CANDIDATE WORK SAMPLE

ASSIGNMENT INSTRUCTIONS AND RUBRIC

PURPOSE: The purpose of the Candidate Work Sample is **to provide evidence of your teaching and how it impacts student learning**. In particular, It is intended to demonstrate your ability to analyze background information about learners, plan instruction appropriately to meet the needs of all learners, adapt instruction appropriately to meet the needs of all learners, create and administer formative and summative assessments (i.e., pre-assessment, formative checks of learning, and post- or summative assessment), and use assessment data to determine the impact on student learning. Using an authentic unit or a series of lessons (3-5 lessons over a period of time in one subject area or one class period), you will reflect on the outcomes of the lessons you taught, analyzing the impact that planning and teaching these specific lessons had on student learning as evidenced through the analysis of the assessment results. This reflective practice will be analyzed during your student teaching experience, however, it should be used throughout your career to maximize student learning. This process will create a habit of mind that you, as an educator, will use in your own teaching practice to deliver quality relevant instruction and to grow professionally! The reflective analysis required of this task is an expectation of you as a professional educator and a demonstration of your commitment to your students to ensure learning.

- Keep in mind that the work you produce is a reflection of your work ethic and the professional skills, attitudes, and content and dispositional knowledge you have obtained during your pre-service career.
- Because you will share authentic experiences within the Candidate Work Sample document, maintaining anonymity is critical and required. For ease of reporting, you may include first names of students ONLY. The use of fictitious names is permitted; however, this must be noted somewhere within the document.

Overall Expectation: All Candidates must pass the Candidate Work Sample as per the Student Teaching course syllabus**.** A **passing** result for the Candidate Work Sample is demonstrated by scoring an average of a "2" with no more than one "1" and no "0's" in any indicator of each of the four (4) Parts. **Candidates must communicate with their CWS Evaluator for due dates and resubmissions; you are allowed multiple attempts**. If the results do not meet the minimum scoring criteria by the final due date, you will be referred to your program for remediation, advisement and next steps. **Reminder:** This is **one** of the course requirements for the student teaching course. Student Teaching is a pass/fail course which means all requirements must meet minimum expectations to earn a passing grade for the course.

Paper Criteria and Format: The CWS work is to be completed in four (4) parts and each part is scored with the aligned rubric (see below). You must pass each part before moving on to the next; it is important to read all instructions and expectations for each part. You will use the instruction documents to complete your work along with the addition and creation of information. Be organized and focused in your writing. ***Rambling will get you nowhere but a returned assignment for a redo!*** Refer to the **examples** in the CWS Resources link in BbLearn.

Your work is expected to demonstrate a strong command of writing conventions/mechanics with little to no errors (refer to Indicator 19 on each rubric). Editing **must** be sought by an outside resource with all documents having been edited prior to submission. Assignments submitted with obvious writing errors will be returned without scoring to be edited by an outside source. Your CWS evaluator is not your editor!

The NAU Writing Center is available to assist you with your writing. The writing center at NAU is committed to providing students with personalized writing instruction. The Center focuses on making students better writers rather than just trying to catch little spelling and grammar errors. When contacting the writing center, provide any writing that you've produced for your assignment along with any instructions/rubrics/prompts that your instructor gave you in class. At your appointment, your tutor will look at your progress and help you in moving onto the next step in producing a strong piece of writing. Click here for Online Tutoring information or contact: Writing.Workshop@nau.edu

Submitting Parts: Each part of the paper **must** be **proofread** and modified prior to submitting for evaluation from the CWS Evaluator. Each Part has a rubric that is aligned with the instructions; make sure you reference the rubric while you are writing to ensure you're including the required content. Revisit the rubric before submission. Along with content indicators for each rubric, there is also a writing/conventions indicator.

Submit each Part into the appropriate assignment link within BbLearn:

CRITERIA	DUE DATES	PTS POSSIBLE	MINIMUM PTS NEEDED
• Part I/Section 1 - Indicator 1*	end of week 2	6	4
• Part II/Section 2 – Indicators 2-3*	end of week 5	9	6
o You must score a 6 for Parts a & b			
• Part III/Sections 3 & 4 – Indicators 4-13*	end of week 10	33	22
• Part IV/Sections 5 & 6 – Indicators 14-18*	end of week 12	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>
*all Parts include Indicator 19			
TOTALS		**66**	**44**

Evaluation of each Part: The rubric is aligned with the objectives for each section. Read through the rubric as you prepare for each Part to best understand the specific information. **Use the rubric as your guide to prepare for each Part of the CWS**.

