

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education**

Impact on Student Learning Project (Special Education)

Student teaching candidates seeking teacher certification through the School of Education at Loyola University Chicago must complete the Impact on Student Learning Project and the Professional Practice Profile. Completion of these culminating activities demonstrates expertise both in content and pedagogy, as well as reflection on clinical and classroom experiences. The purpose of these products is to demonstrate evidence of professional competence in university, state, and national professional teacher preparation standards.

Members of the Teaching and Learning Faculty will evaluate both products to determine whether a candidate can be approved for certification. The Impact on Student Learning Project is submitted through LiveText at the same time that the Professional Practice Profile is submitted.

The Impact on Student Learning Project consists of five sections: educational context; unit learning goals, standards, and objectives; assessment plan; assessment and analysis of learning outcomes; and reflection on teaching and learning. Each of these is detailed below.

NOTE: All student teaching candidates are required to submit a proposal of their instructional unit to an assigned faculty assessor PRIOR to the implementation of their instructional unit.

Proposal submission: Using the Impact on Student Learning Project Proposal Template, submit information regarding your project to your faculty assessor using your Loyola email account. Your faculty assessor will provide comments in the faculty comments boxes and return the form to you. **Once approved**, you may move forward with your Impact on Student Learning Project.

Impact on Student Learning Project Options

You are required to teach/implement one of the following: a) whole class instructional (academic/social) unit, b) small group instructional (academic/social) unit, or c) individual academic/behavioral intervention

The goals and objectives should align with Illinois State Content Standards, Social/Emotional Learning Standards, and/or Individualized Education Program (IEP) Goals. You will also need to create an assessment plan designed to measure student performance before (pre-assessment) and after (post-assessment) your unit/intervention. Additionally, your

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education**

assessment plan should include formative and/or progress monitoring (e.g., Curriculum-Based Measures, on-going direction observation) assessments. Finally, you need to analyze and reflect on your instructional design, educational context, and degree of learning gains demonstrated by your student(s).

Educational Context

Candidates should clearly and thoroughly describe the contextual factors relevant to instructional planning. Candidates should demonstrate knowledge of students' varied approaches to learning, students' skills and prior learning, and classroom, school and community factors affecting student learning. There should be a logical connection between the relevant factors described and your instructional planning. Use information summarized in the Classroom, School, and Community Environment section of your Proposal Template, as well as evidence drawn from your pre-assessment to support your decisions.

The suggested page length for this section is 2 pages.

Unit Learning Goals, Standards, and Objectives

Candidates should write clear, developmentally appropriate learning goals aligned with state and/or national standards. Candidates also need to develop clear, developmentally appropriate learning objectives.

Learning goals are statements that give a broad description of what students will learn, and should be aligned with state and/or national standards. Candidates need to clearly identify the standards addressed by the unit. It is important that your learning objectives are statements describing the specific performance the learner will be able to do after completion of a unit or part of the unit. The candidate needs to be explicit on how the criterion for meeting the objectives on the pre- and post-assessment will be measured.

See Glossary for examples of learning goals, standards, and objectives.

The suggested page length for this section is 1 page.

Assessment Plan

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education**

Candidates should align learning objectives directly with their pre- and post-assessments. The plan should describe how assessments are congruent with the levels of learning within the cognitive, affective, or psychomotor domains. In essence, if you write a learning objective using verbs associated with the synthesis level of cognitive processing, the items on your post-assessment should measure that same level of processing. Your pre- and post-assessments should align (i.e., they do not have to be the same). It is important that your assessments generate information suitable for analysis in a pre- vs. post-assessment manner. The assessment plan should also clearly describe how and what types of formative assessments were used during your instructional unit.

The suggested page length for this section is 2 pages.

NOTE: Consider reviewing your proposal template and your faculty assessor's feedback while completing the first three sections of the Impact on Student Learning Project.

Assessment and Analysis of Learning Outcomes

Refer back to your proposal template and follow the plan for your analysis of learning outcomes. Candidates should address the following questions in their analysis of learning outcomes:

- Report on how many students met each learning objective on the pre- and post-assessments?
- For each objective, compare how the class, as a whole, performed on the post-assessment in comparison to the pre-assessment?
- How did the results on the pre- and post-assessments compare for two sub-groups or individuals within the class?

Reminders:

- Candidates can use both quantitative (e.g., basic statistical techniques such as mean, median, mode) and qualitative (e.g., describing changes in the quality of student work, describing changes in how students use or apply the content and skills) methods to analyze data and report outcomes.
- Summaries of all quantitative analyses must be depicted graphically and should be inserted into the text of this section.

