

**Assurance of Student Learning
2019-2020**

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

School of Teacher Education

Middle Grades Education (579) (Shown on University Website as 5001)

Susan Keesy, Interim Director

Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.

Student Learning Outcome 1: Students will demonstrate the content knowledge and pedagogy necessary to be a teacher.

Instrument 1	Proprietary Assessment (Direct): Praxis II – PLT (Grades 5–9)
Instrument 2	Proprietary Assessment (Direct): Praxis II – Content Areas (Middle School English Language Arts and Middle School Social Studies)
Instrument 3	

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.	Met	Not Met
--	------------	----------------

Student Learning Outcome 2: Students will apply knowledge of content and pedagogy to teach effectively.

Instrument 1	Direct: CAEP Key Assessment 6: Design for Instruction (scored by rubric)
Instrument 2	Direct: CAEP Key Assessment 7: Teacher Work Sample (scored by rubric)
Instrument 3	

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.	Met	Not Met
--	------------	----------------

Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will analyze student learning using assessments.

Instrument 1	Direct: CAEP Key Assessment 5A: Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment (scored by rubric)
Instrument 2	Direct: CAEP Key Assessment 5B: Analysis of Student Learning (scored by rubric)
Instrument 3	

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.	Met	Not Met
--	------------	----------------

Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)

Course outcomes were examined in relation to each of the program learning outcomes.

Adjustments in course instruction have helped strengthen program goals and outcomes and are better preparing students for jobs as middle grades teachers. The following recommendations came out of this year's assessment:

- Establish a more consistent use of the rubrics to measure learning from the Key Assessment
 - Assess changes to individual courses to address weak indicators on these assessments

Program changes: For 2019-20, the department revisited all existing rubrics and scoring procedures to more consistently evaluate students across sections of courses.

Student Learning Outcome 1			
Student Learning Outcome	Students will demonstrate the content knowledge and pedagogy necessary to be a teacher.		
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT measure: Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Grades 5–9 This standardized test measures teacher candidates' knowledge of the foundation of teaching required of beginning educators. It is usually completed near the end of the undergraduate program to reflect pedagogical understanding gained through their educator preparation program. Teacher candidates must pass the PLT before teacher certification is granted by the state.		
Criteria for Student Success	The overall success rate for all students on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Grades 5 - 9 Exam will be no less than 95%, and on each Content Category (5 categories total), students will earn an average of at least 70% of the available points.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	<p>The 2019-2020 data show that there was a 89% success rate (N=18 with 16 students passing) on the Praxis PLT Grades 5 - 9 Exam. On each Content Category, the percentage target of 70% of available points was achieved on each of the content categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students as Learners -- 74% ● Instructional Process -- 78% ● Assessment -- 79% ● Professional Development, Leadership, and Community -- 79% ● Analysis of Instructional Scenarios -- 73% 	Percent of Program Achieving Target	<p>Met: 5 of the 5 content areas had at or above 70% success rate</p> <p>Not Met: 89% success rate on the exam with 95% being the target</p>

Commented [1]: Standardized exams such as the Praxis are excellent instruments to assess the mastery of subject matter for individual students. They can also provide insights for program assessment such as we are doing here. However, to be useful in program assessment, we will require access to a breakdown of how students perform on individual sub-components of the Praxis II exam that relate to the outcome which, in this case, is pedagogy. Even though the Praxis II PLT measures an individual student's overall mastery of pedagogy, pedagogy is a broad area. Some very important questions that must be answered to drive program improvement include (1) what are the different sub-components of pedagogy that students must master to be effective teachers? (2) how does the Praxis II PLT measure these sub-components? and (3) Do we have access to the Praxis II scores in these sub-component areas? I don't really know what the faculty would list as important sub-components of Praxis II PLT, nor do I know how these are tested on the exam. But, for example, let's assume there are ten such areas and that one of them is "lesson plan preparation." Further, assume that the Praxis II PLT has a certain number of questions that relate to lesson plan preparation. For program assessment it will be necessary to know what percentage of the points measuring "lesson plan preparation" that each of our students received on the Praxis II PLT. Otherwise, 95% of our students (our Program Success Target) may get an overall passing score on the Praxis II PLT. BUT all of them could score poorly on "lesson plan preparation." Without the sub-component scores, we would never know that lesson plan preparation is a weakness in our program because this fact will be masked by the overall pass rate. A more powerful way to write the target is "95% of students will pass the Praxis II PLT and in no individual sub-component area will the average score across students be less than XX% of the points available in that area."

Methods	Teacher candidates complete the PLT at an approved testing site. Proper identification is required and stringent testing protocol is followed. This is a timed, computer-based standardized test. It includes both grade- specific and general knowledge about teaching questions. Not all questions are scored as several are used for norming to develop future questions. Scores are reported directly to WKU.		
Measurement Instrument 2	DIRECT measure: Praxis Subject Assessments Teacher candidates must pass standardized subject assessments for all content areas they will be certified to teach. Certification does not occur until all assessments are passed. These exams are completed near the completion of the undergraduate program to ensure teacher candidates have the necessary content knowledge to successfully improve student learning outcomes.		
Criteria for Student Success	The overall success rate on each of the Praxis II Exams, Middle School English Language Arts and Middle School Social Studies, will be no less than 95%, and on each Content Category, students will earn an average of at least 70% of the available points.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	<p>95% success rate on each of the two exams; 70% of points available on each content category</p> <p>The 2019-2020 data show that there was a 65% success rate (N=20 with 13 students passing) on the Middle School English Language Arts exam. On each Content Category, the percentage target of 70% was achieved on 3 of the 4 categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reading - 77% ● Language Use and Vocabulary - 71% ● Writing, Speaking, and Listening - 76% ● English Language Arts 	Percent of Program Achieving Target	<p>Not Met: 65% success rate on the ELA exam with the target at 95% Not Met: 3 of the 4 content categories had a 70% or higher average percentage of points</p> <p>Not Met: 92% success rate on the SS exam with the target at 95% Not Met: 0 of the 6 content categories had a 70% or higher average percentage of points</p>

	<p>Instruction - 69%</p> <p>The 2019-2020 data also show that there was a 92% success rate (N=12 with 11 students passing) on the Middle School Social Studies exam. On each Content Category, the percentage target of 70% was not achieved on any category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● United States History - 60% ● World History - 66% ● Government/Civics - 59% ● Geography - 66% ● Economics - 63% ● Short Content Essays - 67% 		
Methods	Similar to the other Praxis exams, teacher candidates must complete the subject assessments at an approved testing site. Proper identification is required and stringent testing protocol is followed. These are timed, computer-based standardized tests. The middle school certification requirement includes subject assessments in each content area in which students are seeking certification.		
Measurement Instrument 3	N/A		
Criteria for Student Success	N/A		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	N/A	Percent of Program Achieving Target	N/A
Methods	N/A		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.		Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			

Professors in the Middle Grades Education program acknowledged the multiple times students are taking content area tests, especially in English language arts. MGE faculty have been more deliberate at talking about how best to prepare for these Praxis content area tests and explaining to the students the best semester to take the tests for a higher success rate.