Your CWS Evaluator will complete an evaluation through Qualtrics. You will receive the results in your NAU email once the evaluator has completed the evaluation. You **must** open and read the completed rubric to know if you met the expectations. If you did not score an average of a "2" with no more than one "1" in any indicator and no "0's" in each of the four Parts, you must modify and resubmit in a timely manner (working with your CWS Evaluator for due dates). You will also need to review the "feedback" for each Part in BbLearn. Reading the feedback will help you better understand your results should you need to redo and resubmit. **You must earn a passing score as an expectation within the student teaching course requirements.**

Levels of Development: There are four levels of development for a pre-service teacher candidate. The expectation is that a candidate demonstrates a consistent level of development denoted by an overall "2" average with no more than one "1" in each rubric Part. No "0's" on any indicator in each of the four Parts is acceptable. If you earn a "0" on any indicator on your first attempt, you must seek assistance and revise for resubmission. . If the results do not meet the minimum scoring criteria, you will be referred to your program for remediation and advisement. You will be required to work with your program to determine the next steps.

"0" **Does Not Meet Criteria** Candidate does not provide information associated with indicator.

"1" **Developing** Candidate relies on external feedback and input to guide practice of planning, teaching, assessing, and analyzing student learning. Candidate struggles with integrating theory to the practice of teaching.

"2" **Meeting** Candidate demonstrates initiative to intentionally plan, teach, assess, and analyze student learning. Candidate demonstrates an understanding of integrating theory to practice to impact student learning.

"3" **Exceeding** Candidate demonstrates confidence in planning, teaching, assessing, and analyzing student learning. Candidate provides evidence of integrating theory to practice leading to a positive impact on student learning. Candidate demonstrates a uniquely innovating level of practice, student engagement and learning.

Getting Started: Respond to your CWS Evaluator message through the Candidate Work Sample course (email within the course) within the **first week** of your CWS experience. Provide them with the following information:

1. Subject Line: INTRODUCTION
2. State your name, your cooperating teacher's name, grade level, content for the CWS (i.e. Math, Biology, etc.)
3. Start and end dates of the experience. If you are in 2 placements, provide the start and end dates for CWS work (see info below).
4. Note the "**Due by end of Week x**" in the upper right corner of each Part, provide the anticipated due date for Part I and plan for Part II with your CWS evaluator.

Guidelines for completing the CWS: If you are a College of Education, Music, or PE major, you will need to work within these guidelines.

o **Elementary and Special Education dual majors complete** one **assignment during the special education placement.**
o **Early Childhood majors complete** one **assignment during the elementary placement.**
o **ECI 576 Master's Candidates complete** one **assignment during their student teaching experience.**
o **TIPP Candidates complete** one **assignment during their final semester of their student teaching experience.**
o **Music majors will communicate with their CWS evaluator for "best" placement option.**
o **PE majors will complete the CWS during the 1ˢᵗ placement.**

Part I/Section 1: - Indicator 1

Part I/Section 1: Identification of Learning/Learner Characteristics Indicators 1, 19

Section 1 is intended to capture the background information of the students in your classroom. Below is a list of questions that should be completed with your cooperating teacher within the first two weeks of the CWS experience. The responses to the questions will provide the information necessary to complete Part I. Part I must be submitted in BbLearn by the end of **Week 2** of your CWS experience. In collaboration with your cooperating teacher, describe the community, school, class, and students. Then, describe how these demographics will influence your planning, teaching, and student learning.

Address the following ideas in this section:
- Provide an overall picture of your community, school, and grade level team that might affect student learning (e.g., social, economic, grade-level team cohesiveness).
- What specific needs in your classroom, or chosen student population, related to learner development and differences are present in your class, and how might those needs affect student learning (i.e., diversity, Special Education IEPs, 504s, ESL students, gifted program students, remedial class)? (**Note:** Do **not** use student names)
- What characteristics beyond the classroom may impact student learning (e.g., family social situations/issues, available family support for learning, gang involvement, students' access to technology at home)?
- What resources and technology are available to you in your classroom that you might be able to integrate into your chosen content area for your paper? Do your students have access to technology at home?
- How you would take the initiative to identify, locate, and integrate technology in a future instructional setting if not available at this time?
- How are technology tools used to *measure* student learning in your classroom? Give examples to support your claims.
- How is technology used to *support* student learning in your classroom? Give examples to support your claims.

EVALUATION - Part I/Section 1: Identification of Learning/Learner Characteristics Indicators 1, 19

InTASC Standards 1, 7

Indicators	Exceeds = 3	Meets = 2	Developing = 1	Does Not Meet Criteria = 0
1. Identification of information about the learning-teaching context including details about the community, school, class, and individual students. (InTASC 1h; 1k)	The candidate identified **all** the demographic information and "real" knowledge (i.e., beyond what is published on the district's website) of the community, school, class, individual students, and students' family life. (Examples regarding family life: Will students be able to complete homework? Are parents supportive and	The candidate identified **some** of the demographic information and "real" knowledge (i.e., beyond what is published on the district's website) of the community, school, class, and individual students.	The candidate identified **limited** demographic information about the community and listed the name of the school.	The candidate did not provide any demographic information of the community, school, class, and individual students.

involved? Are there family situations that could impact learning?) The candidate considered the learning-teaching context to describe how to integrate technology and how the candidate would take initiative to identify, locate, and integrate technology in a future instructional setting.			

