

Millersville University – ACEI – Assessment #5

The Renaissance Partnership For Improving Teacher Quality

Teacher Work Sample:

- Performance Prompt
- Teaching Process Standards
- Scoring Rubrics

Notice: The materials in this document were developed by representatives of the Renaissance Partnership Institutions and may not be used or reproduced without citing [The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project](http://fp.uni.edu/itq) <http://fp.uni.edu/itq>

Overview of Teacher Work Sample (TWS)

The Vision

Successful teacher candidates support learning by designing a Teacher Work Sample that employs a range of strategies and builds on each student's strengths, needs, and prior experiences. Through this performance assessment, teacher candidates provide credible evidence of their ability to facilitate learning.

Your Assignment

The TWS contains seven teaching processes identified by this project as fundamental to improving student learning. Each Teaching Process is followed by a TWS Standard, the Task, a Prompt, and a Rubric that defines various levels of performance on the standard. The Standards and Rubrics will be used to evaluate your TWS. The Prompts (or directions) help you document the extent to which you have met each of the standards. The underlined words in the Rubric and Prompts are defined in the Glossary.

You are required to teach a comprehensive unit. Before you teach the unit, you will describe contextual factors, identify learning goals based on your state or district content standards, create an assessment plan designed to measure student performance before (pre-assessment), during (formative assessment) and after (post-assessment), and plan for your instruction. After you teach the unit, you will analyze student learning and then reflect upon and evaluate your teaching as related to student learning.

Format

- **Narrative length.** A suggested page length for your narrative is given at the end of each component section. You have some flexibility of length across components, but the total length of your written narrative (excluding charts, graphs, attachments and references) should not exceed twenty (20) word-processed pages, double-spaced in 12-point font, with 1-inch margins.
- **Charts, graphs and attachments.** Charts, graphs and assessment instruments are required as part of the TWS document. You may also want to provide other attachments, such as student work. However, you should be very selective and make sure your attachments provide clear, concise evidence of your performance related to TWS standards and your students' learning progress.
- **References and Credits** (not included in total page length). If you referred to another person's ideas or material in your narrative, you should cite these in a separate section at the end of your narrative under References and Credits.

Contextual Factors

TWS Standard: The teacher uses information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment.

Task: Discuss relevant factors and how they may affect the teaching-learning process. Include any supports and challenges that affect instruction and student learning.

Prompt: In your discussion, include:

- **Community, district and school factors.** Address geographic location, community and school population, socio-economic profile and race/ethnicity. You might also address such things as stability of community, political climate, community support for education, and other environmental factors.
- **Classroom factors.** Address physical features, availability of technology equipment and resources and the extent of parental involvement. You might also discuss other relevant factors such as classroom rules and routines, grouping patterns, scheduling and classroom arrangement.
- **Student characteristics.** Address student characteristics you must consider as you design instruction and assess learning. Include factors such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, special needs, achievement/developmental levels, culture, language, interests, learning styles/modalities or students' skill levels. In your narrative, make sure you address student's skills and prior learning that may influence the development of your learning goals, instruction and assessment.
- **Instructional implications.** Address how contextual characteristics of the community, classroom and students have implications for instructional planning and assessment. Include specific instructional implications for at least two characteristics and any other factors that will influence how you plan and implement your unit.

Learning Goals

TWS Standard: The Teacher sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals.

Task: Provide and justify the learning goals for the unit

Prompt:

- **List the learning goals** (not the activities) that will guide the planning, delivery and assessment of your unit. These goals should define what you expect students to know and be able to do at the end of the unit. The goals should be significant (reflect the big ideas or structure of the discipline), challenging, varied, and appropriate. Number or code each learning goal so you can reference it later.
- **Show how the goals are aligned with local, state, and national standards.** (Identify the source of the standards)
- **Describe the types and levels of your learning goals**
- **Discuss why your learning goals are appropriate in terms of development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills; and other student needs**

Assessment Plan

TWS Standard: The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction.