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

The success rate for the ELA test improved by 3% while the SS test success rate improved 6% since the 2018-19 cycle. MGE professors would like students to be more successful the first time they take the Praxis content tests. Therefore, professors will provide test practice on the content area tests so students are more aware of test content.

Next Assessment Cycle Plan (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)

This outcome will be assessed again in one year (August, 2021). Praxis data for our students will be collected

Professors of the MGE 475 and MGE 481 courses will be responsible for helping to prepare students for the Praxis exams.

Student Learning Outcome 2

Student Learning Outcome	Students will apply knowledge of content and pedagogy to teach effectively.																											
Measurement Instrument 1	Direct: Key Assessment 6: Design for Instruction This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to design effective instruction based on pre-assessment results. They must use their knowledge of students, the classroom environment, teaching methods, and students' prior knowledge to determine the most effective strategy of instruction.																											
Criteria for Student Success	80% of students will score an average of 3 out of 4 on the Key Assessment rubric and on no individual rubric indicator will the average score across all students be less than 2.0 (4 indicators)																											
Program Success Target for this Measurement	80% of students will meet the criteria <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DI 2</td> <td>0%</td> <td>55% (6)</td> <td>45% (5)</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DI 3</td> <td>0%</td> <td>55% (6)</td> <td>45% (5)</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DI 4</td> <td>0%</td> <td>55% (6)</td> <td>45% (5)</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DI 5</td> <td>0%</td> <td>55% (6)</td> <td>45% (5)</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Average Scores: DI 2 - 2.45 DI 3 - 2.45 DI 4 - 2.45 DI 5 - 2.45		1	2	3	4	DI 2	0%	55% (6)	45% (5)	0%	DI 3	0%	55% (6)	45% (5)	0%	DI 4	0%	55% (6)	45% (5)	0%	DI 5	0%	55% (6)	45% (5)	0%	Percent of Program Achieving Target	Not Met: 45% (target of 80%) of students scored an average of 3 out of 4 on the Key Assessment rubric. Met: The average score of each of the 4 indicators was 2.45 (target 2.0).
	1	2	3	4																								
DI 2	0%	55% (6)	45% (5)	0%																								
DI 3	0%	55% (6)	45% (5)	0%																								
DI 4	0%	55% (6)	45% (5)	0%																								
DI 5	0%	55% (6)	45% (5)	0%																								
Methods	The data is collected each fall semester as part of the Practice Teacher Work Sample in MGE 475 and MGE 481. No results were reported from MGE 481. The number of students in MGE 475 for the 2019-20 academic year was 11. Based on faculty's ratings of students' Key Assessments, 5 students met the criteria.																											

Measurement Instrument 2	<p>Direct: Key Assessment 7: Teacher Work Sample</p> <p>This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to design a unit of instruction from beginning to end. They design a pre and post assessment, instructional strategies, lesson plans, describe and evaluate the learning context, differentiate for students' needs, use formative and summative assessments to evaluate student learning, analyze assessment data and reflect on their own practice as a teacher.</p>		
Criteria for Student Success	<p>Students must pass in order to receive teaching credentials. A passing score is an overall score of 2 (Developing) or higher out of 4 on the rubric.</p>		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	<p>95% of students will score no lower than an average of 2 out of 4 on the Key Assessment rubric and on no individual rubric dimension will the average score across all students be less than 2.0.</p> <p>Beginning (1) - 0 students Developing (2) - 1 student Proficient (3) - 9 students Exemplary (4) - 1 student</p> <p>Rubric Dimensions - Average Scores CF1 - 3.5 CF2 - 3.5 CF3 - 3.5 LG1 - 3.0 LG2 - 3.0 LG3 - 3.0 LG4 - 3.0 LG5 - 3.0 LG6 - 3.0 LG7 - 3.0 LG8 - 3.0 LG9 - 3.0 DI1 - 2.9 DI2 - 2.9 DI3 - 2.9</p>	Percent of Program Achieving Target	<p>Met: 100% of students scored no lower than an average of 2 out of 4 on the Key Assessment rubric (target of 95%)</p> <p>Met: No individual rubric dimension had an average score of less than 2.0.</p>

	DI4 - 2.9 DI5 - 2.9 ASL1 - 3.4 ASL2 - 3.4 ASL3 - 3.4 ASL4 - 3.4 ROT1 - 3.5 ROT2 - 3.5 ROT3 - 3.5		
Methods	This capstone project is a requirement of the EDU 489 course, which all students take during their student teaching semester, which is their final semester. The number of students for the 2019-20 academic year was 11.		
Measurement Instrument 3	N/A		
Criteria for Student Success	N/A		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	N/A	Percent of Program Achieving Target	N/A
Methods	N/A		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.		Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
Course outcomes were examined in relation to each of the program learning outcomes. For 2019-20, the department revisited all existing rubrics and scoring procedures to more consistently evaluate students across sections of courses.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
Based on results from previous assessments while using the instrument Key Assessment 6, more emphasis was given in the course MGE 475 to address students' understanding of each section of the assignment and rubric. Since the target was not met by all students, the focus going forward will be to strengthen the instruction surrounding the weakest indicators to move the majority of students from Beginning or Developing (1-2) to the Proficient (3) category. Data will be collected and scored for MGE 481 for Measurement Instrument 1 going forward.			
Next Assessment Cycle Plan (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)			
The data for Measurement Instrument 1 will be collected in the MGE 475 and MGE 481 courses at the end of the fall semester (December, 2020).			

The data for Measurement Instrument 2 will be collected in the EDU 489 course at the end of the spring semester (May, 2021).

