

Tracking the Use of Data for Improvement: Unit (Initial level)

Unit: Unit use of data for Admissions Decisions at Transition Points
Primary Data Set(s): Final Student Teaching Evaluations; UAS Studies

The unit's 2005-2006 review of final student teaching evaluations indicated that pre-service candidates' ability to differentiate instruction and to plan for effective assessment of learning remained relatively weak compared to other skills.

*Excerpt from Assessment Report to Unit—"2004-2005 Student Teaching Final Report": The fourth tier of scores clustered around the differentiation criteria (B-2 Plans Address the Unique Characteristics of Individual Students, B-3 Formulates Clear **[Differentiated]** Learning Outcomes that Are Appropriate for Students, C-7 Provides Appropriate **Accommodations for Diverse Learners**) and the **Assessment criteria** (C-9 Checks for Understanding Using a Variety of Formal or Informal Assessment Techniques, D-1 Provides Evidence to document Student Learning, and B-5 Plans for Assessment of Learning Outcomes).*

*SUMMARY: The data consistently reveal high performance scores for the EMU Pre-service teachers, indicating that achievement of the teacher training outcomes is likely effective, producing the quality of teacher that the university and the K-12 school personnel are hoping to see. The scores range between a 2.6 and 3.0. The data do consistently show patterns of the highest strength in the Professionalism domain and **the weakest scores in the Assessment Domain**. In fact, the lowest mean from all four rater groups is a 2.6 for criteria B5 Plans Assessment of Learning Outcomes.*

At about the same time, the department/unit noted a simultaneous concern regarding the need to simplify the original Unit Assessment System and to re-evaluate the UAS with the newly adopted 2008 NCATE standards. A study of the UAS (Phases I, II, and III) was conducted over the next several years as data on the Final Student Teaching instruments continued to be monitored. The final phase of the UAS Study resulted in the creation of a new assessment instrument, the *Unit/Lesson Plan instrument*, an instrument designed to measure pre-service candidate skills in lesson planning, with a particular emphasis on assessment and differentiation, two areas targeted by the prior reviews of student performance. This instrument was adopted as an assessment of candidate performance to serve as a pre-requisite for the transition point of admission to Student Teaching. Excerpts from the UAS Study report states:

Phase III: In February 2009 the recommendations were made to COTE for approval, resulting in much discussion.

Action III: to adopt the Profile of Performance and the **Unit/Lesson plans** as UAS instruments that measure our candidates' performance at the point of Admission to student teaching; implementation details to be defined by the education department and assessment committee. BFast/MSprunger

Following the 2009 decision to create the Unit/Lesson Plans Instrument (temporarily noted as STAR or the UAS instrument 5b because of its location in the queue on the UAS Refinement Plan), a task force was formed to create an instrument that would measure pre-service candidates' ability to plan effective instruction, with a particular emphasis on differentiation and assessment as previous data sets had indicated a need for. (Further detail is provided in Attachment A—scroll down to page 3—for a sample of the taskforce work that was aligned with NCATE standards for assessment design, feedback loop at transition points, fairness, etc.)

The unit examined the utility of the instrument through two pilot studies in Spring 2010 and Fall 2010 to determine whether this instrument would create an unintentional bias—preventing students from admission who otherwise had stellar performance. No such bias was identified. Thus in the Fall 2011, the unit began implementation of the new assessment tool (Full details are provided on page in Attachment B—scroll ahead to page 11). The Unit/Lesson Plans instrument is used in all endorsement area programs at two points in program so as to give students *opportunity for growth*. Data are collected and used by the Teacher Education Admissions Committee as one of multiple measures of *candidate performance* for *decision-making* at the transition point of Admission to Student Teaching. Students are given *fair notice* in each course syllabus of the instrument's use in decision-making; *fair notice* is also given in the Teacher Education Handbook's checklist for program completion, which is reviewed at each advising session.

Reporting form for Teacher Education Admissions Committee decision-making.

Candidate	Lesson Outcome/ Objectives		Aligned Assessment		Differentiation		Planning for Instruction	
	L. 1	L. 2	L. 1	L. 2	L. 1	L. 2	L. 1	L. 2

Score of 3, 2, or 1 is recorded from each course rubric.

Minimum Required: 2 in every category.

Location of lessons: 2 courses in every program to allow for multiple assessment. Higher score will be used for Adm S.T.