Task

Design an assessment plan to monitor student progress toward learning goal(s). Use multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction. These assessments should authentically measure student learning and may include performance-based tasks, paper-and-pencil tasks, or personal communication. Describe why your assessments are appropriate for measuring learning

Prompt

- **Provide an overview of the assessment plan.** For each learning goal include: assessments used to judge student performance, format of each assessment, and adaptations of the assessments for the individual needs of students based on pre-assessment and contextual factors. The purpose of this overview is to depict the alignment between learning goals and assessments and to show adaptations to meet the individual needs of students or contextual factors. You may use a visual organizer such as a table, outline or other means to make your plan clear.
- **Describe the pre- and post-assessments that are aligned with your learning goals.** Clearly explain how you will evaluate or score pre- and post-assessments, including criteria you will use to determine if the students' performance

meets the learning goals. Include copies of assessments, prompts, and/or student directions and criteria for judging student performance (e.g., scoring rubrics, observation checklist, rating scales, item weights, test blueprint, answer key).

- **Discuss your plan for formative assessment that will help you determine student progress during the unit.** Describe the assessments you plan to use to check on student progress and comment on the importance of collecting that particular evidence. Although formative assessment may change as you are teaching the unit, your task here is to predict at what points in your teaching it will be important to assess students' progress toward learning goals.

Design for instruction

TWS Standard: The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.

Task

Describe how you will design your unit instruction related to unit goals, students' characteristics and needs, and the specific learning context.

Prompt

- **Results of pre-assessment.** After administering the pre-assessment, analyze student performance *relative to the learning goals*. Depict the results of the pre-assessment in a format that allows you to find patterns of student performance relative to each learning goal. You may use a table, graph, or chart. Describe the pattern you find that will guide your instruction or modification of the learning goals.
- **Unit overview.** Provide an overview of your unit. Use a visual organizer such as a block plan or outline to make your unit plan clear. Include the topic or activity you are planning for each day/period. Also indicate the goal or goals (coded from your Learning Goals section) that you are addressing in each activity. Make sure that every goal is addressed by at least one activity and that every activity relates to at least one goal.
 - **Activities.** Describe at least three unit activities that reflect a variety of instructional strategies/techniques and explain why you are planning those specific activities. In your explanation for each activity, include:
 - how the content relates to your instructional goals,
 - how the activity stems from your pre-assessment information and contextual factors,
 - what materials/technology you will need to implement the activity,
 - how you plan to assess student learning during and/or following the activity (i.e. formative assessment)
 - **Technology-** Describe how you will use technology in your planning and /or instruction. If you do not plan to use any form of technology, provide your clear rationale for its omission.

Instructional Decision Making

TWS Standard: The teacher uses on-going analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions.

Task: Provide two examples of instructional decision-making based on students' learning or responses.

Prompt

- Think of a time during your unit when a student's learning or response caused you to modify your original design for instruction. (The resulting modification may affect other students as well.) Cite specific evidence to support your answers to the following:

- Describe the student's learning or response that caused you to rethink your plans. The student's learning or response may come from a planned formative assessment or another source (not the pre-assessment).
- Describe what you did next and explain why you thought this would improve student progress toward the learning goal.

Now, think of one more time during your unit when another student's learning or response caused you to modify a different portion of your original design for instruction. (The resulting modification may affect other students as well.) Respond to the prompt above.

Analysis of Student Learning

TWS Standard: The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.

Task: Analyze your assessment data, including pre/post assessments and formative assessments to determine students' progress related to the unit learning goals. Use visual representations and narrative to communicate the performance of the whole class, subgroups, and two individual students. Conclusions drawn from this analysis should be provided in the "Reflection and Self-Evaluation" section.

Prompt:

In this section, you will analyze data to explain progress and achievement toward learning goals demonstrated by your whole class, subgroups of students, and individual students.