Writing Quality – Rubric row 19 – Indicator included in all sections for assignment submissions

The candidate **must** present proper English usage, including correct grammar, spelling, and syntax, when writing the assignment.
- Correct use of grammar
- Correct use of spelling and mechanics
- Writing and flow convey intended meaning

EVALUATION – Writing Quality – Included in all sections for assignment submissions

The candidate follows proper English usage, including correct grammar, spelling, and syntax, in writing the narrative. In addition to following these criteria, graduate students also properly format the narrative adhering to program expectations for style conventions as accepted by the profession.

Indicator	Exceeds = 3	Meets = 2	Developing = 1	Does Not Meet Criteria = 0
19. Writing • *Correct use of grammar* • *Correct use of spelling and mechanics* • *Writing and flow convey intended meaning.*	**Very few or no patterns** of grammatical, spelling, and/or mechanical errors. The candidate's writing articulates ideas elaborately with no interference to meaning.	**Some patterns** of grammatical, spelling, and/or mechanical errors. The candidate's writing articulates ideas with no interference to meaning.	**Many patterns** of grammatical, spelling, and/or mechanical errors which interferes with meaning. The candidate's writing is developing at this stage.	The candidate's writing is unacceptable at this stage because there are too many errors in syntax and/or mechanics that significantly interferes with meaning.
Number of "1's" for Part I:				
My Average Score for Part I out of 6 points possible: • Must score at least **4** points				

Part II/Section 2: Indicators 2, 3, 19

Section 2: – Evaluation of Prior Knowledge/Skills - Indicators 2, 3

NOTE: The pre-assessment instrument must also be used as the post-assessment. The pre-assessment must will be administered prior to the delivery of any lessons for this unit**.** The results of the pre-assessment should guide your lesson planning. The post-assessment must be administered at the end of the unit/lessons.

Identify the *AZ Career and College Readiness Standards* (Arizona Department of Education, 2014) and/or other content-specific standards and learning objectives. Discuss the connection between the selected standards and objectives to the class curriculum plan. Then, discuss how the pre-assessment you created, selected, or adapted was aligned to the targeted objectives, and describe why the pre-assessment process you chose was appropriate for the targeted students (e.g., the grade level of your students, the difficulty of your chosen assessment for your students).

To be considered quality measures, your pre/post-assessment and other formative assessments you give during your instruction **must:**
- Be your own, original creation, unless approved by your University Supervisor;
- Have measurable criteria to demonstrate learning occurred (e.g., learning objectives that are assessed explicitly through assessment items); **KWL Charts** are **not** an appropriate assessment for this unit
- Be aligned to the learning objectives, state and national standards (when applicable) of your unit of instruction;
- Assess only what your students have learned during your unit of instruction; and
- Provide clear and unambiguous instructions to your students of what they are expected to do.

HINT: Generally, your assessments should **not** be too lengthy; instead, they should have a very specific focus so you can analyze and interpret the results more meaningfully. If you create, select, or adapt a *performance assessment*, or write production-based items (e.g., portfolio, short essay, creative written product, assessment of speaking, art product, musical performance), you must also include a **scoring rubric** of how you will grade students' responses.

EVALUATION - Section 2: Evaluation of Prior Knowledge/Skills - Indicators 2, 3, 19

InTASC Standards 1, 7

Indicators	Exceeds = 3	Meets = 2	Developing = 1	Does Not Meet Criteria = 0
2. Listing and discussion of significant, challenging, varied, and appropriate standards/objectives based on class or grade level curriculum plan that demonstrates they	The candidate listed standards/objectives that included **extremely clear** evidence of collaboration with the Cooperating Teacher to ensure the objectives were aligned to the overall class or grade level curriculum plan.

The candidate provided | The candidate listed standards/objectives that included **somewhat clear** evidence of collaboration with the Cooperating Teacher to ensure the objectives were aligned to the overall class or grade level curriculum plan.

The candidate provided **somewhat clear** evidence that the timing of | The candidate listed standards/objectives, but the candidate provided **vaguely clear** evidence that the objectives were aligned to the class or grade level curriculum plan.

