

**Assurance of Student Learning  
2019-2020**

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

School of Teacher Education

Special Elementary (Learning and Behavioral Disorders)/Elementary Education - #5003

Susan Keeseey, 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.**

**\*\* We acknowledge that our students' success rates were lower than the previous year but also understand that all of our students are teachers who had unusual demands placed on them as a result of COVID-19**

**Student Learning Outcome 1:** Students will apply their elementary education content knowledge to develop and teach an effective whole class lesson.

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

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met Just 1 dimension</b>
---	------------	---

**Student Learning Outcome 2:** Students will analyze assessment data to drive instruction and improve student outcomes.

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

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

**Student Learning Outcome 3:** Students will collect data on a target behavior to determine the function of behavior to create a more positive learning climate.

<b>Instrument 1</b>	Direct: Autobiographical Experience (reflective paper scored by rubric)
<b>Instrument 2</b>	Direct: Behavioral Observation (assignment scored by rubric)
<b>Instrument 3</b>	

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

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

Overall, this analysis demonstrates program effectiveness in the areas measured. However, one weakness was very evident. The SPED program must do a better job training all faculty to share data so our program has access to all our program data.

**Student Learning Outcome 1**

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	Students will apply their elementary education content knowledge to develop and teach an effective whole class lesson.																																
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	<p>Direct: Key Assessment 6: Design for instruction</p> <p>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.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="493 500 1669 889"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>Ave. Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DI 2</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>8.7% (2)</td> <td>39.1% (9)</td> <td>52.2% (12)</td> <td>3.43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DI 3</td> <td>4.3% (1)</td> <td>43.5% (10)</td> <td>39.1% (9)</td> <td>13.0% (3)</td> <td>2.61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DI 4</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>4.3% (1)</td> <td>56.5% (13)</td> <td>39.1% (9)</td> <td>3.35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DI 5</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>4.3% (1)</td> <td>56.5% (13)</td> <td>39.1% (9)</td> <td>3.35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				1	2	3	4	Ave. Score	DI 2	0% (0)	8.7% (2)	39.1% (9)	52.2% (12)	3.43	DI 3	4.3% (1)	43.5% (10)	39.1% (9)	13.0% (3)	2.61	DI 4	0% (0)	4.3% (1)	56.5% (13)	39.1% (9)	3.35	DI 5	0% (0)	4.3% (1)	56.5% (13)	39.1% (9)	3.35
	1	2	3	4	Ave. Score																												
DI 2	0% (0)	8.7% (2)	39.1% (9)	52.2% (12)	3.43																												
DI 3	4.3% (1)	43.5% (10)	39.1% (9)	13.0% (3)	2.61																												
DI 4	0% (0)	4.3% (1)	56.5% (13)	39.1% (9)	3.35																												
DI 5	0% (0)	4.3% (1)	56.5% (13)	39.1% (9)	3.35																												
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	<p>Average score of 3 out of 4 on the Key Assessment rubric. (4 indicators)</p> <p>The overall success rate for all students on the Design for Instruction Key Assessment will be no less than 80% scoring a 3 of 4 points on each of four rubric categories, and no average score across all students in any indicator is less than 3.0.</p>																																
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% of or more students will score an average of 3 out of 4 on each of the Key Assessment rubric indicators.	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>MET: 3 of the 4 indicators scored at or above a 3 of 4 for 80% or more of the student population.</b>																														

**NOT MET: 1 of the 4 indicators**

**Methods**

Data are collected each semester as part of ELED 465. Faculty evaluated this assignment, which requires students to use pre-assessment data to plan a unit of instruction. They must reflect on the data and justify instructional decisions in terms of content and methods. In addition, they create formal formative assessments and make plans to differentiate instruction for students in the classroom. This is a detailed document explaining the learning goals, objectives of the lesson, instructional methods, assessments and modifications/accommodations for different students.

**Measurement Instrument 2**

Direct: Key Assessment 7: Teacher Work Sample

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.