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education**

- Summaries of qualitative analyses must have a rich description of student outcomes and must include specific examples, and artifacts of students work that support the rich description.

NOTE: See Glossary for definitions and examples of both quantitative and qualitative analysis

It is important that your interpretation (i.e., your analysis) of the learning results is meaningful appropriate, and represents the students' performance. Be sure to represent all data quantitatively or qualitatively.

The suggested page length for this section is 3-4 pages.

Reflection on Teaching and Learning
--

Based on the evidence of student learning, candidates should identify insights on effective instruction and assessment. Candidates should draw conclusions based on the Assessment and Analysis of Learning Results section, as well as research and theory. In the discussion of student learning and effective instruction, candidates should make logical connections between the learning goals and learning objectives, instruction, and assessment results. Consider including in your reflection reasons for the levels of performance on your post-assessment (e.g., Were there items on which students performed better or worse? Were learning objectives appropriate given students prior knowledge, motivation, learning styles?)

Candidates should reflect on the implications for future teaching, as well as implications for professional development.

The suggested page length for this section is 3-4 pages.

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education
Special Education Program**

Impact on Student Learning Project Rubric (Special Education)

Candidate Name: _____ Certification: _____

Grad/Undergrad: _____ Term: _____

Educational Context	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning (IPTS 2, 3)	Candidate displays general and specific understanding of the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles) that may affect learning.	Candidate displays general knowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles).	Candidate displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles).
Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning (IPTS 4)	Candidate displays general and specific understanding of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.	Candidate displays general knowledge of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.	Candidate displays little or irrelevant knowledge of students' skills and prior learning.
Knowledge of Community, School, and Classroom Factors (IPTS 3, 4)	Candidate displays a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning.	Candidate displays some knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning.	Candidate displays minimal, irrelevant, or biased knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom.
Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment (IPTS 3, 4, 5)	Candidate provides specific implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.	Candidate provides general implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.	Candidate does not provide implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics <i>OR</i> provides inappropriate implications.
Unit Learning Goals, Standards, and Learning Objectives	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Clarity (IPTS 4)	Objective(s) are clearly stated as learning outcomes.	N/A	Objective(s) are not stated clearly and are activities rather than learning outcomes.

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education
Special Education Program**

Appropriateness For Students (IPTS 2, 4)	Objective(s) are appropriate for the development, pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs.	Most objective(s) are appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs	Objectives are not appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; or other student needs.
Alignment with National, State, or Local Standards (IPTS 4)	Objective(s) are explicitly aligned with national, state or local standards.	N/A	Objective(s) are not aligned with national, state or local standards.
Assessment Plan	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Alignment with Learning Objective(s) and Assessment (IPTS 4, 8)	Each of the learning objective(s) is assessed through the assessment plan; assessments are congruent with the learning objectives in content and cognitive complexity.	Each of the learning objective(s) is assessed through the assessment plan, but some may not be congruent with learning objectives in content and cognitive complexity.	Not all learning objectives are assessed through the assessment plan.
Multiple Modes and Approaches (IPTS 8)	Assessment is on-going and includes multiple assessment modes, both formal and informal.	Assessment is on-going but lacks multiple assessment modes.	Teacher fails to conduct on-going assessment, both formal and informal.
Assessment and Analysis of Learning Outcomes	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Pre-Assessment Data (CEC 8)	Provides an accurate and clear summary of student performance prior to intervention. Appropriate method of analysis (e.g., statistical techniques, changes in rubric categories) has been used and charts and/or other representations have been adequately described.	Provides a summary of student performance prior to intervention. Appropriate method of analysis (e.g., statistical techniques, changes in rubric categories) has been used and charts and/or other representations have been described.	Fails to provide a summary of student performance prior to intervention. Method of analysis, charts, and other representations are missing and/or unclear.
Post-Assessment Data	Provides an accurate and clear summary of student	Provides a summary of student performance	Fails to provide a summary of student performance

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education
Special Education Program**