Student Learning Outcome 3

Student Learning Outcome	Students will analyze student learning using assessments.
Measurement Instrument 1	<p>NOTE: Each student learning outcome should have at least one direct measure of student learning. Indirect measures are not required.</p> <p>Direct: Key Assessment 5A: Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment</p> <p>This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to set learning targets and design assessments that align to the content standards.</p>
Criteria for Student Success	80% of students will score an average of 3 out of 4 on the Key Assessment rubric and on no individual rubric indicator will the average score across all students be less than 2.0 (9 indicators)

Program Success Target for this Measurement	80% of students will meet the criteria					Percent of Program Achieving Target	<p>Not Met: 64% of students scored an average of 3 out of 4 on the Key Assessment rubric (target is 80%)</p> <p>Met: All individual rubric indicators have an average score of 2.0 or higher</p>
		1	2	3	4		
	LGA 1	0%	27%	73%	0%		
	LGA 2	0%	27%	73%	0%		
	LGA 3	0%	27%	73%	0%		
	LGA 4	0%	27%	73%	0%		
	LGA 5	0%	27%	73%	0%		
	LGA 6	0%	36%	64%	0%		

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>LGA 7</td> <td>0%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>64%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LGA 8</td> <td>0%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>64%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LGA 9</td> <td>0%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>64%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </table> <p>Average Scores: LGA1 - 2.7 LGA2 - 2.7 LGA3 - 2.7 LGA4 - 2.7 LGA5 - 2.7 LGA6 - 2.6 LGA7 - 2.6 LGA8 - 2.6 LGA9 - 2.6</p>	LGA 7	0%	36%	64%	0%	LGA 8	0%	36%	64%	0%	LGA 9	0%	36%	64%	0%		
LGA 7	0%	36%	64%	0%														
LGA 8	0%	36%	64%	0%														
LGA 9	0%	36%	64%	0%														
Methods	The data is collected each fall semester as part of the Practice Teacher Work Sample in MGE 475 and MGE 481. No results were reported from MGE 481. The number of students in MGE 475 for the 2019-20 academic year was 11. Based on faculty's ratings of students' Key Assessments, 7 students met the criteria.																	
Measurement Instrument 2	Direct: Key Assessment 5B: Analysis of Student Learning This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to analyze assessment data to measure student learning.																	
Criteria for Student Success	80 % of students will score an average of 3 out of 4 on the Key Assessment rubric and on no individual rubric indicator will the average score across all students be less than 2.0 (4 indicators)																	
Program Success Target for this Measurement	80% of students will meet the criteria		Percent of Program Achieving Target	Not Met:73% of students scored an average of 3 out of 4 on the Key Assessment rubric (target is 80%) Met: All individual														
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>0%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>73% (8)</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </table>		1	2	3	4	A	0%	27%	73% (8)	0%						
	1	2	3	4														
A	0%	27%	73% (8)	0%														

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>S L 1</td> <td></td> <td>(3)</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>A S L 2</td> <td>0%</td> <td>27% (3)</td> <td>73% (8)</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A S L 3</td> <td>0%</td> <td>27% (3)</td> <td>73% (8)</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A S L 4</td> <td>0%</td> <td>27% (3)</td> <td>73% (8)</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </table> <p>Average Scores: ASL1 - 2.7 ASL2 - 2.7 ASL3 - 2.7 ASL4 - 2.7</p>	S L 1		(3)			A S L 2	0%	27% (3)	73% (8)	0%	A S L 3	0%	27% (3)	73% (8)	0%	A S L 4	0%	27% (3)	73% (8)	0%		rubric indicators have an average score of 2.0 or higher
S L 1		(3)																					
A S L 2	0%	27% (3)	73% (8)	0%																			
A S L 3	0%	27% (3)	73% (8)	0%																			
A S L 4	0%	27% (3)	73% (8)	0%																			
Methods	The data is collected each fall semester as part of the Practice Teacher Work Sample in MGE 475 and MGE 481. No results were reported from MGE 481. The number of students in MGE 475 for the 2019-20 academic year was 11. Based on faculty's ratings of students' Key Assessments, 8 students met the criteria.																						
Measurement Instrument 3	N/A																						
Criteria for Student Success	N/A																						
Program Success Target for this Measurement	N/A		Percent of Program Achieving Target	N/A																			
Methods	N/A																						

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.	Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)		
Students struggle with their abilities to analyze how their middle level students perform in a pre/post-test situation from a lesson taught by the WKU students. More emphasis will be provided in MGE 47 and MGE 481 to help students analyze their data. Graphing the middle level student data is an important element within this assessment because it represents something these students will do when they become classroom teachers.		
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)		
Based on results from previous assessments while using the instruments Key Assessment 5A and 5B, more emphasis was given in the course MGE 475 to address students' understanding of each section of the assignment and rubric. Since the target was not met by all students for either instrument, the focus going forward will be to strengthen the instruction surrounding the weakest indicator(s) to move the majority of students from Beginning or Developing (1-2) to the Proficient (3) category. Data will be collected and scored for MGE 481 for both instruments going forward.		
Next Assessment Cycle Plan (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)		
Data for both measurement instruments will be collected from the MGE 475 and MGE 481 courses at the end of the fall semester (December, 2020).		

Rubrics:

Key Assessment 5A: Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment Rubric Scoring Sheet							
CAEP	InTASC	KTS	Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
LGA1							
1.1 1.3 1.4	1.7	2.1	LGA 1 List 2 to 3 learning goals	None of the learning goals are clear or logical for one or more of the following: learning outcomes, stated in behavioral terms, focused on the unit topic, appropriate for student abilities, and appropriate for content/curriculum	Only one clear learning goal provided Or one of the 2 to 3 learning goals are not clear or logical for one or more of the following: learning outcomes, stated in behavioral terms, focused on the unit topic, appropriate for student abilities, and appropriate for content /curriculum.	2 to 3 learning goals stated as clear, logical learning outcomes, stated in behavioral terms, focused on the unit topic, appropriate for student abilities, and appropriate for content/curriculum.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA2							
1.1 D	2,3	3.1	LGA 2 Levels of learning goals	Goals do not reflect revised Bloom's Taxonomy with at least one goal at or above the Analyzing level.	Goals somewhat reflect revised Bloom's Taxonomy with at least one goal at or above the Analyzing level.	Goals reflect revised Bloom's Taxonomy with at least one goal at or above the Analyzing level.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA3							
1.1 1.3 1.4	1,7	2.1	LGA 3 Alignment of Learning Goals with standards	Not every learning goal is aligned with local, state or national standards Or content	Each of the learning goals is not correctly and logically aligned with local, state or national standards in content and Bloom's levels. Some	Each of the learning goals is correctly and logically aligned with local, state or national	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and