- **Whole class.** To analyze the progress of your whole class, create a table that shows pre- and post-assessment data on every student on every learning goal. Then, create a graphic summary that shows the extent to which your students made progress (from pre- to post-) toward the learning criterion that you identified for each learning goal (identified in your Assessment Plan section). Summarize what the graph tells you about your students' learning in this unit (i.e., the number of students met the criterion).
- **Subgroups.** Select a group characteristic (e.g., gender, performance level, socio-economic status, language proficiency) to analyze in terms of **one learning goal**. Provide a rationale for your selection of this characteristic to form subgroups (e.g., girls vs. boys; high- vs. middle- vs. low-performers). Create a graphic representation that compares pre- and post-assessment results for the subgroups on this learning goal. Summarize what these data show about student learning.
- **Individuals.** Select two students that demonstrated different levels of performance. Explain why it is important to understand the learning of these particular students. Use pre-, formative, and post-assessment data with examples of the students' work to draw conclusions about the extent to which these students attained the two learning goals. Graphic representations are not necessary for this subsection.

Note: You will provide possible reasons for why your students learned (or did not learn) in the next section, "Reflection and Self-Evaluation."

Reflection and Self-Evaluation

TWS Standard: The teacher analyzes the relationship between his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.

Task

Reflect on your performance as a teacher and link your performance to student learning results. Evaluate your performance and identify future actions for improved practice and professional growth.

Prompt

- Select the learning goal where your students were most successful. Provide two or more possible reasons for this success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other contextual factors under your control.
- Select the learning goal where your students were least successful. Provide two or more possible reasons for this lack of success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other contextual factors under your control. Discuss what you could do differently or better in the future to improve your students' performance.
- **Reflection on possibilities for professional development.** Describe at least two professional learning goals that emerged from your insights and experiences with the TWS. Identify two specific steps you will take to improve your performance in the critical area(s) you identified.

**Section 2 Assessment 5B
Teacher Work Sample**

Contextual Factors Rubric

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met
Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors	Teacher displays minimal, irrelevant, or biased knowledge of the characteristics of the school, community, and classroom.	Teacher displays some knowledge of the characteristics of the school, community, and classroom that may affect learning.	Teacher displays a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning.
Knowledge of Characteristics of Students	Teacher displays minimal stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge of student differences (development, culture, interests).	Teacher displays general knowledge of student differences (development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning.	Teacher displays general & specific understanding of student differences (development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning.
Knowledge of Students' Varied approaches to Learning	Teacher displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge about the different ways students learn (learning styles/modalities).	Teacher displays general knowledge about the different ways students learn (learning styles/modalities).	Teacher displays general & specific understanding of the different ways students learn (learning styles/modalities) that may affect learning.
Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning	Teacher displays little or irrelevant knowledge of students skills and prior learning.	Teacher displays general knowledge of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.	Teacher displays general & specific understanding of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.
Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment	Teacher does not provide implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, or classroom characteristics OR provides inappropriate implications.	Teacher provides general implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, or classroom characteristics.	Teacher provides specific implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.

Learning Goals Rubric

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met
Significance, Challenge and Variety	Goals reflect only one type or level of learning.	Goals reflect several types or levels of learning but lack significance or challenge.	Goals reflect several types or levels of learning and are significant and challenging.
<i>Clarity</i>	Goals are not stated clearly and are activities rather than learning outcomes.	Some of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes.	Most of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes.
Appropriateness for Students	Goals are not appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; or other student needs.	Some goals are appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs	Most goals are appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs.
Alignment with National, State or Local Standards	Goals are not aligned with national, state or local standards.	Some goals are aligned with national, state or local standards.	Most of the goals are explicitly aligned with national, state or local standards.

Assessment Plan Rubric

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met
Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction	Content and methods of assessment lack congruence with learning goals or lack cognitive complexity.	Some of the learning goals are assessed through the assessment plan, but many are not congruent with learning goals in content and cognitive complexity.	Each of the learning goals is assessed through the assessment plan; assessments are congruent with the learning goals in content and cognitive complexity.
Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance	The assessments contain no clear criteria for measuring student performance relative to the learning goals.	Assessment criteria have been developed, but they are not clear or are not explicitly linked to the learning goals.	Assessment criteria are clear and are explicitly linked to the learning goals.
Multiple Modes and Approaches	The assessment plan includes only one assessment mode and does not assess students before, during, and after instruction.	The assessment plan includes multiple modes but all are either pencil/paper based (i.e. they are not performance assessments) and/or do not require the integration of knowledge, skills and reasoning ability.	The assessment plan includes multiple assessment modes (including performance assessments, lab reports, research projects, etc.) and assesses student performance throughout the instructional sequence.
Technical Soundness	Assessments are not valid; scoring procedures are absent or inaccurate; items or prompts are poorly written; directions and procedures are confusing to students.	Assessments appear to have some validity. Some scoring procedures are explained; some items or prompts are clearly written; some directions and procedures are clear to students.	Assessments appear to be valid; scoring procedures are explained; most items or prompts are clearly written; directions and procedures are clear to students.
Adaptations Based on the Individual Needs of Students	Teacher does not adapt assessments to meet the individual needs of students or these assessments are inappropriate.	Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of some students.	Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of most students.