ATTACHMENT A: Taskforce work on Unit/Lesson Plan Instrument

Tentative Plan for UAS Instrument 5b: Lesson/Unit Plan

Note: this instrument was originally called STAR but was later re-named as Unit/Lesson Plan instrument.

- I. BACKGROUND DISCUSSION (Nov 18/Dec 7, 2009) by TASK FORCE:
 - A. Unit: for PE majors, the unit could be done in the Health course, HE 401.
 - B. Unit: CSE shared that the grading of the unit may not be do-able in the secondary and K-12 courses such as PE, so maybe we shouldn't put it in the gate system for Adm to ST.
 - C. LHL: the question then that we need to go back to is whether or not it is something we value enough to measure, and then we find the resources to support it to make it happen. So the first question is: do we believe (according to standards such as NCATE/VDOE, professional responsibility as educators, etc.) that the unit needs to be measured. The 2nd question is then "how" we make it happen, rather than the reverse of the questions.
 - D. **RECOMMENDATION TO DEPARTMENT:** The Unit Plan will not be added to the requirements for Admission to Student Teaching; the Unit Plan will be re-considered as an instrument in Fall 2011. In the meantime, the model of "mastery" of the unit assignment that is currently conducted in some of our methods courses will be implemented in all programs if it does not currently exist, to ensure that we are training our candidates to plan units with opportunity for feedback. **We recommend that the drafted "unit planning" language/criteria from the recently proposed Unit Rubric be folded into the DOSL.** (see revised DOSL instructions and rubric at end of this doc)
- II. SUGGESTED PLAN
 - A. Course Choice: Two courses were selected for the lesson plan to create multiple assessments by multiple reviewers in order to meet the fairness standard of NCATE Standard 2. Only one course was selected for the unit plan because we do not offer multiple opportunities for this assignment in every program; developmentally, this skill is further developed in student teaching. In addition, the 5 day unit was chosen for each program; some programs have 2 units but not necessarily covering a 5 day plan.
 - B. Rubric:
 - a. Rating Scale: We selected *competent, emerging, and not met* to reflect the developmental stage of the candidate.
 - b. Criteria: We reviewed all of the course rubrics and all of the courses and pulled out the essential commonalities. Criteria were listed with a single word or short phrase to allow for interpretation in each program area. Each program will link the rubric criteria from the individual course assignments to the Adm to ST lesson rubric criteria.
 - C. Proposed scoring cut-off: Lesson Plan
 - a. Students are given opportunity within courses to master the criteria.

- b. The recommended cut-off for piloting the Adm to ST rubric is a score of 2+ for every criterion.
 - c. The highest score on each criterion of the two lesson plans will be the data used for the admission decision. This will meet the fairness standard of NCATE standard 2.
- D. Proposed scoring cut-off: Unit Plan
- a. The recommended cut-off for piloting the Adm to ST rubric is a score of 2+ for every criterion.

Suggested courses:

Course Code	Lesson Plan
ED 331 Math	x
ED 333 SS	x
ED 351 General	x
ED 371 Bio	x
ED 372 Chem	x
ED 373 Eng	x
ED 374 Hist	x
ED 375 Math	x
PE 402 PE	x
ART 398 Sec Art	x
MUED 342 Mus Sec	x
LING450 TESL Meth	x
THR Sp Methods	x
EDS 331 Indiv Instr	x
EDS 332 Adapting	x

- E. Revisions needed for Admission to Student Teaching Procedures:
1. Fair Notification: Students will be notified via the Teacher Education Handbook (starting with Summer 2011 version) and via email that the lesson plan and unit plan will be a component of the Admission to ST decision.
 2. Fair Notification: Each course syllabus will carry a statement notifying the student which course assignments carry designation for admission to ST decisions.
 3. Fair Notification: the Admission to ST packet will reference the instructions for completing the lesson plan/unit task for admission to ST. The STAR (Student Teaching Admission Rubric for a Lesson) will be located in the course syllabi, along with the rubric used by the professor for the actual course assignment.
 4. If students apply for A to ST in fall of senior year, then the criteria for the lesson will be reviewed in December prior to the Spring student teaching, just as the GPA and grade for Lit Block (C or better) is reviewed at that time. Courses that contain these assignments must be graded prior to December 1.
 5. Course faculty, including adjuncts, will be trained in the use of the STAR Faculty will be notified of the required dates for grading these assignments (end of Spring courses or by Dec 1 of Fall courses).
 6. Reporting procedures-TBD.