The candidate provided | The candidate did not list or discuss any standards and/or objectives. |

were chosen in collaboration with Cooperating Teacher. (InTASC 7g)	**extremely clear** evidence that the timing of instruction was appropriate in relation to the overall class or grade level curriculum plan. The candidate **always** noted sources of standards/objectives. (Examples of sources: AZ Career & College Readiness Standards, NETS*Students, Next Generation Science Standards, International Society for Technology Education (ITSE) Standards for Students).	instruction was appropriate in relation to the overall class or grade level curriculum plan. The candidate **sometimes** noted the source of standards/objectives. (Examples of sources: AZ Career & College Readiness Standards, NETS*Students, Next Generation Science Standards, International Society for Technology Education (ITSE) Standards for Students).	**vaguely clear** evidence that the timing of instruction was appropriate in relation to the overall class or grade level curriculum plan. The candidate **seldom** noted the source of standards/objectives.	
3. Description of pre/post assessment (including evidence of how the assessments are good measures), and how they are explicitly aligned to selected learning standards/objectives. (InTASC 1a)	The candidate presented and described **multiple examples** of evidence that the pre- and post-assessments designed by the candidate were good measures and they were aligned to selected learning objectives and standards.	The candidate presented and described **some examples** of evidence that the pre- and post-assessments designed by the candidate were good measures and they were aligned to selected learning objectives and standards.	The candidate presented and described **a few examples** of evidence that the pre- and post-assessments designed by the candidate were good measures and they were aligned to selected learning objectives and standards.	The candidate did not include a pre- or post-assessment instrument.

Writing Quality – Rubric row 19 – Indicator included in all sections for assignment submissions
The candidate **must** present proper English usage, including correct grammar, spelling, and syntax, when writing the assignment. • Correct use of grammar • Correct use of spelling and mechanics • Writing and flow convey intended meaning
EVALUATION – Writing Quality – Included in all sections for assignment submissions
The candidate follows proper English usage, including correct grammar, spelling, and syntax, in writing the narrative. In addition to following these criteria, graduate students also properly format the narrative adhering to program expectations for style conventions as accepted by the profession.

Indicator	Exceeds = 3	Meets = 2	Developing = 1	Does Not Meet Criteria = 0
19. Writing • *Correct use of grammar* • *Correct use of spelling and mechanics* • *Writing and flow convey intended meaning.*	**Very few or no patterns** of grammatical, spelling, and/or mechanical errors. The candidate's writing articulates ideas elaborately with no interference to meaning.	**Some patterns** of grammatical, spelling, and/or mechanical errors. The candidate's writing articulates ideas with no interference to meaning.	**Many patterns** of grammatical, spelling, and/or mechanical errors which interferes with meaning. The candidate's writing is developing at this stage.	The candidate's writing is unacceptable at this stage because there are too many errors in syntax and/or mechanics that significantly interferes with meaning.
Number of "1's" for Part II:				
My Average Score for Part II out of 9 points possible: • Must score at least **6** points				

Part III(a) and Part III(b)/Sections 3-4: Indicators 4 – 13, 19

Section 3: Planning Instruction – Indicators 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

After you have collected the pre-assessment results, begin the process of creating Day 1 Lesson Plan. You will submit this lesson plan at least 72 hours prior to the first day of the CWS instruction and before moving on to planning the subsequent days.

A **Lesson Plan Template** is provided within the BbLearn Candidate Work Sample course. Complete and submit a minimum of 3 lesson plans (5 maximum) for the CWS unit of instruction.

- What **specific** implications for instruction and assessment were based on **both** individual **student needs** and **pre-assessment data**? How did you **adjust instruction** (i.e., adaptations/differentiation) throughout your unit or series of lessons to meet the needs of **all** learners? How did you modify your instruction to your school or classroom setting?
- How were standards/objectives, formative assessment(s) (i.e., checks for learning), and instruction **aligned**?
- How was instruction **sequenced** to directly support the lesson objectives and to accommodate the levels of knowledge/skill determined through the pre-assessment and formative assessment(s)?
- How was **technology integrated** to meet unit standards/outcomes?

HINT: If no or limited technology was available, how could technology be used with future implementations of this unit to support student learning and/or your teaching?

EVALUATION – Section 3: Planning Instruction - Indicators 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 19