CF	Goals	Design	Analysis	Reflection	Total
30	40	54	60	60	214
30	36	50	60	50	196
28	29	48	50	60	187
30	38	50	60	50	198
28	35	37	60	50	182
30	40	50	60	60	210
30	40	50	60	60	210
28	37	44	45	60	186
30	37	50	60	60	207
30	35	46	60	60	201
28	36	50	60	60	206
30	40	50	60	60	210
30	40	50	60	60	210

	30	40	50	60	60	210	
	30	41	50	60	60	211	
	<b>29.5</b>	<b>37.6</b>	<b>48.6</b>	<b>58.3</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>202.5</b>	
	Data for 15 of 26 students from Spring, 2020. The remaining students' data was never received from a retired teacher.						
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students must pass in order to receive teaching credentials. A passing score is an overall score of 85% or higher (minimum of 178 points) on the Teacher Work Sample.  The overall success rate for all students on the holistic score of the Teacher Work Sample will be 100% scoring 85% or above and, <b>at least 90% of the students scoring 85% or higher in each subcategory.</b>						
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	100% of students will score no lower than an average of 85% on the Key Assessment and on the individual subcategories will the average score across all students be less than 85%.			<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>		<b>100%</b>	
<b>Methods</b>	This capstone project is a requirement of the EDU 489 course, which all students take during their student teaching semester, their final semester. All students will design a unit of instruction including pre- & post-test, lessons, formative assessments, differentiated instruction, and analysis of student learning.						
<b>Measurement Instrument 3</b>							
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>							
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>				<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>			
<b>Methods</b>							
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.</b>						<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)							

**Data collection and analysis will be more strategic for the current school year. We need to ensure that all the faculty are keeping the required data and share them so programmatic decisions can be made.**

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

Meet with all faculty to emphasize importance of sharing data.

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

When will this outcome be assessed again? It is perfectly fine to not assess every outcome every year; however, it is important to note *when* it will be assessed again.

Please include the year this outcome will be assessed again, when and what data/artifacts will be collected, what courses will be sampled, and who will be responsible for collecting and providing data and information.

This will be assessed again each semester – Fall 2020 and Spring 2021. ELED 405 and EDU 489 are contributing courses to the data collection in this assessment cycle plan. The artifacts that will be collected are the rubric scores.

## Student Learning Outcome 2

**Student Learning Outcome**

Students will analyze assessment data to drive instruction and improve student outcomes.

**Measurement Instrument 1**

Direct: Key Assessment 5A: Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment

This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to set learning targets and design assessments that align to the content standards.

	1	2	3	4	Ave. Score
<b>LGA 1</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	60.9% (14)	39.1% (9)	3.39
<b>LGA 2</b>	4.3% (1)	8.7% (2)	52.2% (12)	34.8% (8)	3.17
<b>LGA 3</b>	4.3% (1)	17.4% (4)	43.5% (10)	34.8% (8)	3.09
<b>LGA 4</b>	8.7% (2)	34.8% (8)	26.1% (6)	30.4% (7)	2.78
<b>LGA 5</b>	0% (0)	8.7% (2)	65.2% (15)	26.1% (6)	3.17
<b>LGA 6</b>	0% (0)	8.7% (2)	65.2% (15)	26.1% (6)	3.17
<b>LGA 7</b>	8.7% (2)	21.7% (5)	47.8% (11)	21.7% (5)	2.91
<b>LGA 8</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	73.9% (17)	26.1% (6)	3.26
<b>LGA 9</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	69.6% (16)	30.4% (7)	3.30

**Criteria for Student Success**

The overall success rate for all students on the Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment will be no less 80% scoring a 3 of 4 points on each of nine rubric categories, and no average score across all students in any indicator is less than 3.0.

<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% of students will score a 3 or 4 of 4 points on the Key Assessment rubric and on no individual rubric dimension will the average score across all students be less than 3.0.	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>MET:</b> <b>7 of 9 indicators had at or above a 3 or 4 for 80% or more of the student population and an average of 3.0 or greater on each indicator.</b>  <b>NOT MET:</b> <b>2 of the 9 indicators</b>
--	---	--	---

<b>Methods</b>	Data are collected each semester as part of ELED 465. Faculty evaluate this instrument, which requires students to create two learning goals aligned to state standards that reflect the needs of the students in the classroom and the content to be taught. They will also create a summative assessment to give to students prior to instruction and after instruction of lessons. This assessment includes a variety of question types and aims to give the best picture of the students' understanding of the content. In the future, the data collection will be coming from ELED 405, Elementary Math Methods.
----------------	---