F. Collection and Use of Data:

1. Collection of Data: Faculty will complete the STAR electronically in a spreadsheet and email the data to the Administrative Assistant who will copy the data into the master Adm to ST spreadsheet. (input from Sara as Adm Asst is needed)
2. Use of data: At the TEAC meeting, the Adm Asst will report the highest scores in the spreadsheet of data that is already in use for TEAC decision-making.

G. To Be Determined:

1. Decision: when is the checklist for A to ST given to students? Which one are they held accountable for—the one in the Hbook given in Exp Teaching? Or the one on the cover of the Application for ST (add a checklist to the application)?

Implementation Plan For Lesson Rubric:

May 2010 Pilot:

- SPRING 2010: collection of the data as pilot data will begin in Spring 2010 with the notification of this pilot in the Curriculum and SPED blocks and in the Fall 2010 with the secondary blocks. Students will be notified that admission decisions will be made prior to the review of any pilot data.
- DECEMBER 2010: the data will be piloted at the December 2010 TEAC meeting for evaluating the effectiveness of the instrument and whether there are any unintended effects. Admission decisions will be made by TEAC without viewing the pilot data (data will not be on the spreadsheet that TEAC reviews in December). Immediately following the decisions for admission, at the same DEC 2010 meeting, the TEAC will review the pilot data to see how the STAR data would have affected the admissions decisions.
- Iterative revision of the STAR will be made in December 2010/ January 2011.
- Implementation of the STAR rubric will begin in F 2011/S 2012, affecting the May 2012 Admission to ST decisions (for those Student teaching beginning Fall 2012).

STAR Rubric for Admission to Student Teaching

Candidate	Lesson Outcome/ Objectives		Aligned Assessment		Differentiation		Planning for Instruction	
	L. 1	L. 2	L. 1	L. 2	L. 1	L. 2	L. 1	L. 2

Score of 3, 2, or 1 is recorded from each course rubric.

Minimum Required: 2 in every category.

Location of lessons: 2 courses in every program to allow for multiple assessment. Higher score will be used for Adm S.T.

Implementation Plan for the Unit Plan criteria, embedded into the DOSL rubric:

- Pilot the revised DOSL rubric (with unit plan criteria added to it) in ED 411 in Fall 2010 (these new criteria will *not* keep a student from passing ED 411 that fall). Determine whether the new criteria would have kept someone from passing the DOSL assignment. If so, we need to figure out how to teach these skills earlier in program, or we need to clarify the rubric wording.
- January 2011: Department will review the pilot data
- Spring 2011: Department will revise the rubric as needed, based on pilot data.
- FALL 2011: Implementation of the new DOSL rubric with unit criteria.

Faculty Guidelines for Use of the Student Teaching Admission Rubric-Lesson (STAR)

Courses that will use the STAR (field lesson when possible):

ED 331 Math in the Elementary School
ED 333 Social Studies in the Elementary School
EDS 331 Individualized Instruction in the Content Area
EDS 332 Adapting Curriculum for LD, ED & MR
ED 351 General Curriculum & Methods for MS & Secondary Teaching
ED 371-375 Special Methods for Middle & Secondary Teaching
PE 402 Middle & Secondary Physical Education
ART 398 Secondary School Art Methods
MUED 342 Secondary School Music
LING 450 Methods of Language Teaching (TESL)
THR 371 Secondary Theater Methods

Procedures for STAR Data Collection:

1. Candidates will develop a formal lesson plan and faculty will assess it using their individual course rubric for this assignment. (Note: This step is already taking place in each of the courses listed above).
2. Faculty will make an electronic copy of each candidate's lesson plan rubric. (Note: the easiest way to do this is to use the "scan-to-me" feature on the copier) and place the e-copies on Educat/Dept/UAS/Data and Reports/Course Rubric Data/(course code) in a folder for each course.
3. From the course lesson plan rubric, faculty will complete the four criteria on the STAR spreadsheet, recording data as a 2 or a 3. Since we are assuming the Mastery approach in the development of the lesson plan, candidates must have a minimum of a 2 in each category on the STAR.
4. Faculty will submit the electronic STAR spreadsheet to the administrative assistant who will record the highest of the 2 scores in the student database.
5. Recording and submission of the STAR data must be accomplished by December 1 for Fall semester courses for the December TEAC meeting and May 1 for Spring semester courses for the May TEAC meeting.

Documentation of Student Learning from the First Student Teaching Placement

Select at least five consecutive lessons from one block or content area (the same class of students) and from a single unit of instruction in which you will document student learning.