				and Bloom's levels are incorrect.	standards are missing or incorrectly aligned with goals.	standards in content and Bloom's levels.	demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA4				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.3 1.4	4,5 1,7	1.2 2.2	LGA 4 Appropriateness of Learning Goals	Justification is missing for two goals Or 2 or more justifications of the required areas in the prompt	Justification is missing for one goal Or 3 or more justifications of the required areas in the prompt	Clear and logical justification in the 4 required areas for learning goal appropriateness: student prior knowledge, student learning needs and/or developmental appropriateness, authentic real world, and other relevant connections.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA5				○	○	○	○
1.1 D	2,3	3.1	LGA 5 Mastery levels for each Learning Goal	Mastery level is not provided for each goal Or it is not mathematically possible Or indicates level that is too low for student abilities or discipline	Mastery level for each goal may not be mathematically possible or indicates lower expectations for student abilities or discipline	Mastery level for each goal is mathematically possible and indicates high expectations for student abilities or discipline	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA6				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.2	6	5.1 5.3	LGA 6 Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Learning Goals	All assessment items are not aligned to specific learning goals, correct level of Bloom's, and content standard.	All assessment items are clearly and appropriately aligned to 2 of the following: specific learning goals, correct level of Bloom's, and content standard.	All assessment items are clearly and appropriately aligned to specific learning goals, correct level of Bloom's, and content standard.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA7				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.3 1.4	1,7	2.2	LGA 7 Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Adaptations	Description of adaptations does not meet the individual needs of students as described in the contextual factors or no description is provided.	Description of adaptations does not clearly meet the individual needs of students as described in the contextual factors or description is incomplete.	Clear, logical description of adaptations that meet the individual needs of students as described in the contextual factors	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA8				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.2	6	5.1 5.3	LGA 8 Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Modes of Assessment	The pre and post assessment represents only one mode or assessments do not integrate knowledge, skills and/or reasoning ability.	The pre and post assessment duplicates some modes or assessments do not require clear integration of knowledge, skills and/or reasoning ability.	The pre and post assessment includes multiple modes and requires the integration of knowledge, skills and/or reasoning ability.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA9				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.2	6	5.1	LGA 9 Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Scoring Criteria	Scoring procedures are not explained; assessment items or prompts are not written for student understanding; mastery levels are not defined; directions and procedures are not clear to students. Scoring key and/or rubrics are incomplete.	Scoring procedures are not well explained; assessment items or prompts are not clearly written; mastery levels are not clearly defined; directions and procedures are not clear to students. Scoring key and/or rubrics are attached but do not include all required components.	Scoring procedures are explained, assessment items or prompts are clearly written, mastery levels defined, directions and procedures are clear to students. Scoring key and/or rubrics are attached and include all required components.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

Key Assessment 5B: Analysis of Student Learning

Scoring Guide							
CAEP	InTASC	KTS	Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
ASL1							
1.1 1.5 T	1,6,8,9, 10	6.4	ASL 1 Visual Representation of Student Performance	No use of technology tools to create graphs/tables; graphs/tables are hand drawn. 3 or more required graphs/tables are not included. Or All required graphs/tables from the prompt are included but most are inaccurate, do not communicate student learning gains, or do not compare groups and assessments correctly.	Poor use of technology tools to create graphs/tables; graphs/tables do not clearly or accurately communicate data. 1 or 2 required graphs/tables are not included. Or All required graphs/tables from the prompt are included but some are inaccurate, do not communicate student learning gains, or do not compare groups and assessments correctly.	Excellent use of technology tools to create graphs/tables that communicate student learning data legibly and accurately. At least three graphs/tables from the prompt are included, providing accurate data to communicate, assess, and compare student learning gains. Representations are labeled accurately.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
ASL2							
1.1 1.2	6 9	5.4 7.1	ASL 2 Analysis of Student Performance	No discussion for 2 or more graphs or 2 or more goals; or inaccurate discussion and reflection of data results and interpretation for all learning goals. No alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards for each required graph and each learning goal. No conclusions drawn from data or incorrect data used. No reference to trends and patterns in student performance. No interpretation of student misconceptions of content.	Accurate and logical description and reflection on data results and interpretation for only one learning goal; or no discussion for one graph for one or more goals; or inaccurate discussion and reflection of data results and interpretation for some learning goals. Unclear or inaccurate alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards for each required graph and each learning goal; or discussion of alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards is left out for one or more graphs/goals. Inaccurate conclusions drawn from data or inaccurate data used to draw conclusions. Little or no reference to trends and patterns in student performance. Unclear or inaccurate interpretation of student misconceptions of content.	Accurate and logical description, analysis, evaluation and reflection on data results to determine progress of individuals and groups toward learning goals. Identify differences in progress among student groups. Clear, accurate alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards for each required graph and each learning goal. Meaningful conclusions drawn from data and reported using both percentages and raw data. Clear and accurate reference to trends and patterns in student performance. Thorough interpretation of student misconceptions of content.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
ASL3							
1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4	1,7 9	2.4 7.2	ASL 3 Instructional Implications from Data	Inaccurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching and discussion is missing for 2 or more groups or two or more goals.	Accurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching but discussion is missing for 2 or more groups or one or more goals; or inaccurate reflection	Clear reflection and evaluation of instructional practice to inform future teaching. Competently identifies small groups for specific	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

				<p>Inaccurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching or no discussion.</p> <p>No discussion of content/skills that need remediation or discussion is not based on data results or results are missing for 2 or more groups or for 2 goals.</p>	<p>and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching.</p> <p>Insufficiently identifies small groups for specific content/skills based on data representations and clearly evaluates instructional practice in terms of specific student needs that were noted in contextual factors.</p> <p>Unclear description which goal the students made the most learning gains and the goal students made the least learning gains;</p> <p>inadequate discussion on which learning goal determined the best conceptual understanding of content and why; and inadequate discussion which learning goal provided more learning gains due to the assessment mode and why.</p> <p>Unclear description of 2 changes that could be made to instruction and assessment for this unit if the unit were to be taught again.</p> <p>Inadequate description of reinforcement and extension activities of this unit.</p>	<p>content/skills based on data representations and clearly evaluates instructional practice in terms of specific student needs that were noted in contextual factors.</p> <p>Thoroughly describes which goal the students made the most learning gains and the goal students made the least learning gains; discusses which learning goal determined the best conceptual understanding of content and why; and discusses which learning goal provided more learning gains due to the assessment mode and why.</p> <p>Clearly describes 2 changes that could be made to instruction and assessment for this unit if the unit were to be taught again.</p> <p>Appropriately provides logical, detailed discussion of reinforcement and extension activities of this unit.</p>	
		ASL4		○	○	○	○