InTASC Standards 3, 4, 5, and 7– Categories I, II, and III

Indicators	Exceeds = 3	Meets = 2	Developing = 1	Does Not Meet Criteria = 0
4. Listing of standard/objective and instructional strategies and assessment for each instructional day and each lesson plan. *[Attributes: Clarity and Accuracy of alignment to Instruction and Assessment]* (InTASC 4n)	The candidate's presentation of standards and objectives was **extremely clear**. The standards and objectives were **clearly** aligned to instruction and assessments selected by the candidate.	The candidate's presentation of standards and objectives was **somewhat clear**. The alignment of standards and objectives were **somewhat clearly** aligned to instruction and assessments selected by the candidate.	The candidate's presentation of standards and objectives was **vaguely clear**. The alignment of standards and objectives were **vaguely** aligned to instruction and assessments selected by the candidate.	The candidate **did not** list or align any standards, objectives, or instructional strategies.
5. Identification of	The candidate's narrative was	The candidate's narrative was	The candidate's narrative was	The candidate did not identify

specific implications for selection of instructional strategies based on information about learning characteristics and results from pre-assessment. *[Attribute: Breadth]* (InTASC 7d)	**extremely** detailed about how information about learning/ learner characteristics and results from pre-assessment impacted the selection of instructional strategies, adaptations, or differentiation strategies to meet the needs of ALL learners (e.g., ELL, special needs, and students with high scores on pre-assessment); and how to revise learning objectives and/or instruction after evaluating pre-assessment data to meet the challenges of remediation and enrichment.	**somewhat** detailed about how information about learning/ learner characteristics and results from pre-assessment impacted the selection of instructional strategies, adaptations, or differentiation strategies to meet the needs of ALL learners (e.g., ELL, special needs, and students with high scores on pre-assessment); and how to revise learning objectives and/or instruction after evaluating pre-assessment data to meet the challenges of remediation and enrichment.	**vaguely** detailed about how information about learning/ learner characteristics and results from pre-assessment impacted the selection of instructional strategies, adaptations, or differentiation strategies to meet the needs of ALL learners (e.g., ELL, special needs, and students with high scores on pre-assessment); and how to revise learning objectives and/or instruction after evaluating pre-assessment data to meet the challenges of remediation and enrichment.	specific implications or strategies for selecting instructional strategies based on information about learning characteristics and results from pre-assessment.
6. Discussion of instructional strategies that demonstrates they were intentionally selected to foster active engagement, self-motivation, positive social engagement, and collaboration. *[Attributes: Breadth and Meaningfulness of differentiation of instruction]* (InTASC 3d)	The candidate's narrative was **extremely** detailed about how instructional strategies fostered active student engagement and increased student self-motivation, positive social engagement, and collaboration. The candidate's narrative described differentiation of instruction that **meaningfully** promoted active student engagement for a variety of student abilities.	The candidate's narrative was **somewhat** detailed about how instructional strategies fostered active student engagement and increased student self-motivation, positive social engagement, and collaboration. The candidate's narrative described differentiation of instruction that **somewhat meaningfully** promoted active student engagement for a variety of student abilities.	The candidate's narrative was **vaguely** detailed about how instructional strategies fostered active student engagement, increased student self-motivation and positive social engagement, or fostered collaboration. The candidate's narrative described differentiation of instruction that did **not meaningfully** promote active student engagement for a variety of student abilities.	The candidate did not discuss the use of instructional strategies to foster active student engagement.
7. Discussion of sequencing (or scaffolding) of instruction within	The candidate **appropriately** sequenced or scaffolded learning tasks to match the level of knowledge and skills	The candidate **somewhat appropriately** sequenced or scaffolded learning tasks to match the level of knowledge and skills	The candidate did **not appropriately** sequence or scaffold learning tasks to match the level of knowledge and	The candidate provided no evidence of sequencing of instruction.

lesson plans. *[Attributes: Breadth and Appropriateness of sequencing or scaffolding of instruction]* (InTASC 7c)	determined through pre-assessment and formative assessment data. The candidate's intentional selection, organization, and sequence of instructional tasks **always** allows learners to practice, review, and master learning.	determined through pre-assessment and formative assessment data. The candidate's intentional selection, organization, and sequence of instructional tasks **sometimes** allows learners to practice, review, and master learning.	skills determined through pre-assessment and formative assessment data. The candidate's intentional selection, organization, and sequence of instructional tasks **seldom** allows learners to practice, review, and master learning.	
8. Discussion of instructional technology strategies that demonstrates they were intentionally selected to address content standards/objectives. *[Attribute: Breadth]* (InTASC 5l)	The candidate's initiative to locate a variety of appropriate technology resources for instruction was **extremely** apparent. The candidate's narrative addressed **in much detail** how technology was selected and integrated to address content standards/ objectives and promote critical thinking and problem solving, and/or described potential integration of technology for future implementations of lesson.	The candidate's initiative to locate a variety of appropriate technology resources for instruction was **somewhat** apparent. The candidate's narrative addressed **in some detail** how technology was selected and integrated to address content standards/ objectives and promote critical thinking and problem solving.	The candidate's initiative to locate a variety of appropriate technology resources for instruction was **vaguely** apparent. The candidate's narrative addressed **in limited detail** how technology was selected and integrated to address content standards/ objectives and promote critical thinking and problem solving.	The candidate did not discuss the use of instructional technology strategies.