(see Rubric on pages 9 and 10)

Each section should be a single document/link titled:

1. Introduction
2. Lesson Plans
3. Examples of Student Work
4. Documentation of Student Learning
5. Reflection

1. Introduction

- Description of the students and school (use pseudonyms): number in the class, age, cultural profile, academic profile, and a brief description of the school. See <http://www.schoolmatters.com/> for information about your school.
- Learning environment: describe the room set up, length of class, and available resources
- Prior knowledge: task analysis, description of how you determined their prior knowledge
- Provide rationale for the unit and unit outcomes for the total learning experience that relate directly to your assessment of student learning
- Describe your plan for support/differentiation of instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of your students

2. Lesson Plans

- Submit at least five consecutive, coherent and connected lesson plans from one block or content area (the same group of students) and from a single unit of instruction
- Align outcomes for each lesson to Virginia SOLs/IEPs
- In each lesson clearly identify your plan to support/differentiate instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of ALL students
- In each lesson clearly identify assessment strategies outlined with the outcomes, including at least one rubric and a culminating assessment.

3. Examples of Student Work

- Provide examples of high, middle, and low achieving student work to support your claim of student learning. Specify the achievement level for each example.

4. Documentation of student learning

- Describe how you know that your students achieved the learning outcomes of the lessons
- Using the examples of student work, explain how many students achieved the outcomes. For those who did not, why not?

5. Reflection of your impact on student learning

- How did you as the teacher enhance the learning of each of your students?
- What changes did you make throughout to adapt your instruction to meet different learning styles and levels of ability?
- What would I do differently to improve student learning the next time I teach this unit or content?

Documentation of Student Learning Rubric

Requirements	Exemplary 3	Competent 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
<i>Introduction</i>			
Description of the students and school	Explicit description of the number of students, age, cultural profile, academic profile, and thorough description of the school	Complete description of the number of students, age, cultural profile, academic profile, and brief description of the school	Incomplete or missing description of the number of students, age, cultural profile, academic profile, and brief description of the school
Learning environment	Explicit description the room set up, length of class, and available resources	Complete description of the room set up, length of class, and available resources	Incomplete or missing description of the room set up, length of class, and available resources
Prior knowledge/ task analysis	Precise and complete description of how you determined the prior knowledge of your students	Complete description of how you determined the prior knowledge of your students	Incomplete or missing description of how you determined the prior knowledge of your students
Unit outcomes	Rationale and unit outcomes relate directly and specifically to the assessment of student learning throughout all of the lessons	Rationale and unit outcomes relate to the assessment of student learning throughout all of the lessons	Rationale and unit outcomes relate somewhat to the assessment of student learning throughout some of the lessons
Differentiation of Instruction	Explicit description of the plan for support/differentiation of instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of all students	Complete description of the plan for support/differentiation of instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of all students	Incomplete or missing description of the plan for support/differentiation of instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of all students
<i>Lesson plans</i>			
Five consecutive lesson plans from one block or content area	Five or more consecutive, coherent and connected lesson plans from one block or content area (the same group of students) and from a single unit of instruction	Five consecutive, coherent and connected lesson plans from one block or content area (the same group of students) and from a single unit of instruction	Less than five consecutive lesson plans from one block or content area (the same group of students) or from a single unit of instruction lack coherence and connection within the unit
Align outcomes for each lesson to an SOL/IEPs	Outcomes for each lesson are aligned to Virginia SOL/IEPs		Outcomes for some of the lessons are aligned to Virginia SOL/IEPs
Each lesson clearly identifies your plan to support/differentiate instruction	Each lesson includes a clear & complete description of the plan for support/differentiation of instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of ALL students	Each lesson includes a description of the plan for support/differentiation of instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of ALL students	One or more lessons does not include a description of the plan for support/differentiation of instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of your students
Assessment Strategies	Each lesson clearly identifies the assessment strategies that are aligned with the outcomes and instruction of the lesson; includes a culminating assessment	Each lesson identifies the assessment strategies that are aligned with the outcomes and instruction of the lesson; includes a culminating assessment	One or more of the lessons does not include assessment strategies or a culminating assessment, may not be aligned with the outcomes and/or instruction