1.1 1.3 1.4	4,5	1.5	ASL 4 Analysis of an Individual Student	<p>Inaccurate data used for student evaluation.</p> <p>No conclusions drawn about the extent to which this student attained learning goals in this unit.</p> <p>No description of student's misconceptions about content, assessment or instruction.</p> <p>No discussion of student's misconceptions about content.</p> <p>No discussion on how formative assessments helped with instructional adjustment.</p> <p>No reflection of what could have been done differently. No description of next steps.</p>	<p>Inaccurate portrayal and description of the individual student's data from pre-, formative, and post-assessments.</p> <p>Inappropriate conclusions drawn about the extent to which this student attained learning goals in this unit.</p> <p>Inaccurate description of student's misconceptions about content, assessment, and instruction or parts missing.</p> <p>Unclear discussion on how formative assessments helped with instruction adjustment. Collaborative efforts did not connect to student results.</p> <p>Inaccurate, short reflection of what could have been done differently. Little description of next steps or unclear connection of next steps to student success.</p>	<p>Accurate portrayal and description of an individual student's data from pre-, formative, and post-assessments along with the instruction and connection to contextual factors.</p> <p>Appropriate conclusions drawn about the extent to which this student attained learning goals in this unit.</p> <p>Accurately describes students' misconceptions about content with clear discussion on how formative assessments helped with instruction adjustment. Includes any collaborative efforts.</p> <p>Clear discussion on how formative assessments helped with instruction adjustment. Any collaborative efforts connect to student results.</p> <p>Accurate, in-depth reflection of what could have been done differently. Thorough description of next steps for individual.</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>
-------------------	-----	-----	--	---	---	--	---

**Key Assessment Six: Design for Instruction
Scoring Sheet**

CAEP	InTASC	KTS	Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.3 1.4	4,5 1,7	1.1 1.2 1.3 2.1 2.5	DI 2 Unit Overview	<p>Provides a limited description for 5 of the following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Learning goals and objectives for each day/lesson; Topic/activity per day related to at least one learning goal;</p> <p>Instructional strategies content aligned with Bloom's levels and differentiation of instruction.</p> <p>Variety of research-based strategies, activities, alignments/resources</p> <p>Student engagement; Real world connections;</p>	<p>Provides an adequate description for 6 following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Learning goals and objectives for each day/lesson; Topic/activity per day related to at least one learning goal;</p> <p>Instructional strategies content aligned with Bloom's levels and differentiation of instruction.</p> <p>Variety of research-based strategies, activities, alignments/resources</p> <p>Student engagement; Real world connections;</p>	<p>Provides thorough understanding of the following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Learning goals and objectives for each day/lesson; Topic/activity per day related to at least one learning goal;</p> <p>Instructional strategies content aligned with Bloom's levels and differentiation of instruction.</p> <p>Variety of research-based strategies, activities, alignments/resources</p> <p>Student engagement; Real world connections;</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>

				Description multiple formative assessments that are appropriate and aligned to the Learning Goals; Specific adaptations and differentiation per strategy that address Contextual Factors and the pre-assessment.	Description multiple formative assessments that are appropriate and aligned to the Learning Goals; Specific adaptations and differentiation per strategy that address Contextual Factors and the pre-assessment.	Description multiple formative assessments that are appropriate and aligned to the Learning Goals; Specific adaptations and differentiation per strategy that address Contextual Factors and the pre-assessment.	
DI3				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.5 T	1,6,8,9,10	6.1	DI 3 Integration of Technology	Minimal technology use in planning and instruction	Some technology use in planning and instruction	Demonstrate technology integration in planning and instruction and how P-12 student use of technology will be integrated in unit for higher level thinking activities and in a real world context.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
DI4				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.3 1.4	4,5 1,7	1.1 1.2 1.3 2.4 2.5	DI 4 Instructional Strategies	Provides an limited description of two instructional strategies from different learning goals for 2 of the following criteria in unit overview: Identification of appropriate content related strategies to meet Learning Goals and revised Bloom's levels; Instructional strategies meet student needs through appropriate adaptations and differentiated instruction based on pre-assessment data. Real world connections; Discussion of materials/technology.	Provides an adequate description of two instructional strategies from different learning goals for 3 of the following criteria in unit overview: Identification of appropriate content related strategies to meet Learning Goals and revised Bloom's levels; Instructional strategies meet student needs through appropriate adaptations and differentiated instruction based on pre-assessment data. Real world connections; Discussion of materials/technology.	Thorough and clear description of two instructional strategies from different learning goals that includes: Identification of appropriate content related strategies to meet Learning Goals and revised Bloom's levels; Instructional strategies meet student needs through appropriate adaptations and differentiated instruction based on pre-assessment data. Real world connections; Discussion of materials/technology.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
DI5				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4	1,7 6	2.3 5.4	DI 5 Formative Assessments	Provides a limited description for 1 of the following criteria in unit overview: Description of assessment and purpose; Justify appropriateness for the content and developmental level of students; Inclusion of formative assessments and scoring criteria.	Provides an adequate description for 2 of the following criteria in unit overview: Description of assessment and purpose; Justify appropriateness for the content and developmental level of students; Inclusion of formative assessments and scoring criteria.	Thorough and clear explanation of Formative Assessments including the following items: Description of assessment and purpose; Justify appropriateness for the content and developmental level of students; Inclusion of formative assessments and scoring criteria.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

Teacher Work Sample Scoring Sheet

Name _____ **Instructor** _____

	Percentage	Points Earned	Points Possible
Contextual Factors	15%	_____	(30)
Learning Goals and Pre/Post Assessment.	20%	_____	(40)
Design for Instruction	25%	_____	(50)
Analysis of Student Learning	30%	_____	(60)
Reflection of Teaching Practices	10%	_____	(20)
TOTAL	100%	_____	(200)
Format	_____	_____	(10)

(Separate score based on instructor preference)

Critical Performance Holistic Scoring Guide		
Level	Percentage	Descriptor
4	97-100%	No revision required; rich, insightful, in-depth and elaborate; establishes and maintains purpose throughout; accurate, relevant, and thorough
3	85-97%	Standard-met with few errors that do not deter from accuracy and/or meaning; focused, effective, and relevant
2	77-84%	Significant gap in understanding, although an attempt was made; unelaborated with several errors present
1	76% or less	Minimal understanding; only small portions are addressed; response is limited, incorrect, missing, random, weak, and/or ineffective
0	0	Response is completely irrelevant or not submitted

NOTE: Students must score a Level 2 in order to receive a passing grade in EDU 489 and EXED 434. Students who score below Level 2, must register for EDU 491 the next semester (J-term or May term) and complete a TWS in a new setting.

