

# Slippery Rock University Student Teaching Student Learning Objective (SLO) Project

*Adapted from the "Pennsylvania Teacher Candidate Effectiveness Assessment," created by a PAC-TE subcommittee*

## Introduction:

Teacher candidates in all programs at Slippery Rock University will complete a Student Learning Objective (SLO) project during student teaching. This process and project has been designed to provide evidence of the effectiveness of the teacher candidates' teaching, to provide teacher candidates with the opportunity to apply their knowledge of the Danielson Domains through their reflection on their teaching, and to provide teacher candidates with an experience similar to what they may complete as part of their future teacher evaluation.

## Objective(s):

*Through the completion of the Student Learning Objective Project, the teacher candidate will:*

- Analyze student data and content standards to identify an area of growth for a target population of students.
- Develop pre- and post-assessments that can be used to determine student growth.
- Develop an instructional plan that reflects best practices in a specific teaching discipline.
- Implement an instructional plan and adapt instruction to the target population of students in the unique qualities of the environment in which they are learning.
- Analyze pre- and post-assessments to determine academic growth.
- Reflect on a cycle of planning, teaching, assessing and analyzing using Charlotte Danielson's *Domains for Teaching*.
- Reflect on the ability to use technology, when appropriate, throughout the cycle of planning, teaching and assessing and analyzing.

**Target Date(s): To be completed during the student teaching semester.**

## Student Learning Objective (SLO):

The SLO Project is to be completed in three stages. As such, feedback can be provided to the teacher candidate by the cooperating teacher and university supervisor at key stages during the process. The tasks associated with each Stage are outlined below:

### Student Learning Objective Implementation Stages

SLO Stage	Task
<b>Stage 1</b>	Analysis of Student Performance Data Identification of Instructional Needs Identification of Target Population Establishment of Achievement Goal
<b>Stage 2</b>	Development of Pre and Post-Assessment Development of Instructional Plan
<b>Stage 3</b>	Administration of Pre-Assessment Implementation of Instructional Plan Administration of Post-Assessment Analysis of Academic Growth Reflection

Although delivered in stages, the SLO process should be considered cyclical. The SLO process begins

and ends with a review of student performance data. The cyclical nature of the SLO process is illustrated by the following. A description of each task and performance rubrics are included on the following pages.

### Student Learning Objective Implementation Cycle



#### Analysis of Student Performance Data:

The SLO process begins and ends with the analysis of student performance data. In consultation with a cooperating teacher, the teacher candidate will analyze several forms of standards-aligned student performance data to determine the instructional needs of a targeted population of students. Assessments, such as benchmark assessments, diagnostic assessments, or standards-aligned classroom assessments, can all be analyzed to attain student performance data. In all cases, teacher candidates should analyze multiple forms of student performance data to determine the instructional needs of a targeted group of students.

#### Identification of Instructional Needs:

The identification of instructional needs for a target group of students should emerge through the analysis of student performance data. For the purpose of this assessment, the teacher candidate should confine the identification of instructional needs to one academic standard. The teacher candidate should make this decision in consultation with the cooperating teacher and university supervisor. Academic standards can come from PA Standards ([www.pdesas.org/standard/views](http://www.pdesas.org/standard/views)) or other content-specific standards common in the discipline, such as those commonly found in the individual specialized professional associations that are connected to specific fields of teaching.

#### Identification of Target Population:

In consultation with the cooperating teacher and university supervisor, the teacher candidate must identify the student population targeted for instruction. A rationale for selecting the target population should be provided and should contain information that aligns with the review of student performance data and the identification of instructional needs. The teacher candidate must also provide background information for the target population.

#### Establishment of Achievement Goal:

In consultation with the cooperating teacher and university supervisor, the teacher candidate must set an achievement goal. The achievement goal should indicate the intended academic growth for the target population in the academic standard selected and should be reasonable for the target population selected.

#### Development of Pre- and Post-Test:

In consultation with the cooperating teacher and university supervisor, the teacher candidate must develop a pre- and post-assessment that is designed to produce baseline performance and identify academic growth accordingly. The pre and post-assessment must be directly aligned to the content standard it is intended to assess.

#### Development of Instructional Plan:

An instructional plan, consisting of a series of lessons that contain a clear beginning and ending date, must be developed in consultation with the cooperating teacher and university supervisor. The instructional plan must address the instructional needs (i.e. content standard) for the target population selected for the SLO. Research-based instructional methodology, best practices, and the instructional components should be used to define the quality of the teacher candidate's instructional plan. Evidence should be used to validate one's assessment.

