for Years 1-5 of the proposed program.

Other Sources

At this time, SOE does not have any other sources of income.

Total Year

No additional explanation or comments.

TABLE 2: PROGRAM EXPENDITURES					
Expenditure Categories	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
1. Faculty (b + c below)	\$231,200	\$372,088	\$486,956	\$501,563	\$522,007
a. Number of FTE	2.0	3.125	4.0	4.0	4.125
b. Total Salary	\$140,000	\$273,594	\$360,708	\$371,528	\$387,672
c. Total Benefits	\$50,400	\$98,494	\$126,248	\$130,035	\$134,335
2. Admin. Staff (b + c below)	\$0	\$190,400	\$194,670	\$200,510	\$206,526
a. Number of FTE	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
b. Total Salary	\$0	\$140,000	\$144,200	\$148,526	\$152,982
c. Total Benefits	\$0	\$50,400	\$50,470	\$51,984	\$53,544
3. Support Staff (b + c below)	\$6,048	\$346,234	\$482,554	\$509,562	\$537,778
a. Number of FTE	0.06	2.93	4.15	4.15	4.15
b. Total Salary	\$5,600	\$256,896	\$364,389	\$384,602	\$405,717
c. Total Benefits	\$448	\$89,338	5	\$124,960	\$132,061
4. Technical Support and Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5. Library	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6. New or Renovated Space	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
7. Other Expenses	\$121,000	\$986,401	\$1,903,6176	\$1,915,055	\$1,930,961
TOTAL (Add 1 – 7)	\$317,448	\$1,895,123	\$3,067,797	\$3,126,690	\$3,197,272

Program Expenditures and Narrative Rationale

Year 1 is designated as a planning year for developing the program. Year 2 will be the first year that candidates enroll in the program, with a launch date of summer 2023. In subsequent years, a new cohort of candidates will enroll annually in the program and program alumni will continue to be supported as they become teachers of record in their own classrooms. This alumni support, which is accounted for in the budget below, will continue for four years post-graduation for each candidate.

Faculty

For Year 1, funds allocated to the faculty line will support full-time faculty to develop the program. These funds include the reallocation of full-time faculty from another SOE teacher preparation program, who will contribute to program and course development. SOE will not hire any new faculty during Year 1.

In Year 2-5, funds allocated to the faculty line will support current full- and part-time faculty in the management and delivery of the program. The budget includes funding set aside to hire a new full-time faculty with STEM expertise in Year 3.

Administrative Staff

During Year 1, the planning year, SOE intends to initiate a hiring process for two new positions: (1) a Program Manager and (2) a Program Coordinator—who will assume their roles beginning in Year 2. The Program Manager will oversee experiential learning placements and certification requirements. The Program Coordinator will provide direct support to the program faculty and program candidates from recruitment through matriculation.

Support Staff

During Year 1, the planning year, SOE will initiate a hiring process for a Learning Engineer as a full-time employee, who will devote a portion of their time to support the program launch. The Learning Engineer will collaborate with Program Leads, Advisors, Mentors, Coaches, K-12 educators, and Instructional Designers, to develop highly innovative learning experiences that enhance the experience for all involved in the program.

For Years 2 and 3, SOE will hire members of the Whole Teacher Support team who will provide support to candidates during the degree program and for four years post-graduation. The team membership will include:

- One full-time Life Design Leader starting in Year 2, who will oversee the Whole Teacher Support team and provide training on the principles and practices of Life Design.
- Three part-time Advisors starting in Year 2 and an additional three part-time Advisors starting in Year 3. These positions will be paid on a per diem basis, working eight hours per week, initially at the rate of \$27 per hour. Advisors will provide guidance to candidates to support program success, professional identify development, and wellness.
- Four part-time Coaches starting in Year 2, and an additional two part-time Coaches starting in Year 3, who will support candidates in their classroom context using observation and feedback cycles.

- Two part-time Mentors in Year 2, and an additional two part-time Mentors starting in Year 3, who will provide subject-matter expertise in the content area specializations.
- One part-time post-graduation support team member starting in Year 3, with one additional post-graduation support team member added subsequently in both Years 4 and 5, who will provide support to graduates in their professional teaching career post-graduation.

Equipment

No equipment expenditures are needed at this time.

Library

No library expenditure expenditures beyond those currently provided to the School of Education are requested at this time.

New/Renovated Space

There is no anticipated new or renovated special facilities needs at this time.

Other Expenses

In Year 1, the planning year, funding will be allocated as follows to support the implementation of the program:

- Marketing (\$52,000)
- Advertising-branding (\$14,000)
- Admissions support (\$30,000)
- Course development (\$20,000)

In Years 2-5, funding will be allocated to cover the following annual costs on a per student basis:

- Stipends (\$25,000)
- Books (\$1,800)
- Health insurance (\$1,241)
- School fees (\$525)

The expenditures allocated for Years 2-5 also include a 10 percent contingency and overhead cost. These expenditures will cover partial costs of marketing and admissions.

