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Curricular Source

• Candidate work during field experiences—Learning Assessment Model Project (LAMP)

Institutional Sources

• Unit Assessment System Data
• Data from surveys of employers, candidates and supervisors
Candidate Work During Field Experiences

Learning Assessment Model Project (LAMP)

• Ten day standards-based teaching unit required for all BSU student teachers

• LAMP allows BSU student teachers to showcase knowledge acquired throughout teacher education program

• Projects allow students to thoughtfully apply instructional strategies to impact student learning in classroom environment

• Used as key assessment in all of the SPA Reports

• Includes five components
LAMP Components

The Instructional Unit
- Inclusion of academic content standards/variety of instructional strategies
- Accommodation of developmental difficulties
- Incorporation of media and technology

Assessments (pre/post measures)
- Validity and reliability of assessments
- Presence of specific and appropriate criteria for mastery levels
- Well constructed test items
LAMP Components (continued)

K-12 Student Project

- Incorporation of state and national standards in the project
- Presentation of evaluation criteria

Assessments (pre/post measures)

- Appropriately addresses standards incorporated in the project
- Evaluates both processes and conventions
- Presence of specific and appropriate criteria for mastery level
LAMP Components (continued)

**K-12 Student Learning Evaluation**
- Pre-test performance graph with interpretation
- Rationale for instructional modifications based on pre-test
- Interpretation of project performance
- Post-test performance graph with interpretation
- Comparison of pre-test, post-test, and project performance
- Reflection of data and rationale for modifications for future instruction
Institutional Sources
Unit Assessment System Data

- Faculty analyze candidate performance, including performance on LAMP and other assessments related to impact on student learning
- Candidates may check their performance
- Faculty can create reports to see aggregated or disaggregated LAMP assessment data
## Example of Rubric Row for LAMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Interpretation of Post-test Performance</strong></td>
<td>Interpretation does not accurately reflect data. Analysis does not address students' content area understanding,</td>
<td>Interpretation reflects whole class performance. Analysis does not identify individual differences in content area understanding,</td>
<td>Interpretation reflects whole class and either compares specific student performance on the pretest and post-test or class performance on separate standards. Analysis reflects students' knowledge of individual content area concepts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standards aligned to this row:
- **INTASC P1.K.1, P2.K.3, P8.K.1**
- **INTASC P1.K.2, P2.K.3, P8.P.4**
- **TESOL - 5 Domains 5.c**
### Average Rubric Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>StdDev</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Content Standards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Additional Standards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Developmental Appropriateness</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Authentic Skills</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Technology and/or Media</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Development of Unit Plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Validity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reliability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Objective Test Items</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Other Quantifiable Measures</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Testing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations for Students with Special Needs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Criteria for Mastery</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Content Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interpretation of Pretest Performance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rationale for Instruction Modifications</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interpretation of Project Performance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interpretation of Post-test Performance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Analysis of Instructional Approaches</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Standards Addressed within the Rubric</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Procedures and Mechanics within the Rubric</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rubric Construction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Criteria for Mastery</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Interpretation of Post-test Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z0 Total assessments (including N/A)
LAMP Comparison

Date

Faculty can compare different data sets. In this example, each blue bar represents LAMP Data for Language Arts candidates who were assessed between July 1, 2008-June 30, 2009 and the red bar represents candidates assessed between July 1, 2009-June 30, 2010.
Survey Data

• Candidates, employers, and supervisors are asked to respond to questions related to impact on student learning in a variety of surveys
• Exit Survey Data shared with Professional Education Committee with focus on areas of concern
• Disaggregated Exit Survey Data shared with Program Managers
• Educational Leadership Alumni Survey includes questions related to impact on student learning
• While current surveys help in effort, unit is seeking help from institution to encourage higher response rate
• Professional Development Focus Groups
External Data Sources
Potential External Data Sources

• Indiana Mentoring and Assessment Program (IMAP)
• Data from statewide teacher evaluation system
• Statewide P-12 testing and Student Growth Model
• Data systems that link P-12 schools teacher performance to the educator preparation unit
Indiana Mentoring & Assessment Program (IMAP)

• Completed during license holder’s first two years of employment
• Required for all beginning teachers, administrators, and school service personnel
• IMAP Assessment based on INTASC Principles
• Assessment completed by building principal (or appropriate supervisor)
# Teacher IMAP Assessment

**Teacher's Name**

**Year of Enrollment**
- 1st
- 2nd (Check One)

**Evaluator**
- Name
- Position

**Date of Evaluation**

### Principle #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he/she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Demonstrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Demonstrates a basic level of content knowledge in the teaching specialty to which is assigned.

| Progressing |
- Demonstrates an appropriate level of content knowledge in the teaching specialty to which assigned.

| Proficient |
- Motivates students to investigate the content area to expand their knowledge and satisfy their natural curiosity.
- Extends knowledge of subject beyond content in their teaching specialty and sparks a curiosity for learning beyond the required course work.

**Evidenced By**
- Display of technology used
- Use of student learning teams
- Collaborative lesson planning

**Professionals development**

**Documentation of differentiated instruction**

**Materials used to promote critical thinking and problem solving**

**Lesson plans**

**Test scores/data**

**Other**

### Principle #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Demonstrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Understands developmental levels of students and recognizes the need to differentiate instruction.
- Assesses resources needed to address strengths and weaknesses of students.

| Progressing |
- Understands developmental levels of students and appropriately differentiates instruction.
- Reviews and uses alternative resources or adapts existing resources to take advantage of student strengths or address weaknesses.

| Proficient |
- Identifies appropriate developmental levels of students and consistently and appropriately differentiates instruction.
- Encourages and guides colleagues to adapt instruction to align with students' developmental levels.
- Stays abreast of current research about student learning and emerging resources and encourages the school to adopt or adapt them for the benefit of all students.