Contextual Factors Rubric				
Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
CF 1 School Information KTS 2.2, 3.3	Characteristics of school described at the minimal, inaccurate, irrelevant or biased level in 2 or more of the required areas. School information provided limited to the 5 required areas. Implications based on this information are missing or not appropriately stated.	Characteristics of school described at the minimal, inaccurate, irrelevant or biased level in 1 of the 5 required areas. School information provided includes the 5 required areas and at least 1 additional area. Implications based on this information are clearly stated and complete for the 1 area.	Characteristics of school described clearly at a substantive, accurate, and unbiased level in all of the 5 required areas. School information provided includes the 5 required areas and at least 1 additional area. Implications based on this information are clearly stated and complete for 2 areas.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
CF 2 Knowledge of Classroom Information KTS 2.2, 3.3	Characteristics of classroom described at the minimal, inaccurate, irrelevant or biased level in 2 or more of the 4 required areas. Implications based on this information are missing	Characteristics of classroom described at the minimal, inaccurate, irrelevant or biased level in 1 of the 4 required areas. Implications based on this information are clearly stated and complete for 1 area.	Characteristics of classroom described clearly at a substantive, accurate, and unbiased level in all of the 4 required areas. Implications based on this information are clearly stated and complete for at least 2 areas.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
CF 3 Knowledge of Student Characteristics KTS 2.2, 3.3	Characteristics of students described at the minimal, inaccurate, irrelevant or biased level in 2 or more of the 8 required areas. Implications based on this information are missing or not appropriately stated in at 2 areas.	Characteristics of students described at the minimal, inaccurate, irrelevant or biased level in 1 of the 8 required areas. Implications based on this information are clearly stated and complete for 6 of the 7 areas.	Characteristics of students described clearly at a substantive, accurate, and unbiased level in all of the 8 required areas. Implications based on this information are clearly stated and complete for the 7 required areas.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment Rubric

Prompt Areas	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
LGA 1 List 2 to 3 learning goals KTS 2.1	None of the learning goals are clear or logical for one or more of the following: learning outcomes, stated in behavioral terms, focused on the unit topic, appropriate for student abilities, and appropriate for content/curriculum	Only one clear learning goal provided Or one of the 2 to 3 learning goals are not clear or logical for one or more of the following: learning outcomes, stated in behavioral terms, focused on the unit topic, appropriate for student abilities, and appropriate for content/curriculum.	2 to 3 learning goals stated as clear, logical learning outcomes, stated in behavioral terms, focused on the unit topic, appropriate for student abilities, and appropriate for content/curriculum.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA 2 Levels of learning goals KTS 3.1	Goals do not reflect revised Bloom's Taxonomy with at least one goal at or above the Analyzing level.	Goals somewhat reflect revised Bloom's Taxonomy with at least one goal at or above the Analyzing level.	Goals reflect revised Bloom's Taxonomy with at least one goal at or above the Analyzing level.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA 3 Alignment of Learning Goals with standards KTS 2.1	Not every learning goal is aligned with local, state or national standards Or content and Bloom's levels are incorrect.	Each of the learning goals is not correctly and logically aligned with local, state or national standards in content and Bloom's levels. Some standards are missing or incorrectly aligned with goals.	Each of the learning goals is correctly and logically aligned with local, state or national standards in content and Bloom's levels.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA 4 Appropriateness of Learning Goals KTS 2.2, 1.2	Justification is missing for two goals Or 2 or more justifications of the required areas in the prompt	Justification is missing for one goal Or 3 or more justifications of the required areas in the prompt	Clear and logical justification in the 4 required areas for learning goal appropriateness: student prior knowledge, student learning needs and/or developmental appropriateness, authentic real world, and other relevant connections.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA 5 Mastery levels for each Learning Goal KTS 3.1	Mastery level is not provided for each goal Or it is not mathematically possible Or indicates level that is too low for student abilities or discipline	Mastery level for each goal may not be mathematically possible or indicates lower expectations for student abilities or discipline	Mastery level for each goal is mathematically possible and indicates high expectations for student abilities or discipline	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA 6 Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Learning Goals KTS 5.1, 5.3	All assessment items are not aligned to specific learning goals, correct level of Bloom's, and content standard.	All assessment items are clearly and appropriately aligned to 2 of the following: specific learning goals, correct level of Bloom's, and content standard.	All assessment items are clearly and appropriately aligned to specific learning goals, correct level of Bloom's, and content standard.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

LGA 7 Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Adaptations KTS 2.2	Description of adaptations does not meet the individual needs of students as described in the contextual factors or no description is provided.	Description of adaptations does not clearly meet the individual needs of students as described in the contextual factors or description is incomplete.	Clear, logical description of adaptations that meet the individual needs of students as described in the contextual factors	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA 8 Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Modes of Assessments KTS 5.1, 5.3	The pre and post assessment represents only one mode or assessments do not integrate knowledge, skills and/or reasoning ability.	The pre and post assessment duplicates some modes or assessments do not require clear integration of knowledge, skills and/or reasoning ability.	The pre and post assessment includes multiple modes and requires the integration of knowledge, skills and/or reasoning ability.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA 9 Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Scoring Criteria KTS 5.1	Scoring procedures are not explained; assessment items or prompts are not written for student understanding; mastery levels are not defined; directions and procedures are not clear to students. Scoring key and/or rubrics are incomplete.	Scoring procedures are not well explained; assessment items or prompts are not clearly written; mastery levels are not clearly defined; directions and procedures are not clear to students. Scoring key and/or rubrics are attached but do not include all required components.	Scoring procedures are explained, assessment items or prompts are clearly written, mastery levels defined, directions and procedures are clear to students. Scoring key and/or rubrics are attached and include all required components.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