Documentation of student learning			
Student Achievement of the Learning Outcomes	Complete and accurate description of documenting how students achieved the learning outcomes of the lessons	A description documenting how students achieved the learning outcomes of the lessons	A description documenting how students achieved the learning outcomes of the lessons is missing or incomplete
Examples of Student Work	Several examples of high, middle, and low achieving student work are provided to support your claim of student learning; the achievement level for each example is clearly identified	One example of high, middle, and low achieving student work is provided to support your claim of student learning; the achievement level for each example is clearly identified	Examples of high, middle, and low achieving student work do not support your claim of student learning, or are missing, and/or the achievement level for each example is not indicated
Number and explanation of students achieving the outcomes	Clearly indicates number of students achieving/not achieving the outcomes; detailed explanation of why students did or did not achieve outcomes	Indicates number of students achieving/not achieving the outcomes; explanation of why students did or did not achieve outcomes	Number of students achieving/not achieving the outcomes is incomplete or missing; incomplete explanation of why students did or did not achieve outcomes
Reflection of your impact on student learning			
Enhancement of Student Learning	Answer indicates an understanding of differentiated instruction and the diverse needs of learners; clearly articulates how you as the teacher enhanced the learning of each student	Answer indicates an understanding of differentiated instruction and the diverse needs of learners; provides evidence of how you as the teacher enhanced the learning of each student	Answer lacks or does not indicate an understanding of differentiated instruction, the diverse needs of learners, and/or does not provide evidence of how you as the teacher enhanced the learning of each student
Changes Made Throughout	Several examples of significant changes made throughout to adapt instruction to meet different learning styles and levels of ability	One example of a significant change made throughout to adapt instruction to meet different learning styles and levels of ability	Examples of a significant change made throughout to adapt instruction to meet different learning styles and/or levels of ability are missing
Changes I Would Make the Next Time	Examples of what you would do differently the next time the unit or content is taught clearly demonstrates how to improve student learning	Examples of what you would do differently the next time the unit or content is taught demonstrates how to improve student learning	Examples of what you would do differently the next time the unit or content is taught does not demonstrate how to improve student learning, or is missing
Total /45 30+ pts, No score below 2			

ATTACHMENT B: Unit/Lesson Plan Instrument
Procedures for
Lesson Plan Evaluation for Admission to Student Teaching

Description: The *Lesson Plan Evaluation for Admission to Student Teaching* is a measure of the pre-service candidate's demonstration of lesson planning in field experiences. The instrument also reflects the Education Department's emphasis on the candidate's ability to demonstrate the professional knowledge necessary for entry into the student teaching experience. The *Lesson Plan Evaluation* is administered in two sequential methods courses to allow for multiple reviewers and for candidate opportunity to demonstrate growth over time.

Courses using the Lesson Plan Evaluation (When possible the lesson plan used will be the field lesson plan):

- ED 331 Math in the Elementary School
- ED 333 Social Studies in the Elementary School
- EDS 331 Individualized Instruction in the Content Area
- EDS 332 Adapting Curriculum for LD, ED & MR
- ED 351 General Curriculum & Methods for Middle & Secondary Teaching
- ED 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, & 376 Special Methods for Middle & Secondary Teaching
- PE 402 Middle & Secondary Physical Education
- ART 398 Secondary School Art Methods
- MUED 342 Secondary School Music
- LING 450 Methods of Language Teaching (TESL)
- THR 371 Secondary Theater Methods

The *Lesson Plan Evaluation* standardizes the measure of 4 aspects of lesson planning over the unit's programs: lesson outcome/objectives, aligned assessment, planning for instruction, and differentiation. The *Lesson Plan Evaluation* is used for decision-making for admission to Student Teaching.

Scoring:

Candidates must achieve a score of at least 2.0 on each criterion at least once out of the two lesson plan evaluations completed throughout their program.

A score of less than 2.0 will result in the development of a *Student Growth Plan* to ensure that the pre-service candidate is given opportunity and support for professional growth. The EMU course instructor is responsible for developing the *Student Growth Plan*. In exceptional circumstances (eg. the course instructor is not a department faculty member), the Department Chair may complete the *Student Growth Plan* or appoint the faculty advisor or other department faculty member to do so.

Implementation and Fair Notice:

Data collection officially begins fall 2011. As of 2011-12, the lesson plan evaluation requirement for admission to student teaching will be stated in the teacher education handbook, in course syllabi (for courses using the lesson plan evaluation), in the application for student teaching, and in all parallel documents.

The Lesson Plan Evaluation will be used for admission to student teaching decisions beginning May 2012. To ensure fair practice and opportunity for the candidate, the Lesson Plan Evaluation data will only be used for student teaching decision making if at least two sets of data have been collected by the time the candidate is ready to be admitted to student teaching. By fall 2012 all candidates applying for admission to student teaching should have data from two courses to be used for admission decisions.