Part III/Section 4: Instructional Decisions: Monitoring & Adjusting (InTASC Standards 2, 3, 6, 8) – Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, 13

For each lesson, discuss/reflect on how each lesson was taught, the knowledge/skill of the students, the effectiveness of the instruction, how adaptations/differentiations were applied, and an overall reflection on your thought processes during the lesson.

HINT: After each lesson is taught, complete the reflections on each lesson plan. Review those reflections, and summarize the instructional decisions made while teaching the lessons and report on that information within this section.

Narrative should include:
- Which forms of instruction were effective or not effective and why?
- Which instructional technology strategies were effective or not effective and why?
- How you taught/met student learning needs throughout each lesson?
- How did you use the formative assessment data results to monitor and adjust instruction, if necessary?
- What adjustments did you make based on Cooperating Teacher or student feedback? Student cues? Your own observations of your teaching?

EVALUATION - Section 4: Instructional Decisions: Monitoring & Adjusting - Indicators 9 – 14, 19

InTASC Standards 2, 3, 6 and 8 – Categories I and III

Indicators	Exceeds = 3	Meets = 2	Developing = 1	Does Not Meet Criteria = 0
9. Reflection of instructional content in terms of being the appropriate level of complexity for students that encourages the development of critical thinking and problem solving. *[Attributes: Breadth and Relevance]* (InTASC 8f)	The candidate provided **multiple relevant** reflections on the delivery of instructional content to effectively reach different levels of learning represented in the classroom; create a variety of learning tasks that connected knowledge to meaningful, real-world applications; and foster critical thinking and problem solving skills.	The candidate provided **some relevant** reflections on the delivery of instructional content to effectively reach different levels of learning represented in the classroom; create a variety of learning tasks that connected knowledge to meaningful, real-world applications; and foster critical thinking and problem solving skills.	The candidate provided a **few relevant** reflections on the delivery of instructional content to effectively reach different levels of learning represented in the classroom; create a variety of learning tasks that connected knowledge to meaningful, real-world applications; and foster critical thinking and problem solving skills.	The candidate did not evaluate the use of instructional content.
10. Reflection of instructional strategies in relation to content and	The candidate provided **multiple relevant** reflections on the use of instructional strategies to promote learner	The candidate provided **some relevant** reflections on the use of instructional strategies to promote learner development and active	The candidate provided a **few relevant** reflections on the use of instructional strategies to promote learner development	The candidate did not evaluate the use of instructional strategies in relation to content and

learner development that promote active student engagement. *[Attributes: Breadth and Relevance]* (InTASC 3i; 3j)	development and active engagement in the learning process through the use of strategies that support autonomous learning, leadership, and collaboration in the classroom; motivating students to adopt new learning strategies; and motivating students to build skills for outside the classroom.	engagement in the learning process through the use of strategies that support autonomous learning, leadership, and collaboration in the classroom; motivating students to adopt new learning strategies; and motivating students to build skills for outside the classroom.	and active engagement. Content was delivered in a **rigid, unchanging format**, providing **few** opportunities for student engagement, and offering no real potential for student growth or change.	learner development.
11. Reflection of application of adaptations/ differentiation by student groupings or individual students. *[Attributes: Breadth and Relevance]* (InTASC 2g)	The candidate provided **multiple relevant** reflections on the use of adaptations and differentiation by student groupings and individual students. The candidate's discussion of the effectiveness or challenges of the selected strategies was **consistently** relevant.	The candidate provided **some relevant** reflections on the use of adaptations and differentiation by student groupings and individual students. The candidate's discussion of the effectiveness or challenges of the selected strategies was **somewhat** relevant.	The candidate provided a **few relevant** reflections on the use of adaptations and differentiation by student groupings and individual students. The candidate's discussion of the effectiveness or challenges of the selected strategies was **vaguely** relevant.	The candidate did not evaluate the use of adaptation or differentiation of instruction.
12. Reflection of the integration of instructional technology strategies, tools, and applications. *[Attributes: Breadth and Relevance]* (InTASC 8g; 8o)	The candidate described **in much detail** how the use of instructional technology in the classroom **advanced** the lesson, promoted student learning, and encouraged student use of relevant learning tools.	The candidate described **in some detail** how the use of instructional technology in the classroom **supported** the lesson, promoted student learning, and provided students with the opportunity to use learning tools.	The candidate discussed **in limited detail** how the use of instructional technology strategies, tools, and applications were integrated into instruction.	The candidate did not evaluate how the use of instructional technology strategies, tools, or applications were integrated into instruction.
13. Use of formative assessment data to monitor learning and adjust instruction, if necessary. *[Attributes: Breadth*	The candidate described **multiple and relevant** ways of how instruction was adjusted based on formative assessment data (e.g., results of in-class tests, quizzes, and checks for	The candidate described **some relevant** ways of how instruction was adjusted based on formative assessment data (e.g., results of in-class tests, quizzes, and checks for comprehension).	The candidate described **few and vaguely relevant** ways of how instruction was adjusted based on formative assessment data (e.g., results of in-class tests, quizzes, and checks for	The candidate did not use formative assessment data to check for learning or adjust instruction.

and Relevance] (InTASC 6a; 6c; 6g)	comprehension).		comprehension).	