#### Delivery of Pre-Assessment and Instructional Plan:

Under the supervision of the cooperating teacher and (when appropriate) the university supervisor, the teacher candidate must administer the pre-assessment and deliver the instructional plan to the target population. The teacher candidate must analyze the results of the pre-assessment to establish baseline performance for the SLO. The teacher candidate must then deliver the instructional plan, administering the research-based instructional methodology, best practices, and Danielson components identified in their plan through a series of lessons. Throughout the delivery of the instructional plan, time should be set aside to provide the teacher candidate feedback and time for reflection.

#### Delivery of the Post-Assessment and Analysis of Academic Growth:

Once the instructional plan has been delivered to the target population, the teacher candidate must administer the post-assessment. The post assessment results should be compared to the baseline results to calculate the academic growth of the target population. Once again, this task should be completed in consultation with the cooperating teacher and (when appropriate) the university supervisor. The academic growth of the target population should be compared to the Achievement Goal set earlier in the SLO process.

#### Reflection:

An in-depth, written reflection must be completed by the teacher candidate and submitted to both the cooperating teacher

and university supervisor. Time should be reserved by the cooperating teacher and university supervisor to review the teacher candidate's reflections with them. The reflection should include:

- a rationale for the academic standard selected that is grounded in the analysis of student performance data.
- a complete description of the population targeted in the SLO Project along with a rationale for their selection.
- identification of the academic growth of all members of the target population using the pre- and post-assessment results.
- identification of the Instructional Goal set for the SLO Project, rationale for the selection of the goal, and an analysis of the success of the goal.
- a description of the academic plan and a rationale for the instructional methodology selected.
- any mitigating factors that may have adversely affected the implementation of the instructional plan and how the plan could be improved in the future.

#### Student Learning Objective Rubric:

As noted above, the SLO Project is designed to be completed in three stages. As such, feedback can be provided for the teacher candidate by the cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor at key stages along the process. The SLO rubric is scored using a three-point scale in the following categories: Unsatisfactory, Basic, and Proficient. A category of Distinguished is contained in the SLO rubric; however, this category is only included to illustrate performance expectations for practicing teachers. Expecting teacher candidates to achieve this category is unreasonable.

<b>Student Learning Objective (SLO) Process Rubric</b>				
<b>Formative Assessment Stage #1 #2 #3</b>				
<b>Classroom Context</b>				
<b>Name</b>		<b>School</b>		<b>District</b>
<b>Class/ Course Title</b>		<b>Grade Level</b>		<b>Total Number of Students</b>
<b>Typical Class Size</b>		<b>Class Frequency</b>		<b>Class Duration</b>
<b>Analysis of Student Performance Data (Stage 1)</b>				
Unsatisfactory (0)	Basic (1)	Proficient (2)	Distinguished	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of student performance data for analysis was unclear or non-existent.</li> <li>- Performance data was not linked to any specific standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least one form of student performance data was analyzed.</li> <li>- Performance data was loosely connected to a specific standard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multiple forms of student performance data were analyzed.</li> <li>- Performance data directly connected to a specific standard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multiple forms of student performance data were analyzed.</li> <li>- Performance data was directly connected to an Academic Standard(s), Assessment Anchor(s) and district curriculum.</li> </ul>	
<b>Identification of Instructional Need &amp; Identification of Target Population (Stage 1)</b>				
Unsatisfactory (0)	Basic (1)	Proficient (2)	Distinguished	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification of instructional need was unclear in connection to performance measures.</li> <li>- No rationale existed for selecting the target population.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification of instructional need was loosely connected to performance measures.</li> <li>- Background information related to the target population was reviewed; however, the rationale for selecting the target population was unclear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification of instructional need was directly connected to performance measures.</li> <li>- Background information related to the target population was reviewed and the rationale for selecting the target population was clear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification of instructional need was directly connected to the analysis of multiple forms of student performance data and collaboration with one's peers.</li> <li>- A direct connection between student performance data, Academic Standard, Assessment Anchor and its Eligible Content existed. Background information was researched for the subgroup of students selected and a rationale for the target population of students was clear.</li> </ul>	
<b>Achievement Goal (Stage 1)</b>				
Unsatisfactory (0)	Basic (1)	Proficient (2)	Distinguished	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Achievement Goal was not connected to the identified instructional need or performance measures.</li> <li>- The achievement goal was unreasonable for the target population.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Achievement Goal was loosely connected to the identified instructional need and/or performance measures.</li> <li>- The Achievement Goal was somewhat reasonable for the target population.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Achievement Goal was directly connected to the identified instructional need and/or performance measures.</li> <li>- The Achievement goal was reasonable for the target population.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Achievement Goal was directly connected to the identified instructional need(s), Academic Standard(s), Assessment Anchor and its eligible content.</li> <li>- The Achievement goal took into consideration needs specific to the target population (e.g. process monitoring, specially designed instruction, etc.).</li> <li>- The Achievement goal was highly appropriate for the target population.</li> </ul>	