Total Expenses

No additional information.

Appendix D
List of Current Educator Preparation Programs Offered by Other Maryland Institutions
 (pulled from MHEC Academic Program Inventory)

School Name	Degree Level	Program Name	CIP
Bowie State University	Master's	Elementary Education	131202
Bowie State University	Master's	Secondary Education	131205
Bowie State University	Master's	Teaching (MAT)	131205
Coppin State University	Master's	Teaching (MAT)	139999
Frostburg State University	Master's	Education (various concentrations)	130101
Frostburg State University	Master's	Secondary, K-12 (MAT)	131205
Frostburg State University	Master's	Elementary Education (MAT)	131202
Goucher College	Master's	Education	130101
Goucher College	Master's	Teaching	131205
Loyola University Maryland	Master's	Classroom Teaching	130101
Loyola University Maryland	Master's	Teaching (MAT)	131299
McDaniel College	Master's	Elementary Education	131202
McDaniel College	Master's	Secondary Education	131205
McDaniel College	Master's	Teaching	131299
Morgan State University	Master's	Teaching (MAT)	131205
Mount St. Mary's University	Master's	Education	131202
Mount St. Mary's University	Master's	Elementary Education	131202
Mount St. Mary's University	Master's	Secondary Teaching	131205
Notre Dame of Maryland University	Master's	Teaching (MAT)	131205
Salisbury University	Master's	Education (various concentrations)	130101
Salisbury University	Master's	Teaching (MAT) (with UMES)	131205
St. Mary's College of Maryland	Master's	Teaching (MAT)	130101
Stevenson University	Master's	Teaching (MAT)	131205
Towson University	Master's	Elementary Education	131202
Towson University	Master's	Secondary Education	131205
University of Maryland, Baltimore County	Master's	Education	130101
University of Maryland, Baltimore County	Master's	Teaching (MAT)	130101
University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES)	Master's	Teaching (MAT) (with Salisbury)	131205
University of Maryland Global Campus	Master's	Secondary Teaching	131205

Appendix E References

- Baltimore City Public Schools. (n.d.). *Building a generation: City schools' blueprint for success*. Retrieved January 5, 2022, from <https://www.baltimorecityschools.org/sites/default/files/2019-01/Blueprint-complete.pdf>
- Baker, Z., & Gehlbach, H. (2022). Policy dialogue: Teaching environmentalism on a warming planet. *History of Education Quarterly*, 62(1), 107-119. <https://doi.org/10.1017/heq.2021.56>
- Burnett, B., & Evans, D. (2016). *Designing your life: how to build a well-lived, joyful life*. (1st ed.) New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Corcoran, R. P., Cheung, A. C. K., Kim, E., & Xie, C. (2018). Effective universal school-based social and emotional learning programs for improving academic achievement: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 50 years of research. *Educational Research Review*, 25, 56-72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2017.12.001>
- Eccles, R. (2021, Nov 16). *Annual Reporting 2020-2021 (TPAR)*. [PowerPoint slides]. Deans and Directors Meeting, Maryland State Department of Education, Baltimore, MD. https://livejohnshopkins-my.sharepoint.com/:p/r/personal/moferral_jh_edu/Documents/ED%20DEV%20PROJECT/Annual%20Reporting_TPAR_%202020-2021%2011.16.21.pptx?d=w8675c15497e1478fab75c84690abbe53&csf=1&web=1&e=v372Xy
- Hagermoser Sanetti, L. M., Boyle, A. M., Magrath, E., Cascio, A., & Moore, E. (2021). Intervening to decrease teacher stress: A review of current research and new directions. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 25, 416–425. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-020-00285-x>
- House Bill 1300: Blueprint for Maryland's future – implementation*. (2020). Retrieved April 6, 2022, from <https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2020RS/bills/hb/hb1300E.pdf>
- Johns Hopkins University. (n.d.). *History and mission*. Retrieved March 24, 2022, from <https://www.jhu.edu/about/history/>
- Johns Hopkins University. (n.d.). *Johns Hopkins School of Education*. Retrieved March 21, 2022, from <https://education.jhu.edu/>
- Johns Hopkins University. (n.d.). *Student affairs life design lab*. Retrieved January 5, 2022, from <https://studentaffairs.jhu.edu/life-design/>
- Johns Hopkins University. (n.d.). *Johns Hopkins University ten by twenty: A vision for Johns Hopkins by 2020*. (n.d.). Retrieved March 16, 2022, from <https://10x2020progress.jhu.edu/>

- Kush, J. M., Badillo-Goicoechea, E., Musci, R. J., Stuart, E. A. (2021). Teacher mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic: Informing policies to support teacher well-being and effective teaching practices. *arXiv e-prints*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.01547>
- Madigan, D. J., & Kim, L. E. (2021). Towards an understanding of teacher attrition: A meta-analysis of burnout, job satisfaction, and teachers' intentions to quit. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 105*, 103425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103425>
- Mahoney, J. L., Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2018). An update on social and emotional learning outcome research. *Phi Delta Kappan, 100*(4), 18–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721718815668>
- Maryland Department of Labor. (n.d.). *Maryland long term occupational projections (2018 - 2028)*. <http://www.labor.maryland.gov/lmi/iandoproj/maryland.shtml>
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2022, February 24). *Maryland State Department of Education introduces the Maryland national board-certified teacher in low performing school program for 2022-23*. Retrieved March 24, 2022, from <https://news.maryland.gov/msde/maryland-state-department-of-education-introduces-the-maryland-national-board-certified-teacher-in-low-performing-school-program-for-2022-23/>
- Maryland State Department of Education. (n.d.). *MD's P-12 dashboards*. Retrieved January 5, 2022, from https://mldscenter.maryland.gov/webcenter/portal/P12LDS/page133?_adf.ctrl-state=le011j4x9_9&_afLoop=309953406567937#%40%3F_afLoop%3D309953406567937%26centerWidth%3D100%2525%26leftWidth%3D0%2525%26rightWidth%3D0%2525%26showFooter%3Dfalse%26showHeader%3Dfalse%26_adf.ctrl-state%3Di11p6ne2p_17
- Maryland State Department of Education. (n.d.). *Professional staff by assignment, race/ethnicity and gender Maryland public schools: October 2020*. Retrieved April 6, 2022, from <https://www.marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/DCAA/SSP/20202021Staff/2021ProfStaffbyRace.pdf>
- Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in adulthood*. (2nd ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- National Education Association. (n.d.). *Social-emotional learning should be priority during COVID-19 crisis*. Retrieved January 12, 2022, from <https://www.nea.org/advocating-for-change/new-from-nea/social-emotional-learning-should-be-priority-during-covid-19>
- Stanford life design lab*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 20, 2022, from <http://lifedesignlab.stanford.edu/>

- Steward, L. (2022, February 28). *We're at a tipping point: A crisis in teaching threatens reform efforts in Maryland*. Baltimore Fishbowl. <https://baltimorefishbowl.com/stories/were-at-a-tipping-point-a-crisis-in-teaching-threatens-reform-efforts-in-maryland/>
- Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2019). Understanding teacher shortages: An analysis of teacher supply and demand in the United States. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 27(35). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.3696>
- Taylor, R. E., Oberle, E., Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-analysis of follow-up effects. *Child Development*, 88(4), 1156-1171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12864>
- Teach in Maryland*. (n.d.). Retrieved March 11, 2022, from <https://teach.in.maryland.gov/Pages/Certified-Out-of-State-Teacher.aspx>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (n.d.). *Employment projections*. <https://data.bls.gov/projections/occupationProj>
- Vega, V. (2017, June 14). *Social and emotional learning research*. Edutopia. <https://www.edutopia.org/sel-research-learning-outcomes>
- Wright, D. S., Balgopal, M. M., McMeeking, L. B., & Weinberg, A. E. (2019). Developing resilient K-12 STEM teachers. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 21(1), 16–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422318814483>

Johns Hopkins University
PMS - 10

Vendor Number: 2099953

Check Number: 11945871

Check Date: 05/26/2022

Vendor Name: MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSIO

Invoice No.	Invoice Date	PO Number	Comments	Gross Amount	Discount	Net Amount
05112022	05/11/2022		SOE M.Ed in Teaching Profession	850.00	0.00	850.00
GROSS AMOUNT				850.00	0.00	850.00

For all inquiries please contact ACCOUNT PAYABLE at: APSSC@JHMI.EDU

REMOVE DOCUMENT ALONG THIS PERFORATION

THIS DOCUMENT IS PRINTED IN TWO COLORS. DO NOT ACCEPT UNLESS BLUE AND BROWN ARE PRESENT.

Johns Hopkins Accounts Payable Service Center
P.O. Box 33499
Baltimore, MD 21218-9998

05/26/2022

11945871

JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. 50-937
Syracuse, NY 213

CHECK AMOUNT

\$850.00*

EIGHT HUNDRED FIFTY USD and 00 /100

Pay to the order of MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSIO
6 N LIBERTY ST 10TH FLR
BALTIMORE, MD 21201

Hedone Brady

⑈ 11945871 ⑈ ⑆ 021309379⑆ ⑆ 601879034⑈

Johns Hopkins Accounts Payable Service Center
P.O. Box 33499
Baltimore, MD 21218-9998

MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSIO
6 N LIBERTY ST 10TH FLR
BALTIMORE, MD 21201

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR
OPENING INSTRUCTIONS

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR
OPENING INSTRUCTIONS

8510021320 / 18003526 C2018 - 0221

CB11Z