Design For Instruction

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met
Alignment with Learning Goals	Few lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Few learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Not all learning goals are covered in the design.	Most lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Most learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Most learning goals are covered in the design.	All lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. All learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. All learning goals are covered in the design.
Accurate Representation of Content	Teacher's use of content appears to contain numerous inaccuracies. Content seems to be viewed more as isolated skills and facts rather than as part of a larger conceptual structure.	Teacher's use of content appears to be mostly accurate. Shows some awareness of the big ideas or structure of the discipline.	Teacher's use of content appears to be accurate. Focus of the content is congruent with the big ideas or structure of the discipline.
Lesson and Unit Structure	The lessons within the unit are not logically organized (e.g., sequenced).	The lessons within the unit have some logical organization and appear to be somewhat useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals.	All lessons within the unit are logically organized and appear to be useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals.
Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments, and Resources	Little variety of instruction, activities, assignments, and resources. Heavy reliance on textbook or single resource (e.g., work sheets).	Some variety in instruction, activities, assignments, or resources but with limited contribution to learning.	Significant variety across instruction, activities, assignments, and/or resources. This variety makes a clear contribution to learning.
Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments, and Resources	Instruction has not been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Activities and assignments do not appear productive and appropriate for each student.	Some instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Some activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student.	Most instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Most activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student.
<i>Use of Technology</i>	Technology is inappropriately used OR teacher does not use technology, and no (or inappropriate) rationale is provided.	Teacher uses technology but it does not make a significant contribution to teaching and learning OR teacher provides limited rationale for not using technology.	Teacher integrates appropriate technology that makes a significant contribution to teaching and learning OR provides a strong rationale for not using technology.

Instructional Decision Making

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator met
Sound Professional Practice	Many instructional decisions are inappropriate and not pedagogically sound.	Instructional decisions are mostly appropriate, but some decisions are not pedagogically sound.	Most instructional decisions are pedagogically sound (i.e., they are likely to lead to student learning).
Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning	Teacher treats class as “one plan fits all” with no modifications.	Some modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs, but these are not based on the analysis of student learning, best practice, or contextual factors.	Appropriate modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs. These modifications are informed by the analysis of student learning/performance, best practice, or contextual factors. Include explanation of why the modifications would improve student progress.
Congruence Between Modifications and Learning Goals	Modifications in instruction lack congruence with learning goals.	Modifications in instruction are somewhat congruent with learning goals.	Modifications in instruction are congruent with learning goals.

Analysis of Student Learning Rubric

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met
Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation	Presentation is not clear and accurate; it does not accurately reflect the data.	Presentation is understandable and contains few errors.	Presentation is easy to understand and contains no errors of representation.
Alignment with Learning Goals	Analysis of student learning is not aligned with learning goals.	Analysis of student learning is partially aligned with learning goals and/or fails to provide a comprehensive profile of student learning relative to the goals for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.	Analysis is fully aligned with learning goals and provides a comprehensive profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.
Interpretation of Data	Interpretation is inaccurate, and conclusions are missing or unsupported by data.	Interpretation is technically accurate, but conclusions are missing or not fully supported by data.	Interpretation is meaningful, and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data.
Evidence of Impact on Student Learning	Analysis of student learning fails to include evidence of impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals.	Analysis of student learning includes incomplete evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals.	Analysis of student learning includes evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal.