<b>Development of Pre and Post-Assessment (Stage 2)</b>			
Unsatisfactory (0)	Basic (1)	Proficient (2)	Distinguished
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre and post-assessments not aligned to the instructional standard identified for analysis.</li> <li>- Pre and post-assessments were not appropriate for the target population.</li> <li>- Pre and post-assessments were not designed to elicit measurable data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre and post assessments were somewhat aligned to the instructional standard identified for analysis.</li> <li>- Pre and post-assessments were somewhat appropriate for the target population.</li> <li>- Pre and post-assessments are designed to attain measurable data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre and post-assessments fully aligned to the instructional standard identified for analysis.</li> <li>- Pre and post-assessments were appropriate for the target population.</li> <li>- Pre and post-assessments are designed to attain measurable data related to the intended learning objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre and post-assessments directly aligned to the content standard(s) identified for the target population.</li> <li>- Pre- and post-assessments were carefully designed for the target population and meaningful data can be generated to inform future instructional decisions using the pre and post-assessments.</li> </ul>
<b>Development of Instructional Plan (Stage 2)</b>			
Unsatisfactory (0)	Basic (1)	Proficient (2)	Distinguished
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of content specific rubric created to be consistent with standards and best practices advocated by the Specialized Professional Association associated with the teacher candidate's area(s) of specialization.</li> </ul> <p><b>This area differs per department and/or program.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of content specific rubric created to be consistent with standards and best practices advocated by the Specialized Professional Association associated with the teacher candidate's area(s) of specialization.</li> </ul> <p><b>This area differs per department and/or program.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of content specific rubric created to be consistent with standards and best practices advocated by the Specialized Professional Association associated with the teacher candidate's area(s) of specialization.</li> </ul> <p><b>This area differs per department and/or program.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Instructional plan consisted of a complete unit that contained a clear beginning and ending date. Instructional outcome was clearly identified and directly connected to the identified instructional need(s), Academic Standard(s), Assessment Anchor(s) and Eligible Content.</li> <li>- Instructional plan was based on research- based instructional methodology.</li> <li>- A sound rationale for the selection of the instructional methodology selected was included.</li> <li>- The instructional plan took into consideration needs specific to the subgroup of students selected (e.g. I.E.P. ELL, etc.).</li> <li>- Multiple forms of follow-up student performance data were analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the instructional plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Delivery of Pre-Assessment (Stage 3)</b>			
Unsatisfactory (0)	Basic (1)	Proficient (2)	Distinguished
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre-assessment was administered to the target population.</li> <li>- Protocol interfered with the attainment of valid baseline data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre-Assessment was administered to the target population.</li> <li>- Testing protocol did not interfere with the attainment of valid baseline data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre-Assessment was administered to the target population following appropriate testing protocol.</li> <li>- Pre-Assessment scores were calculated to identify baseline performance for the target population.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre-Assessment was administered to the target population in congruence with each learner's needs (e.g. IEP, ESL, etc.).</li> <li>- Baseline data was established that was valid.</li> </ul>

<b>Delivery of Instructional Plan (Stage 3)</b>			
<b>Unsatisfactory (0)</b>	<b>Basic (1)</b>	<b>Proficient (2)</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Instructional delivery was not congruent with the instructional plan.</li> <li>- Research-based instructional methodologies, best practices, and Danielson components were not delivered acceptably.</li> <li>- The timeline established for the instructional plan was not adhered to even in consideration of unforeseen circumstances. (e.g. snow day, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Instructional delivery was congruent with the instructional plan.</li> <li>- Research-based instructional methodologies, best practices, and Danielson components were delivered but corrections were necessary.</li> <li>- The instruction somewhat adhered to in consideration of unforeseen circumstances. (e.g. snow day, etc.).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Instructional delivery was consistent with the instructional plan.</li> <li>- Research-based instructional methodology, best practices, and Danielson-components were delivered professionally.</li> <li>- The instructional timeline was adhered to in consideration of unforeseen circumstances (e.g. snow day, etc.).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Instructional delivery was congruent with the instructional plans and professional adjustments were made as learner needs dictated.</li> <li>- Research-based methodology, best practices, and Danielson-components were exceptionally delivered.</li> <li>- The instructional timeline was adhered to in consideration of unforeseen circumstances (e.g. snow day, etc.).</li> <li>- The remainder of the class was appropriately accommodated given their individual instructional needs through a variety of means (differentiated instruction, co-teaching, technology-based instruction, etc.).</li> </ul>
<b>Delivery of Post-Assessment and Analysis of Academic Growth (Stage 3)</b>			
<b>Unsatisfactory (0)</b>	<b>Basic (1)</b>	<b>Proficient (2)</b>	<b>Distinguish ed</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Post-assessment was administered to the target population.</li> <li>- Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data.</li> <li>- Post-assessment scores were not compared to pre-assessment scores and no reasonable identification of growth was identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Post-assessment was administered to the target population.</li> <li>- Testing protocol did not interfere with the attainment of valid post-assessment data.</li> <li>- Post-assessment scores were calculated and compared to the pre-assessment results and the academic growth for the target population was somewhat identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Post-assessment was administered to the target population following appropriate testing protocol.</li> <li>- Post-assessment scores were calculated and compared to the pre-assessment results and the academic growth for the target population was clearly identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Post-assessment was professionally administered to the target population following appropriate testing protocol.</li> <li>- Post-assessment results were calculated and compared to the pre-assessment results and the academic growth of the target population was clearly identified.</li> <li>- The academic growth of the target population determines the score for this section (as outlined below).</li> </ul>
<p><b>*Note this section is not scored. This SLO model is scored for process, not outcome. Performance Outcome should be noted and included in the teacher candidate's Reflection (below).</b></p>			