Writing Quality – Rubric row 19 – Indicator included in all sections for assignment submissions

The candidate **must** present proper English usage, including correct grammar, spelling, and syntax, when writing the assignment.
- Correct use of grammar
- Correct use of spelling and mechanics
- Writing and flow convey intended meaning

EVALUATION – Writing Quality – Included in all sections for assignment submissions

The candidate follows proper English usage, including correct grammar, spelling, and syntax, in writing the narrative. In addition to following these criteria, graduate students also properly format the narrative adhering to program expectations for style conventions as accepted by the profession.

Indicator	Exceeds = 3	Meets = 2	Developing = 1	Does Not Meet Criteria = 0
19. Writing - *Correct use of grammar* - *Correct use of spelling and mechanics* - *Writing and flow convey intended meaning.*	**Very few or no patterns** of grammatical, spelling, and/or mechanical errors. The candidate's writing articulates ideas elaborately with no interference to meaning.	**Some patterns** of grammatical, spelling, and/or mechanical errors. The candidate's writing articulates ideas with no interference to meaning.	**Many patterns** of grammatical, spelling, and/or mechanical errors which interferes with meaning. The candidate's writing is developing at this stage.	The candidate's writing is unacceptable at this stage because there are too many errors in syntax and/or mechanics that significantly interferes with meaning.

Number of "1's" for Part III:

My Average Score for Part III(b) out of 21 points possible:
- Must score at least **12** points

Part IV/Sections 5 & 6: Indicators 14 – 18, 19

Section 5: Assessment Data & Analysis (InTASC Standard 6) – Indicators 14, 15, 16

Compare, analyze and interpret the results from the pre and post assessments in table format. Then, reflect on the instructional process.

Analysis should include:
- A table that **must** include the **students' scores (pre and post)** and **average class scores for each test question**
  - **could** include charts and graphs that are accurately labeled with titles, xy axis identifiers, and a meaningful representation of the data
- A discussion that effectively communicates **results by standards and objectives**, identifying which **pre/post assessment questions or performance tasks** were students **more or less successful** with completing
- An interpretation of **data** in terms of the **students' growth/learning/achievement** that **must** include:
  - Learners **attainment** of standards and objectives
  - Levels of **achievement** for all learners
  - Interpretations of the **variations** in student achievement

HINT: Gifted and Special Populations along with Demographic Comparisons could help to make sense of varied results.

EVAULATION – Section 5: Assessment Data & Analysis – Indicators 14, 15, 16, 19

InTASC Standard 6 – Category III

Indicators	Exceeds = 3	Meets = 2	Developing = 1	Does Not Meet Criteria = 0
14. Display of assessment data communicates learning results for the class as a whole. *[Attribute: Breadth]* (InTASC 6l)	The candidate reported **all** class assessment data (i.e., all assessment data collected, pre/post and formative assessments) using graphical displays and data tables to visually communicate learning results (i.e., charts, bar graphs, titles, labels, meaningful representation).	The candidate reported **some** class assessment data (i.e., basic Pre/Post Assessment data) to communicate learning results for class (e.g., class average scores, individual student scores) in data tables.	The candidate reported **limited** Assessment data (i.e., only some of the data collected) in terms of communicating learning results for class.	The candidate did not report assessment data.
15. **Analysis of assessment results:** Discussion communicates results by standard/ objective, including which pre/post	The candidate analyzed and communicated which assessment results demonstrated that specific objectives were met by identifying **all** the questions or performance tasks that	The candidate analyzed and communicated how the assessment results met the standards/objectives by identifying **some** questions or performance tasks that students were more or less successful in completing.	The candidate analyzed or communicated how assessments results performed by standard/objective by identifying **few** questions or performance tasks that students were more or less	The candidate did not communicate standard/ objective level assessment results.