Reflection and Self Evaluation Rubric

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met
Interpretation of Student Learning	No evidence or reasons provided to support conclusions drawn in “Analysis of Student Learning” section.	Provides evidence but no (or simplistic, superficial) reasons or hypotheses to support conclusions drawn in “Analysis of Student Learning” section.	Uses evidence to support conclusions drawn in “Analysis of Student Learning” section. Explores multiple hypotheses for why some students did not meet learning goals.
Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment	Provides no rationale for why some activities or assessments were more successful than others.	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities or assessments and superficially explores reasons for their success or lack thereof (no use of theory or research).	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provides plausible reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack thereof.
Alignment Among Goals, Instruction and Assessment	Does not connect learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction and/or the connections are irrelevant or inaccurate.	Connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction, but misunderstandings or conceptual gaps are present.	Logically connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction.
Implications for Future Teaching	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment.	Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment but offers no rationale for why these changes would improve student learning.	Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment and explains why these modifications would improve student learning.
Implications for Professional Development	Provides no professional learning goals or goals that are not related to the insights and experiences described in this section.	Presents professional learning goals that are not strongly related to the insights and experiences described in this section and/or provides a vague plan for meeting the goals.	Presents a small number of professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section. Describes specific steps to meet these goals.

Section II Assessment 5C - Teacher Work Sample Tables

Teacher Work Sample – Professional Block

Key

Ratings: 4–Outstanding; 3–Competency demonstrated; 2–Satisfactory with guidance; 1–Competency not demonstrated

N = Number; CF=Contextual Factors; LG=Learning Goals; AS=Assessment Plan; DI=Design for Instruction; ID=Instructional Decision Making; AN=Analysis of Student Learning; RS=Reflection/Self-Evaluation

Spring 2003		N	1	2	3	4			
Holistic Score by Percent									
Undergraduate			0%	%	%				0
Post Baccalaureate			0	%	%				0
Spring 2003		N	CF	LG	AS	DI	ID	AN	RS
Subcategories by mean									
Undergraduate									
Post Baccalaureate									

Fall 2003		N	1	2	3	4			
Holistic Score by Percent									
Undergraduate			0	%	%				%
Post Baccalaureate			0	0	%	%			%
Fall 2003		N	CF	LG	AS	DI	ID	AN	RS
Subcategories by mean									
Undergraduate									
Post Baccalaureate									

Spring 2004		N	1	2	3	4			
Holistic Score by Percent									
Undergraduate			0	%	%				%
Post Baccalaureate			0	0	%	%			%
Spring 2004		N	CF	LG	AS	DI	ID	AN	RS
Subcategories by mean									
Undergraduate									
Post Baccalaureate									

Analytic Score Conversion to Holistic Score

Mean of 3.0 = 4 outstanding

Mean of 2.50 - 2.99 = 3 competency demonstrated

Mean of 2.0 – 2.49 = 2 satisfactory with guidance

Mean of 1.99 or below = 1 competency not demonstrated

Attachment J – Teacher Work Sample Tables

Teacher Work Sample – Student Teaching

Key

Ratings: 4–Outstanding; 3–Competency demonstrated; 2–Satisfactory with guidance; 1–Competency not demonstrated

N = Number; CF=Contextual Factors; LG=Learning Goals; AS=Assessment Plan; DI=Design for Instruction; ID=Instructional Decision Making; AN=Analysis of Student Learning; RS=Reflection/Self-Evaluation

During Spring 2003 a cohort of six undergraduate candidates volunteered to participate in a pilot study. Due to clerical error, four of the Teacher Work Sample scores were not recorded. All candidates were mentored through the process.