(CEC 8)	performance following intervention. Appropriate method of analysis (e.g., statistical techniques, changes in rubric categories) has been used and charts and/or other representations have been adequately described.	following intervention. Appropriate method of analysis (e.g., statistical techniques, changes in rubric categories) has been used and charts and/or other representations have been described.	following intervention. Method of analysis, charts, and other representations are missing and/or unclear.
Interpretation of Data (CEC 8)	Interpretation is meaningful, and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data.	Interpretation is technically accurate, but conclusions are missing or not fully supported by data.	Interpretation is inaccurate, and conclusions are missing or unsupported by data.
Evidence of Impact on Student Learning (CEC 8)	Analysis of student learning includes significant evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who progressed toward learning objectives, changes in student performance from pre- to post-assessment/intervention, and comparisons among two subgroups or individuals. Analysis includes finding patterns of student learning performance above and beyond required analyses	Analysis of student learning includes evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who progressed toward learning objectives, changes in student performance from pre- to post-assessment/intervention, and comparisons among two subgroups or individuals.	Analysis of student learning fails to include evidence of impact on student learning in terms of addressing the three questions for analysis of learning outcomes
Reflection on Teaching and Learning	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment (IPTS 10)	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provides plausible reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities or assessments and superficially explores reasons for their success or lack thereof (no use of	Provides no rationale for why some activities or assessments were more successful than others.

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education
Special Education Program**

	lack thereof.	theory or research).	
Interpretation of Student Learning (IPTS 10)	Uses compelling and relevant evidence to support conclusions drawn in "Assessment and Analysis" section. Explores multiple hypotheses for why some students did not meet learning goals.	Provides evidence to support conclusions drawn in "Assessment and Analysis" section.	No evidence or reasons provided to support conclusions drawn in "Assessment and Analysis" section.
Alignment among Goals, Objectives, Instruction and Assessment (IPTS 10)	Logically connects learning goals, objectives, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction.	Connects learning goals, objectives, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction.	Does not connect learning goals, objectives, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction and/or the connections are irrelevant or inaccurate.
Implications for Future Teaching (IPTS 10)	Provides thoughtful, compelling and insightful ideas for redesigning learning goals, objectives, instruction, and assessment and explains why these modifications would improve student learning. Candidate uses the evidence from the Impact on Student Learning Project to reflect on their future practices	Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, objectives, instruction, and assessment but offers no rationale for why these changes would improve student learning.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning learning goals, objectives, instruction, and assessment.
Implications for Professional Development (IPTS 10, 11)	Presents clear and specific professional learning goals and rationales that emerge from the insights and experiences described gained from the Impact Project. Describes specific steps to meet these goals. Candidate's response shows a	Presents professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences gained from the Impact Project. Describes specific steps to meet these goals. Candidate's response shows a commitment to on-going professional	Provides no professional learning goals or goals that are not related to the insights and experiences described in this section.

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education
Special Education Program**

	commitment to on-going professional development.	development.	
Project Clarity and Conventions	Candidate's project is well-written and of collegiate level. The author's ideas, as written, are clear, compelling, and original.	Candidate's project is of collegiate level. There is a clear beginning, middle, and end. The essay flows nicely from one idea to the next.	The candidate's project is below collegiate level. It is unstructured and unclear.
Grammar and Spelling	The candidate's project is free from grammar and spelling errors.	The candidate's project has a few grammar and spelling errors.	The candidate's project is riddled with grammar and spelling errors.
Overall Assessment	TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE

Decision Rules

- 16 Target Ratings without an Unacceptable Rating = Target
- 5 or More Unacceptable Ratings = Unacceptable
- All Other Rating Combinations = Acceptable

Resubmission Guidelines

- Unacceptable Ratings for any components within the Assessment and Analysis of Learning Results or Reflection on Teaching and Learning warrants resubmission of those components.
- Resubmissions are submitted directly to the faculty assessor, whose discretion it is to determine when performance reaches acceptable.
- Assessment rubric is completed only once. Resubmissions do not get re-assessed in LiveText.

Loyola University Chicago
School of Education

Impact on Student Learning Project (Special Education)
Proposal Template

Student Teaching Candidates: Please submit the following information regarding your Impact on Student Learning Project to your faculty advisor using your Loyola email account. Your faculty assessor will provide comments in the faculty comments boxes and return the form to you. **Once approved**, you may move forward with your Impact on Student Learning Project.

General Information

Candidate's Name: _____

Identify where you are student teaching (i.e., name of school, grade level). Provide a brief description of the content/topic area and skills for your unit (e.g., science unit on plant life). If you teach to more than one group of students, provide information only for the class with which you will be completing your project.