<p>0% to 69% of students met the PI targets.</p>	<p>70% to 79% of students met the PI targets.</p>	<p>80% to 94% of students met the PI targets.</p>	<p>95% to 100% of students met the PI targets.</p>
--	---	---	--

**Instructional Reflection (Stage 3)**

Unsatisfactory (0)	Basic (1)	Proficient (2)	Distinguishe d
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reflection related to the SLO process was minimal or non-existent.</li> <li>- Reflection on the instructional growth and mastery of the target population was not included or unclear.</li> <li>- Rationale for selecting the target population and the instructional plan was not clear.</li> <li>- An analysis related to the effectiveness of the instructional plan was not included or unclear.</li> <li>- No connections were made to Danielson Domains.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reflection related to the SLO process was provided.</li> <li>- Reflection was unclear in identifying the instructional growth and mastery of all members of the target population.</li> <li>- Rationale for selecting the target population and instruction plan was unclear.</li> <li>- Reflection included an analysis of the effectiveness of the Instructional Plan but did not include mitigating factors that may have impeded academic progress.</li> <li>- Minimal or weak connections were made to Danielson Domains.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reflection related to the SLO Process was in-depth.</li> <li>- Reflection identified the academic growth and mastery of all members of the target population through the analysis of multiple forms of pre- and post-assessment data.</li> <li>- Reflection included a rationale for selecting the target population and for selecting the instructional plan.</li> <li>- Reflection included an analysis of the effectiveness of the instructional plan implemented, including mitigating factors that may have detracted from performance gains.</li> <li>- Strong connections were made to multiple Danielson Domains.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reflection related to the SLO process was in-depth and included a collaborative discussion with one’s peers.</li> <li>- Reflection identified the academic growth of all members of the target population through the analysis of multiple forms of pre- and post-assessment data.</li> <li>- Reflection included a rationale for selecting the target population.</li> <li>- Reflection included a rationale for selecting the instructional plan as well as recommendations how the instructional plan could inform educators who will teach the target population in the future.</li> <li>- Reflection included a rational for selecting the instructional plan. The rationale included an analysis of the effectiveness of the instructional plan implemented, including mitigating factors that may have detracted from performance gains for the target population.</li> <li>- The SLO reflection includes recommendations for further SLO development to support student achievement of standards in this targeted content area.</li> <li>- Strong connections were made to all four Danielson Domains.</li> </ul>

**Reflection on Application of Technology (Stage 3)**



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technology is completely absent throughout the entire SLO process.</li> </ul> <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technology use is flawed by either the selection of inappropriate technology or by an inability to troubleshoot any technology issues if they occurred, which detracted from the SLO process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technology is appropriately utilized during the SLO process.</li> <li>- Technology competency is demonstrated by only slight issues troubleshooting any technology issues if they occurred and by the appearance of familiarity with the technology applications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technology is appropriately utilized during the SLO process.</li> <li>- Technology proficiency is demonstrated by being able to effectively troubleshoot any technology issues if they occurred and by the appearance of comfort and familiarity with all technology applications.</li> <li>- The use of technology enhances the SLO process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technology is appropriately utilized throughout the SLO process.</li> <li>- Technology proficiency is demonstrated by a total lack of user errors and by the appearance of comfort and familiarity with all technology applications.</li> <li>- The use of technology enhances all parts of the SLO process, including planning, instruction and assessment.</li> </ul>
--	---	---	--