**Evidenced By**
- Display of technology used
- Use of student learning teams
- Collaborative lesson planning

**Professional development**

**Documentation of differentiated instruction**

**Materials used to promote critical thinking and problem solving**

**Lesson plans**

**Test scores/data**

**Other**

### Principle #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Demonstrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Demonstrates awareness of the variety of methods and materials necessary to meet the needs of all students.

| Progressing |
- Demonstrates awareness or use of appropriate methods and materials necessary to meet the needs of all students.
Statewide Teacher Evaluation System

• Teacher Effectiveness Rubric
• A pilot of the new system will occur in 2011-2012
• All teachers, administrators, and school services personnel will be evaluated annually using Effectiveness Rubric
## Sample Rubric from Statewide Teacher Evaluation System

### Domain 1: Purposeful Planning

Teachers use Indiana content area standards to develop a rigorous curriculum relevant for all students: building meaningful units of study, continuous assessments and a system for tracking student progress as well as plans for accommodations and changes in response to a lack of student progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Highly Effective (4)</th>
<th>Effective (3)</th>
<th>Improvement Necessary (2)</th>
<th>Ineffective (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 Utilize Assessment Data to Plan | At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:  
- Incorporates differentiated instructional strategies in planning to reach every student at his/her level of understanding | Teacher uses prior assessment data to formulate:  
- Achievement goals, unit plans, AND lesson plans | Teacher uses prior assessment data to formulate:  
- Achievement goals, unit plans, OR lesson plans, but not all of the above | Teacher rarely or never uses prior assessment data when planning. |
| 1.2 Set Ambitious and Measurable Achievement Goals | At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:  
- Plans an ambitious annual student achievement goal | Teacher develops an annual student achievement goal that is:  
- Measurable,  
- Aligns to content standards, AND  
- Includes benchmarks to help monitor learning and inform interventions throughout the year | Teacher develops an annual student achievement goal that is:  
- Measurable,  
- Aligns to content standards, OR  
- Include benchmarks to help monitor learning and inform interventions throughout the year | Teacher rarely or never develops achievement goals for the class OR goals are developed, but are extremely general and not helpful for planning purposes. |
| 1.3 Develop Standards-Based Unit Plans and Assessments | At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:  
- Creates well-designed unit assessments that align with an end of year summative assessment (either state, district, or teacher created):  
- Anticipates student reaction to content; allocation of time per unit is flexible and/or reflects level of difficulty of each unit | Based on achievement goals, teacher plans units by:  
- Identifying content standards that students will master in each unit  
- Creating assessments before each unit begins for backwards planning  
- Allocating an instructionally appropriate amount of time for each unit | Based on achievement goals, teacher plans units by:  
- Identifying content standards that students will master in each unit  
- Create assessments before each unit begins for backwards planning  
- Allocate an instructionally appropriate amount of time for each unit | Teacher rarely or never plans units by identifying content standards that students will master in each unit OR there is little to no evidence that teacher plans units at all. |
| 1.4 Create Objective-Driven Lesson Plans and Assessments | At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:  
- Plans for a variety of differentiated instructional strategies, anticipating where these will be needed to enhance instruction  
- Incorporates a variety of informal assessments/checks for understanding as well as summative assessments where necessary and uses all assessments to directly inform instruction | Based on unit plan, teacher plans daily lessons by:  
- Identifying lesson objectives that are aligned to state content standards  
- Matching instructional strategies as well as meaningful and relevant activities/assignments to the lesson objectives  
- Designing formative assessments that measure progress towards mastery and inform instruction | Based on unit plan, teacher plans daily lessons by:  
- Identifying lesson objectives that are aligned to state content standards  
- Matching instructional strategies and activities/assignments to the lesson objectives  
- Plan formative assessments to measure progress towards mastery or inform instruction | Teacher rarely or never plans daily lessons OR daily lessons are planned, but are thrown together at the last minute, thus lacking meaningful objectives, instructional strategies, or assignments. |
Statewide K-12 Testing

- Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Process (ISTEP+)
- Test administered each spring
- English/Language Arts (grades 3-8)
- Mathematics (grades 3-8)
- Science (grades 4 and 6)
- Social Studies (grades 5 and 7)
- End of Course Assessments (ECAs) for Algebra I and English/Language Arts
Student Growth Model

- Tracks the growth of individual students over time
- Tracks the growth of a school/school corporation’s growth over time
- Possible for IDOE to track the growth of an educator’s students over time
Sample of Growth Model Data
Our Wish List

• Statewide data system issues a teacher identification number to each licensed educator that would allow the institution to view confidential data on candidates

• Specific data for teacher education candidates who complete IMAP, Statewide Teacher Evaluation System, and Growth Model needs to be made available to and linked to higher education institutions

• If DOE could release this data to higher education institutions, it would allow for powerful continuous improvement

• Data availability would have major implications for program revisions and professional development opportunities
Links to Resources

LAMP
http://portfolio.iweb.bsu.edu/resources/studentteaching/LAMP.html

Indiana Student Growth Model
https://learningconnection.doe.in.gov/GrowthModel/ModelFAQs.aspx

Indiana Statewide Teacher Evaluation System

Indiana Mentoring & Assessment Program
http://www.doe.in.gov/educatorlicensing/pdf/IMAP_Year_2_Teacher.pdf