assessment questions or performance tasks students were more or less successful with completing**.** *[Attribute: Breadth]* (InTASC 6l)	students were more or less successful with completing.		successful with completing.
16. **Interpretation of assessment results** in terms of growth/ learning/ achievement. *[Attribute: Clarity]* (InTASC 6c)	Based on the analysis of assessment results, the candidate's interpretations of learning was **extremely** clear. The candidate demonstrated this by considering learners' attainment of standards/objectives; discussing levels of achievement for all learners (including, for example, special populations of learners); discussing extended achievement in relation to standards/objectives of students who excelled on the pre-assessment; and describing possible reasons for the variation in student achievement.	Based on the analysis of assessment results, the candidate's interpretations of learning was **somewhat** clear. The candidate demonstrated this by considering learners' attainment of standards/objectives; discussing levels of achievement for all learners (including, for example, special populations of learners); and describing possible reasons for the variation in student achievement.	Based on the analysis of assessment results, the candidate's interpretations of learning was **vaguely** clear. The candidate demonstrated this by considering learners' attainment of standards/objectives. The candidate conducted a **limited** reflection of previous learning, which resulted in few changes to instructional delivery.	The candidate did not summarize assessment results in terms of growth or learning achievement.

Part IV/Section 6: Reflections on the Overall Unit: Implications for the Future (InTASC Standards 9, 10) – Indicators 17, 18

Reflect on the instructional process and how the students' results will help improve your teaching performance. Use examples from your student teaching experience and the delivery (during and after) of this unit to support your reflection.
- What **impact** or **value** does your unit plan/series of lessons have on the overall **achievement** of your student learners?
- What **conversations** have you had with our mentor teacher, other colleagues, or other resources to **positively impact** all of your student learners?
- How could you **modify** your unit, lessons, or practice to **improve student learning**?
- Should other assessments or student learning data be considered?

HINT: Grades Earned, Scores on Individual Test Questions, Absenteeism, etc. could help with the reflection process and determining overall achievement.

EVALUATION – Section 6: Reflections on the Overall Unit: Implications for the Future – Indicators 17, 18, 19

InTASC Standards 9 and 10 – Category IV

Indicators	Exceeds = 3	Meets = 2	Developing = 1	Does Not Meet Criteria = 0
17. Reflection on advancing instruction to improve student learning. *[Attributes: Clarity and Meaningfulness]* (InTASC 9c; 9g)	The candidate's modification of instructional delivery of a unit or individual lessons to improve student learning, re-teaching content that proved unsuccessful was **extremely** clear and meaningful.	The candidate's modification of instructional delivery of a unit or individual lessons to improve student learning, re-teaching content that proved unsuccessful was **somewhat** clear and meaningful.	The candidate's modification of instructional delivery of a unit or individual lessons to improve student learning, re-teaching content that proved unsuccessful was **vaguely** clear and meaningful.	The candidate did not describe advancing instruction to improve the results of student learning.
18. Reflections regarding connection between successful student learning and positive collaborative relationship with mentoring teacher, other school colleagues, families, community organizations or online resources. *[Attribute: Breadth]* (InTASC 9d; 10d; 10e)	The candidate connected personal experiences in the classroom that demonstrated the importance of establishing positive collaborative relationships with mentor teachers, school colleagues, families, and/or community organizations to support students.	The candidate described the importance of establishing positive collaborative relationships with mentor teachers, school colleagues, families, and/or community organizations to support students.	The candidate briefly described (or summarized) the importance of establishing positive collaborative relationships with mentor teachers, school colleagues, families, and/or community organizations to support students.	The candidate did not reflect on the importance of establishing positive collaborative relationships in the student teaching environment.

Writing Quality – Rubric row 19 – Indicator included in all sections for assignment submissions				

The candidate **must** present proper English usage, including correct grammar, spelling, and syntax, when writing the assignment.
- Correct use of grammar
- Correct use of spelling and mechanics
- Writing and flow convey intended meaning

EVALUATION – Writing Quality – Included in all sections for assignment submissions				

The candidate follows proper English usage, including correct grammar, spelling, and syntax, in writing the narrative. In addition to following these criteria, graduate students also properly format the narrative adhering to program expectations for style conventions as accepted by the profession.

Indicator	Exceeds = 3	Meets = 2	Developing = 1	Does Not Meet Criteria = 0
19. Writing • *Correct use of grammar* • *Correct use of spelling and mechanics* • *Writing and flow convey intended meaning.*	**Very few or no patterns** of grammatical, spelling, and/or mechanical errors. The candidate's writing articulates ideas elaborately with no interference to meaning.	**Some patterns** of grammatical, spelling, and/or mechanical errors. The candidate's writing articulates ideas with no interference to meaning.	**Many patterns** of grammatical, spelling, and/or mechanical errors which interferes with meaning. The candidate's writing is developing at this stage.	The candidate's writing is unacceptable at this stage because there are too many errors in syntax and/or mechanics that significantly interferes with meaning.
Number of "1's" for Part IV:				
My Average Score for Part IV out of 18 points possible: • Must score at least **12** points				

TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE: **66**

- Must score at least **44** points
- No more than one "1" in each Part
- No "0" scores