Spring 2003			N	1	2	3	4	
Holistic Score by Percent (Undergraduate)			█	0	0	100%	0	
Spring 2003	N	CF	LG	AS	DI	ID	AN	RS
Subcategories by mean	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█

Fall 2003 (Written)			N	1	2	3	4	
Holistic Score by Percent								
Undergraduate			█	█%	31%	█%	0	
Post Baccalaureate				█%	0	█%	0	
Fall 2003	N	CF	LG	AS	DI	ID	AN	RS
Subcategories by mean								
Undergraduate	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Post Baccalaureate	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█

Spring 2004 (Written and Oral)			N	1	2	3	4	
Holistic Score by Percent								
Undergraduate			█	0	█%	█%	█%	
Post Baccalaureate				0	0	█%	█%	
Spring 2004	N	CF	LG	AS	DI	ID	AN	RS
Subcategories by mean								
Undergraduate	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
Post Baccalaureate	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█

Analytic Score Conversion to Holistic Score

Mean of 3.0 = 4 outstanding

Mean of 2.50 - 2.99 = 3 competency demonstrated

Mean of 2.0 – 2.49 = 2 satisfactory with guidance

Mean of 1.99 or below = 1 competency not demonstrated

Evidence of Meeting Standards

#5 Assessment of Candidate Effect on Student Learning – Teacher Work Sample

Description and Use

The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is a process and a product that enables candidates to demonstrate their ability to plan, implement, and evaluate a standards-based unit of instruction for a specific class of students and to analyze and reflect on the impact their teaching had on student learning. Through performance assessment candidates provide evidence of their ability to facilitate learning by meeting the following seven standards: (1) The teacher uses information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment; (2) The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals; (3) The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during and after instruction; (4) The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts; (5) The teacher uses on-going analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions; (6) The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement; and (7) The teacher reflects on his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice. The TWS consists of a comprehensive unit and an extensive narrative describing how each of the seven standards is met. The teaching standards, prompts, and rubric can be found in Attachment I. TWS units are scored analytically using a 3-point scale (Attachment I). A holistic score is calculated in the following manner: TWS mean of 3.0 = 4 (outstanding); mean of 2.50 - 2.99 = 3 (competency demonstrated); mean of 2.0 – 2.49 = 2 (satisfactory); and 1.99 or below = 1 (competency not demonstrated).

Candidates complete a modified TWS of three to five lessons during the three week field experience of Professional Block. This serves as a formative assessment, providing the knowledge and experience needed for the culminating experience during student teaching. Because candidates receive mentoring and feedback and are encouraged to make revisions, they are expected to achieve a holistic score of 2 in Professional Block. During student teaching, the candidate completes a TWS for each teaching assignment. A written TWS is completed during the first placement and an oral version during the second placement. Although the TWS is not currently being used to determine eligibility for certification, candidates must demonstrate competency with an overall holistic score of 2 or higher to successfully complete student teaching.

Alignment with Standards

Standard 1 – Candidate knowledge of and ability to use principles and theories of child development to construct learning opportunities is assessed through the TWS as indicated below.

Standard 2.1 through 2.4 – Although the student teacher does not develop a unit for each content area, knowledge of content included in the TWS is assessed in the section, *Design for Instruction*.

Standard 3.1 – Implementing instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, subject matter, curricular goals, and community is assessed by twenty-four of thirty-two indicators in the TWS. The first standard requires candidates to use information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment. Candidates are expected to refer to and use this information in each of the remaining standards. Knowledge of learning theory is assessed as part of the *Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Instructional Decision-Making, and Reflection* sections. Candidates are assessed on knowledge of subject matter, their ability to use a variety of instructional approaches, and appropriate use of technology and other resources in the *Design for Instruction*.

Standard 3.2 – Adaptation for diverse learners is assessed with twelve indicators throughout the TWS. Indicators referring to knowing and understanding student differences and needs and planning instruction and assessment to meet those needs can be found in six of the seven standards. In *Contextual Factors*, candidates identify individual student needs, document adaptations to accommodate individual student needs in the assessment plan, and refer to student needs throughout the remaining standards.

Standard 3.3 – Candidates are assessed on their ability to set significant, challenging, varied, and appropriate learning goals and to assess student learning using multiple assessment modes. Candidates are expected to use on-going analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions and to provide a rationale for their actions based on theory, best practice, and contextual factors. Candidates are expected to provide significant variety across instruction, activities, assignments, and resources that lead to student learning. Indicators in the following standards relate specifically to Standard 3.3: *Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for instruction, Instructional Decision-Making, and Reflection and Self-evaluation*.