Classroom, School, and Community Environment

Classroom

1. How many students are enrolled in your class and identify the number in each of the following demographic categories?

_____ student(s) with IEPs _____ student(s) with 504 plans _____ student(s) who are ELL

_____ student(s) meeting grade level expectations

_____ student(s) exceeding grade level expectations

_____ student(s) below grade level expectations

_____ student(s) who are male _____ student(s) who are female

_____ other:

Loyola University Chicago
School of Education

2. Does the classroom environment allow for the following groupings?
(check all that apply)

whole class small groups individual

peer teaching heterogeneous grouping

other:

3. What resources are available for you to use in the classroom
environment? (check all that apply)

textbooks manipulatives technology
(e.g., hands on materials)

other:

4. What additional support is available to you in the classroom? (check all
that apply)

educational assistants resource teachers

peer tutors parent volunteers

other:

5. Describe the physical organization of your classroom.

6. Describe the classroom management approach (i.e., philosophy and
strategies) used by your cooperating professional?

7. What types of instructional methods are typically used by your
cooperating professional?

8. What assessment approach (i.e., philosophy and strategies) is typically
used by your cooperating professional?

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education**

School

Most of the data requested below can be found on your district website, the Interactive Illinois Report Card website (<http://iirc.niu.edu/>), or by asking your cooperating professional or building administrator.

1. What percent of students in your school are identified in each of the following demographic categories?

_____ American Indian or Alaska Native _____ Asian
_____ Black or African American _____ Hispanic or Latino
_____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander _____ White

2. What percent of students in your school are classified as receiving free/reduced lunch (this may be listed as 'Low SES')?

3. What are the average attendance rates for each of the following demographic groups?

_____ students _____ teachers (if available)
_____ parents at school events (e.g., open house)

4. Describe the schools' approach to differentiation on a school-wide level.

Community

1. What community resources (outside the school) are available to school personnel and students in your school?

Reflection on Classroom, School, and Community Environment

1. Given the data on your class, the school and the community, how will this inform the planning of your instructional unit?

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education**

FACULTY ASSESSOR COMMENTS:

Unit Instructional Planning

In the table below, answer the following questions:

1. What is the goal for the unit?
2. What learning standards (e.g., State (ISBE) and/or National) align with your goal?
3. What are the learning objectives for your goal?

NOTE: Please keep the maximum number of learning objectives to three per unit goal. You may have fewer than three learning objectives. You may also consider having a second unit goal, in which case you should use the same table format to summarize your answers relevant to the second goal.

Goal:
Learning Standard(s):
Learning Objective 1:
Learning Objective 2:
Learning Objective 3:

4. Describe and attach your pre- and post-assessments. Be sure to describe how you will score your assessments.

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education**

In the table below, answer the following questions for each learning objective:

5. Describe how the pre- and post-assessments measure what students have learned. Be sure to describe how you will determine whether or not the student met the objective.
6. Describe how the pre- and post-assessments are aligned and how these assessments will allow you to determine if student performance has improved with regard to the learning objectives.
7. Describe the formative assessments that will be used and how these formative assessments allow you to understand if students are progressing on the learning objectives for the unit?

Connections between assessments and learning objective 1:
Connections between assessments and learning objective 2:
Connections between assessments and learning objective 3:

Plan the analysis of your learning outcomes below. You will be required to analyze your assessment data in the following ways:

8. by those who met/did not met each objective
 - ___ number of students
 - ___ percent/proportion of students
 - ___ which and/or how many objectives were met*

**Option for individual academic/behavior interventions only*

9. by differences in performance between the pre- and post-assessment for your entire class (for each objective)
 - ___ averaging scores or comparing ranges of scores
 - ___ describing movement/changes in rubric categories
 - ___ case study analysis comparing baseline to intervention*

**Loyola University Chicago
School of Education**

___ describing qualitative changes in student performance (e.g., use of multi-syllabic vs. mono-syllabic words; comparing feedback given on rough draft vs. final copy of essay/paper).

___ descriptive summary of progress monitoring data*

___ other:

10. by differences in performance for unique groups or individuals

___ students with IEPs vs. students without IEPs

___ students with and without disciplinary concerns

___ students who varied on pre-assessment performance (lowest and highest) vs. performance on post-assessment

___ student level of performance vs. normative/typical comparison peer*

___ correlation between academic and behavioral performance levels*

___ other:

11. Provide a unit calendar with the schedule for lessons and assessments.

NOTE: It is important that your timing of the unit meets with all university timeline requirements.

FACULTY ASSESSOR COMMENTS: