**STRUCTURED
Field Experience Log & Reflection**

**Instructional Technology Department**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Candidate:** Neal Austin Smith III | **Mentor/Title:** Jonathan Tanner, Assistant Principal | **School/District:** Simpson Middle School/Cobb County |
| **Field Experience/Assignment:**Engaged Learning Project | **Course:**ITEC 7400 21st Century Teaching and Learning  | **Professor/Semester:**Dr. Jo Williamson, Summer 2014  |

**Part I: Log**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date(s)** | **Activity/Time** | **STATE StandardsPSC** | **NATIONAL StandardsISTE NETS-C** |
| **6/24/14** | Brainstorming ideas for Engaged Learning project (2 hours)  | 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.6, 6.3 | 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3b,  |
| 6/25/14 | Continued brainstorming for EL project (2 hours) | 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.6, 6.3 | 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3b,  |
| 6/26/14 | Research into possible topics for EL project and creation of EL project idea including research on standards alignment and possible activities (3 hours) | 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.6, 6.3 | 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3b,  |
| 7/1/14 | Began adding details to my EL idea to fill in template (2 hours) | 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.6, 6.3 | 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3b,  |
| 7/7/14 | Review of comments from peers and instructor regarding my idea (1 hour) | 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.6, 6.3 | 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3b, 5a, 5c, 5d |
| 7/8/14 | Edited my EL project based on comments from peers and instructor and to add more detail to the draft template (3 hours) | 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.6, 6.3 | 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3b, 5a, 5c, 5d |
| 7/9/14 | Continued adding to EL draft template (1 hour) | 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.6, 6.3 | 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3b,  |
| 7/13/14 | Provided feedback to peers on EL drafts (.5 hours) | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.3, 3.6, 3.7,  | 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3b, 5a, 5c, 5d |
| 7/13/14 | Read comments from teacher and peers regarding my EL project draft (.5 hours) | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.3, 3.6, 3.7,  | 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3b, 5a, 5c, 5d |
| 7/14/14 | Made changes to my EL project based on peer and instructor comments, added details, and adapted draft to final template (3 hours)  | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.3, 3.6, 3.7,  | 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3b,  |
| 7/15/14 | Reviewed projects posted by peers (1 hour) | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.3, 3.6, 3.7,  | 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3b, 5a, 5c, 5d |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Hours: [30 hours ] |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **DIVERSITY**(Place an X in the box representing the race/ethnicity and subgroups involved in this field experience.) |
| **Ethnicity** | **P-12 Faculty/Staff** | **P-12 Students** |
|  | P-2 | 3-5 | 6-8 | 9-12 | P-2 | 3-5 | 6-8 | 9-12 |
| **Race/Ethnicity:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Asian |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
|  Black |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
|  Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
|  Native American/Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  White |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
|  Multiracial |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| **Subgroups:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Students with Disabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
|  Limited English Proficiency |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
|  Eligible for Free/Reduced Meals |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |

**Part II: Reflection**

|  |
| --- |
| **CANDIDATE REFLECTIONS:**(Minimum of 3-4 sentences per question) |
| **1. Briefly describe the field experience. What did you learn about technology facilitation and leadership from completing this field experience?**For this field experience, I brainstormed, researched, planned, designed and created an technology-enhanced project for my technology and engineering class. In the project, students will be tasked with using technology resources at their disposal to research, evaluate and design a new design for the standard aluminum can. From the experience, I learned a lot about how to use technology to enhance the engagement in a lesson. I learned how to include the indicators of engaged learning in my lessons and how to design lessons that rise to levels 5 and 6 of the levels of technology integration. I also learned ways to use criticism from my peers to improve lessons in order to increase the LoTi levels and engagement as a result of technology integration.  |
| **2. How did this learning relate to the knowledge** (what must you know), **skills** (what must you be able to do) **and dispositions** (attitudes, beliefs, enthusiasm) **required of a technology facilitator or technology leader? (Refer to the standards you selected in Part I. Use the language of the PSC standards in your answer and reflect on all 3—knowledge, skills, and dispositions.)**This experience related to my knowledge of the indicators of engaged learning and the Levels of technology integration. It also related to my knowledge of the content standards for the engineering and technology courses and for the expectations of the products and projects that I can expect my students to have the skills to complete. The projects related to my skills in using that knowledge to design and complete a project that incorporates technology and indicators of engagement and covers the proper standards that need to be covered. Finally, the experience related to my enthusiasm for my content and the beliefs that I hold that technology can be used to facilitate learning through the use of project and problem-based learning to facilitate the use of higher order thinking skills.  |
| **3. Describe how this field experience impacted school improvement, faculty development or student learning at your school. How can the impact be assessed?**This project will have a profound impact on all three areas mentioned. First, the project will impact faculty development because after completion of the project, I am more motivated than ever to share the indicators or engaged learning, information about the LoTi levels and tips for creating more engaging lessons with the rest of the staff at my school. Since one of our school improvement goals is to increase the higher order thinking skills of our students, more engaging lessons with higher levels of technology integration will have an impact on school improvement in helping to reach that goal. Finally, the creation of more engaging lessons with better integration of technology will improve student learning by helping reluctant students become engaged in the material and encouraging already engaged students to forge a deeper connection to the content. The impact will be assessed based on the amount of professional learning offered and the number of teachers who begin using the indicators of engaged learning while planning and those who begin to integrate technology into their lessons.  |