Design for Instruction

Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
DI 1 Results of pre-assessment KTS 5.4, 2.2	<p>Depicted the results of the pre-assessment. Failure to administer pre-assessment or to accurately provide 2 or more of the following information pieces and implications as they relate to learning goals:</p> <p>Number of students mastering each learning goal; type of missed questions/tasks; and content/skill of incorrect responses.</p> <p>For each of the above areas, identify the implications derived from pre-assessment data and adjustments planned due to information from pre-assessment data analysis.</p>	<p>Depicted the results of the pre-assessment. Administration of pre-assessment but failure to accurately provide 1 of the following information pieces and implications as they relate to learning goals:</p> <p>Number of students mastering each learning goal; type of missed questions/tasks; and content/skill of incorrect responses.</p> <p>For each of the above areas, identify the implications derived from pre-assessment data and adjustments planned due to information from pre-assessment data analysis.</p>	<p>Depicted the results of the pre-assessment. Administration of pre-assessment and accurate inclusion of the following information pieces and implications as they relate to learning goals:</p> <p>Number of students mastering each learning goal; type of missed questions/tasks; and content/skill of incorrect responses.</p> <p>For each of the above areas, identify the implications derived from pre-assessment data and adjustments planned due to information from pre-assessment data analysis.</p>	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

<p>DI 2 Unit Overview</p> <p>KTS 2.1, 1.3, 2.5, 1.1, 1.2</p>	<p>Provides a limited description for 5 of the following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Learning goals and objectives for each day/lesson;</p> <p>Topic/activity per day related to at least one learning goal;</p> <p>Instructional strategies content aligned with Bloom's levels and differentiation of instruction.</p> <p>Variety of research-based strategies, activities, alignments/resources</p> <p>Student engagement</p> <p>Real world connections;</p> <p>Description multiple formative assessments that are appropriate and aligned to the Learning Goals;</p> <p>Specific adaptations and differentiation per strategy that address Contextual Factors and the pre-assessment.</p>	<p>Provides an adequate description for 6 following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Learning goals and objectives for each day/lesson;</p> <p>Topic/activity per day related to at least one learning goal;</p> <p>Instructional strategies content aligned with Bloom's levels and differentiation of instruction.</p> <p>Variety of research-based strategies, activities, alignments/resources</p> <p>Student engagement</p> <p>Real world connections;</p> <p>Description multiple formative assessments that are appropriate and aligned to the Learning Goals;</p> <p>Specific adaptations and differentiation per strategy that address Contextual Factors and the pre-assessment.</p>	<p>Provides thorough understanding of the following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Learning goals and objectives for each day/lesson;</p> <p>Topic/activity per day related to at least one learning goal;</p> <p>Instructional strategies content aligned with Bloom's levels and differentiation of instruction.</p> <p>Variety of research-based strategies, activities, alignments/resources</p> <p>Student engagement</p> <p>Real world connections;</p> <p>Description multiple formative assessments that are appropriate and aligned to the Learning Goals;</p> <p>Specific adaptations and differentiation per strategy that address Contextual Factors and the pre-assessment.</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>
<p>DI 3 Integration of Technology</p> <p>KTS 6.1</p>	<p>Minimal technology use in planning and instruction</p>	<p>Some technology use in planning and instruction</p>	<p>Demonstrate technology integration in planning and instruction and how P-12 student use of technology will be integrated in unit for higher level thinking activities and in a real world context.</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>
<p>DI 4 Instructional Strategies</p> <p>KTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.4, 2.5</p>	<p>Provides an limited description of two instructional strategies from different learning goals for 2 of the following criteria in unit overview:</p>	<p>Provides an adequate description of two instructional strategies from different learning goals for 3 of the following criteria in unit overview:</p>	<p>Thorough and clear description of two instructional strategies from different learning goals that includes:</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>

	<p>Identification of appropriate content related strategies to meet Learning Goals and revised Bloom's levels;</p> <p>Instructional strategies meet student needs through appropriate adaptations and differentiated instruction based on pre-assessment data.</p> <p>Real world connections;</p> <p>Discussion of materials/technology.</p>	<p>Identification of appropriate content related strategies to meet Learning Goals and revised Bloom's levels;</p> <p>Instructional strategies meet student needs through appropriate adaptations and differentiated instruction based on pre-assessment data.</p> <p>Real world connections;</p> <p>Discussion of materials/technology.</p>	<p>Identification of appropriate content related strategies to meet Learning Goals and revised Bloom's levels;</p> <p>Instructional strategies meet student needs through appropriate adaptations and differentiated instruction based on pre-assessment data.</p> <p>Real world connections;</p> <p>Discussion of materials/technology.</p>	
<p>DI 5 Formative Assessments KTS 2.3, 5.4</p>	<p>Provides a limited description for 1 of the following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Description of assessment and purpose;</p> <p>Justify appropriateness for the content and developmental level of students;</p> <p>Inclusion of formative assessments and scoring criteria.</p>	<p>Provides an adequate description for 2 of the following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Description of assessment and purpose;</p> <p>Justify appropriateness for the content and developmental level of students;</p> <p>Inclusion of formative assessments and scoring criteria.</p>	<p>Thorough and clear explanation of Formative Assessments including the following items:</p> <p>Description of assessment and purpose;</p> <p>Justify appropriateness for the content and developmental level of students;</p> <p>Inclusion of formative assessments and scoring criteria.</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>

Analysis of Student Learning

Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<p>ASL 1 Visual Representation of Student Performance KTS 6.4</p>	<p>No use of technology tools to create graphs/tables; graphs/tables are hand drawn.</p> <p>3 or more required graphs/tables are not included.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>All required graphs/tables from the prompt are included but most are inaccurate, do not communicate student learning gains, or do not</p>	<p>Poor use of technology tools to create graphs/tables; graphs/tables do not clearly or accurately communicate data.</p> <p>1 or 2 required graphs/tables are not included.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>All required graphs/tables from the prompt are included but some are inaccurate, do not communicate student learning gains, or do not compare groups</p>	<p>Excellent use of technology tools to create graphs/tables that communicate student learning data legibly and accurately.</p> <p>At least three graphs/tables from the prompt are included, providing accurate data to communicate, assess, and compare student learning gains. Representations are labeled accurately.</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>