Procedures:

1. In August or December:
 - a. A procedures document for using the Lesson Plan Evaluation is distributed to course instructors via email (see attached course instructors document).
 - b. Course instructors place a copy of the lesson plan rubric in the syllabus along with the following fair notice statement:

Statement for 2011-12: *"The lesson plan criteria which includes Lesson Outcome/Objectives, Aligned Assessment, Planning for Instruction, and Differentiation will be used for admission to student teaching decisions beginning fall 2012."*

Statement for 2012-13 and beyond: *"The lesson plan evaluation will be used for admission to student teaching decisions. A minimum score of 2.0 is required on four criteria (Lesson Outcome/Objectives, Aligned Assessment, Planning for Instruction, and Differentiation) at least once out of the two lesson plan evaluations that have been selected for review for admission to student teaching. If you score less than 2.0 on any of the criteria, you will be given opportunity to outline a plan for growth in the identified area through the creation of a Student Growth Plan. See the Entrance Requirements to Student Teaching in the Teacher Education Handbook for more information."*

2. Early in the semester, course instructors review the lesson plan rubric with the candidates and highlight the selected rows from the rubric that are used for admission to student teaching decisions.
3. In mid November and mid March:
 - a. The administrative assistant distributes the lesson plan data spreadsheet and procedural instructions to course instructors.
 - b. Course instructors record data on the lesson plan data spreadsheets (see pg. 2 of attached course instructors document) and submit the spreadsheets to the administrative assistant who will record the candidate's scores in EX. Submission of data must be completed by December 1 for fall semester courses and May 1 for spring semester courses.

(CONTINUED on next page)

Lesson Plan Evaluation Procedures for Course Instructors

The *Lesson Plan Evaluation for Admission to Student Teaching* is a measure of the pre-service candidate's demonstration of lesson planning and the professional knowledge necessary for entry into the student teaching experience. The *Lesson Plan Evaluation* is administered in two sequential methods courses to allow for multiple reviewers and for candidate opportunity to demonstrate growth over time. When possible the lesson plan used will be the field lesson plan.

Courses in which the Lesson Plan Evaluation is used for admission decisions:

Fall

ED 351 General Curriculum & Methods for Middle & Secondary Teaching
ED 371, 372, 373, 374, 375 & 376 Special Methods for Middle & Secondary Teaching
ART 398 Secondary School Art Methods
LING 450 Methods of Language Teaching (TESL)
MUED 342 Secondary School Music
PE 402 Middle & Secondary Physical Education
THR 371 Secondary Theater Methods

Spring

ED 331 Math in the Elementary School
ED 333 Social Studies in the Elementary School
EDS 331 Individualized Instruction in the Content Area
EDS 332 Adapting Curriculum for LD, ED & MR

Directions for Course Instructors

1. In your syllabus, include a copy of the Lesson Plan Evaluation and the following fair notice statement:
"The lesson plan evaluation will be used for admission to student teaching decisions. A minimum score of 2.0 is required on four criteria (Lesson Outcome/ Objectives, Aligned Assessment, Planning for Instruction, and Differentiation) at least once out of the two lesson plan evaluations that have been selected for review for admission to student teaching. If you score less than 2.0 on any of the criteria, you will be given opportunity to outline a plan for growth in the identified area through the creation of a Student Growth Plan. See the Entrance Requirements to Student Teaching in the Teacher Education Handbook for more information."
2. Review the Lesson Plan Evaluation with the candidates. Explain how the evaluation will be used for admission decisions. Candidates must demonstrate mastery learning until a score of at least a 2.0 on each criterion is achieved.
3. A spreadsheet template will be sent by email to you near the end of the semester for you to record the Practicum Evaluation scores for each student. Please complete the template and return to the education department administrative assistant ***no later than*** December 1 in the fall, and May 1 in the spring.

Lesson Plan Data Spreadsheet Template

Lesson Plan Data for Admission to Student Teaching

Course: *(ex. ED101 Exploring Teaching)*

Semester & Year: *(ex. Fall 2011)*

Instructions: Score of 3, 2, or 1 is recorded per category from each course rubric.

Minimum required for admission to student teaching: 2 in every category

Candidate	Lesson Outcome/Objectives	Aligned Assessment	Differentiation	Planning for Instruction