Standard 3.4 – Active engagement in learning is inherent in the TWS. The emphasis on instruction and assessment to meet the needs of all learners and significant and challenging learning goals lead to student motivation and active engagement.

Standard 4 - Assessment for instruction is a requirement for the TWS. Candidates must develop an assessment plan that includes pre-, formative, and post-assessment for each learning goal as well as plans to adapt assessments for specific students. The candidate must use multiple assessment modes including performance assessment as well as traditional assessments. Candidates are assessed on their ability to modify instructional plans to address individual student needs and to analyze the effectiveness of their teaching. Finally, candidates profile student learning of the whole class, subgroups, and several individuals and communicate information about student progress and achievement. Refer specifically to *Assessment Plan, Instructional Decision-Making, Analysis of Student Learning, and Reflection and Self-evaluation*.

Standard 5.1 and 5.2 - Assessment of candidate professional development occurs in *Instructional Decision-making and Reflection and Self-evaluation*. Candidates must justify that instructional decisions were informed by the analysis of student performance, best practice, and contextual factors. As candidates reflect on their teaching and its effectiveness, they provide multiple hypotheses for why students did or did not learn and why activities were successful or unsuccessful. Candidates must provide ideas for redesigning instruction or assessment with an explanation of how these would improve student learning. Finally, candidates must present several personal professional learning goals that emerged from their insights and experiences and describe specific ways to meet these goals.

Standard 5.3 and 5.4 – Although MU candidates do not develop a specific family-oriented project, candidates are aware of and use information about family beliefs, values, and practices as they develop their TWS. One indicator assesses the candidate’s knowledge of “general and specific understanding of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning.” Another indicator assesses candidate’s ability to “provide specific implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.”

Summary of Data and Interpretation

MU began the TWS as pilot studies from 2001-2003. The number of candidates increased from as few as five to an entire section in Fall 2003 and currently all Professional Block and student teachers. The TWS is scored formatively during Professional Block; the candidates are provided guidance and feedback throughout the process. The percentage of undergraduates reaching competency (score of 3) or better in Professional Block has increased from 68% to over 90% (97.5% in Fall 2003 and 91% in Spring 2004). Post baccalaureate candidates have increased from 75% meeting competency to 100% in the last two

semesters. Post baccalaureate candidates tended to score slightly higher in most subcategories. It should be noted that the number of post baccalaureate candidates ranged from four to fourteen (Attachment J).

During the initiation of the pilot studies, it became apparent that our candidates did not have a strong understanding of assessment, analysis of student learning, and use of contextual factors to modify instruction for students with special needs. TWS scores reflect the intensive mentoring that occurred during Spring and Fall of 2003. TWS subcategories with the greatest improvement were use of contextual factors and reflection/self-evaluation. Improvement was also noted in designing an assessment plan and analysis of student learning. Increasing scores reflect changes in the elementary program that better prepare our candidates to focus on student needs and student learning. Components of the TWS were incorporated into the assignments of many courses in the education program and a course on classroom assessment was developed and mandated for all students entering the program in fall 2003. In Spring 2004, candidates in Professional Block required significantly less guidance. Details of changes to the program are explained Section V.

Scores for student teachers have also increased as well as the percentage of candidates meeting competency. Student teachers are encouraged to complete the TWS with a minimum of supervisor assistance. In the fall of 2003, 85% of undergraduate candidates attained satisfactory level or better with 54% achieving competency. Scores increased in Spring 2004 to 100% scoring satisfactorily or above -- 94% at the competency or outstanding level. The range in mean scores in the subcategories has narrowed, indicating that candidates are better able to plan, assess, and analyze student learning.

Post baccalaureate candidates have also improved, although one must be cautious when interpreting scores with a low sample such as four in Fall 2003. One hundred percent of the post baccalaureate candidates achieved competency or outstanding ratings in Spring 2004. Means for the subcategories are comparable to those of the undergraduate candidates. Scores for TWS are reflective of the overall student teaching scores and licensure test scores for undergraduate and post baccalaureate candidates.