	compare groups and assessments correctly.	and assessments correctly.		
ASL 2 Analysis of Student Performance KTS 5.4, 7.1	<p>No discussion for 2 or more graphs or 2 or more goals; or inaccurate discussion and reflection of data results and interpretation for all learning goals.</p> <p>No alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards for each required graph and each learning goal.</p> <p>No conclusions drawn from data or incorrect data used.</p> <p>No reference to trends and patterns in student performance.</p> <p>No interpretation of student misconceptions of content.</p>	<p>Accurate and logical description and reflection on data results and interpretation for only one learning goal; or no discussion for one graph for one or more goals; or inaccurate discussion and reflection of data results and interpretation for some learning goals.</p> <p>Unclear or inaccurate alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards for each required graph and each learning goal; or discussion of alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards is left out for one or more graphs/goals.</p> <p>Inaccurate conclusions drawn from data or inaccurate data used to draw conclusions.</p> <p>Little or no reference to trends and patterns in student performance.</p> <p>Unclear or inaccurate interpretation of student misconceptions of content.</p>	<p>Accurate and logical description, analysis, evaluation and reflection on data results to determine progress of individuals and groups toward learning goals. Identify differences in progress among student groups.</p> <p>Clear, accurate alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards for each required graph and each learning goal.</p> <p>Meaningful conclusions drawn from data and reported using both percentages and raw data. Clear and accurate reference to trends and patterns in student performance. Thorough interpretation of student misconceptions of content.</p>	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
ASL 3 Instructional Implications from Data KTS 2.4, 7.2	<p>Inaccurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching and discussion is missing for 2 or more groups or two or more goals.</p> <p>Inaccurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching or no discussion.</p> <p>No discussion of content/skills that need remediation or discussion is not based on data results or results are missing for 2 or more groups or for 2 goals.</p>	<p>Accurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching but discussion is missing for 2 or more groups or one or more goals; or inaccurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching.</p> <p>Insufficiently identifies small groups for specific content/skills based on data representations and clearly evaluates instructional practice in terms of specific student needs that were noted in contextual factors.</p> <p>Unclear description which goal the students made the most learning gains and the goal students made the least learning gains; inadequate discussion on which learning goal</p>	<p>Clear reflection and evaluation of instructional practice to inform future teaching.</p> <p>Competently identifies small groups for specific content/skills based on data representations and clearly evaluates instructional practice in terms of specific student needs that were noted in contextual factors.</p> <p>Thoroughly describes which goal the students made the most learning gains and the goal students made the least learning gains; discusses which learning goal determined the best conceptual understanding of content and why; and discusses which learning goal</p>	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

		<p>determined the best conceptual understanding of content and why; and inadequate discussion which learning goal provided more learning gains due to the assessment mode and why.</p> <p>Unclear description of 2 changes that could be made to instruction and assessment for this unit if the unit were to be taught again.</p> <p>Inadequate description of reinforcement and extension activities of this unit.</p>	<p>provided more learning gains due to the assessment mode and why.</p> <p>Clearly describes 2 changes that could be made to instruction and assessment for this unit if the unit were to be taught again.</p> <p>Appropriately provides logical, detailed discussion of reinforcement and extension activities of this unit.</p>	
<p>ASL 4 Analysis of an Individual Student</p> <p>KTS 1.5</p>	<p>Inaccurate data used for student evaluation.</p> <p>No conclusions drawn about the extent to which this student attained learning goals in this unit.</p> <p>No description of student's misconceptions about content, assessment or instruction.</p> <p>No discussion of student's misconceptions about content. No discussion on how formative assessments helped with instructional adjustment.</p> <p>No reflection of what could have been done differently. No description of next steps.</p>	<p>Inaccurate portrayal and description of the individual student's data from pre-, formative, and post-assessments.</p> <p>Inappropriate conclusions drawn about the extent to which this student attained learning goals in this unit.</p> <p>Inaccurate description of student's misconceptions about content, assessment, and instruction or parts missing.</p> <p>Unclear discussion on how formative assessments helped with instruction adjustment. Collaborative efforts did not connect to student results.</p> <p>Inaccurate, short reflection of what could have been done differently. Little description of next steps or unclear connection of next steps to student success.</p>	<p>Accurate portrayal and description of an individual student's data from pre-, formative, and post-assessments along with the instruction and connection to contextual factors.</p> <p>Appropriate conclusions drawn about the extent to which this student attained learning goals in this unit.</p> <p>Accurately describes students' misconceptions about content with clear discussion on how formative assessments helped with instruction adjustment. Includes any collaborative efforts.</p> <p>Clear discussion on how formative assessments helped with instruction adjustment. Any collaborative efforts connect to student results.</p> <p>Accurate, in-depth reflection of what could have been done differently. Thorough description of next steps for individual.</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>

Reflection of Teaching Rubric

Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
R 1 Self-assessment of KTS KTS 9.1	Completes self-assessment of KTS standards before and after completion of TWS but leaves 3 or more standards blank Or does not complete either pre-assessment or post-assessment of KTS standards.	Completes and includes self-assessment of KTS standards before and after completion of TWS but leaves 2 or more standards blank.	Completes and includes entire self-assessment of KTS standards before and after completion of TWS.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
R 2 Identify Teaching Strengths KTS 7.2, 7.3, 9.1	Short and disconnected discussion of 1 of the teacher's strengths as related to self-evaluation of KTS, Or discussion is very vague and not related to KTS, Provides no examples from teaching experience in this unit to support discussion.	Short and disconnected discussion of 2 of teacher's strengths as related to self-evaluation of KTS and student learning Or discussed only 1 teacher strength related to self-evaluation of KTS, Provides one example from teaching experience in this unit that is unrelated to the KTS strength discussed and student learning.	Appropriate, logical, detailed discussion of 2 of teacher's strengths as related to self-evaluation of KTS and student learning. Provides one or more examples from teaching experience in this unit in revealing each KTS strength discussed.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
R3 Identify areas of Professional Development KTS 7.2, 7.3, 9.1, 9.2	Discussion of teacher's needs for improvement is not related to self-evaluation of KTS Or only one improvement is discussed. Description of one or more priorities for your own professional development is vague and not clearly based on specific data from self-assessment and student performance. Include a specific plan for growth.	Discussion of one or more of teacher's needs for improvement as related to self-evaluation of KTS may not be clear, logical, or appropriate. Description of one or more priorities for your own professional development is not clearly based on specific data from self-assessment and student performance. Include a specific plan for growth.	Appropriate, logical, detailed discussion of 2 of teacher's needs for improvement as related to self-evaluation of KTS. Clearly describes 2 to 3 priorities for your own professional development based on specific data from self-assessment and student performance. Include a specific plan for growth.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.