<b>Measurement Instrument 2</b>	<p>Direct: Key Assessment 5B: Analysis of Student Learning</p> <p>This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to analyze assessment data to measure student learning.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="489 976 1667 1440"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>Ave. Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>ASL 1</b></td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>68.2% (15)</td> <td>31.8% (7)</td> <td>3.17</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>ASL 2</b></td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>68.2% (15)</td> <td>31.8% (7)</td> <td>3.17</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>ASL 3</b></td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>18.2% (4)</td> <td>81.8% (18)</td> <td>3.65</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>ASL 4</b></td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>18.2% (4)</td> <td>81.8% (18)</td> <td>3.65</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		1	2	3	4	Ave. Score	<b>ASL 1</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	68.2% (15)	31.8% (7)	3.17	<b>ASL 2</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	68.2% (15)	31.8% (7)	3.17	<b>ASL 3</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	18.2% (4)	81.8% (18)	3.65	<b>ASL 4</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	18.2% (4)	81.8% (18)	3.65
	1	2	3	4	Ave. Score																										
<b>ASL 1</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	68.2% (15)	31.8% (7)	3.17																										
<b>ASL 2</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	68.2% (15)	31.8% (7)	3.17																										
<b>ASL 3</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	18.2% (4)	81.8% (18)	3.65																										
<b>ASL 4</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	18.2% (4)	81.8% (18)	3.65																										

<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	The overall success rate for success rate for all students on Analysis of Student Learning will be no less 80% scoring a 3 of 4 points on each of four rubric categories, and no average score across all students in any indicator is less than 3.0.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% of students will score a 3 or 4 on the Key Assessment rubric and on no individual rubric dimension will the average score across all students be less than 3.0.	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>4 of 4 indicators had at or above a 3 or 4 for 80% or more of the student population and an average of 3.0 or greater.</b>
<b>Methods</b>	Data are collected each semester as part of ELED 405. As part of the unit of instruction, students use their assessment data from pre- and post-assessments and formative assessments to evaluate student learning. This is the culmination of a semester-long unit instruction project.		
<b>Measurement Instrument 3</b>			
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>			
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>		<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	
<b>Methods</b>			
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.</b>		<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
Students demonstrated the ability to analyze data to drive student learning. There are two subcategories that the target was not reached. We will meet with ELED faculty to determine how to work together to strengthen these areas.			
<b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
<b>We will meet in early Fall to discuss areas of strength and weakness.</b>			
<b>Next Assessment Cycle Plan</b> (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)			
When will this outcome be assessed again? It is perfectly fine to not assess every outcome every year; however, it is important to note <i>when</i> it will be assessed again.			
Please include the year this outcome will be assessed again, when and what data/artifacts will be collected, what courses will be sampled, and who will be responsible for collecting and providing data and information.			
This area is accessed every semester. However, the Teacher Work Sample may go over a revision to ensure it is up-to-date.			

**Student Learning Outcome 3**

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	Students will collect data on a target behavior to determine the function of behavior to create a more positive learning climate.														
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	Direct: Autobiographical Experience  This assignment is completed in the first semester of the clinical experience so students begin to analyze the classroom environment as an important component of student learning.														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>Fall 2019</th> <th>Spring 2020</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="center">12</td> <td align="center">12</td> <td align="center">14</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">11</td> <td align="center">11</td> <td align="center">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">10</td> <td></td> <td align="center">2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Score	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	12	12	14	11	11	5	10		2		
Score	Fall 2019	Spring 2020													
12	12	14													
11	11	5													
10		2													
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	90% of students will score at least 10 out of 12 on the Autobiographical Experience rubric and on no individual rubric dimension will the average score across all students be less than 2 out of 3.														
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	90% of students will meet the criteria	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	100%												
<b>Methods</b>	This assignment is in the starting point for SPED 400. Students reflect and write on their impressions of different classroom situations and the environment impacts learning. Instructor scores assignment.														
<b>Measurement Instrument 2</b>	Direct: Behavioral Observation  This assignment requires students to use the cumulative knowledge gained in SPED 400 to choose target behavior and collect data to determine the function of the behavior.														

		Score	Fall 2019	
		30	0	
		29	3	
		28	3	
		27	3	
		26	1	
		25	3	
		19	1	
	This assignment was not completed in Spring, 2020 due to school closures as a result of COVID-19.			
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	85% of students will score at least a 25 out of 30 on the Behavioral Observation rubric and on no individual rubric dimension will the average score across all students be less than 2 out of 3.			
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	85% of students will meet the criteria	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	93%	
<b>Methods</b>	Students collect behavioral data and analyze results to determine the function of behavior at the end of SPED 400. Data and reflection are scored by the instructor. Feedback is provided.			
<b>Measurement Instrument 3</b>				
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>				
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>		<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>		
<b>Methods</b>				
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.</b>			<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)				

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

Our goals were met for behavior. We will keep more detailed data regarding each dimension for the rubrics.

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

This outcome will be assessed in the Fall and Spring during the 2020-21 academic year.

Rubrics:

Key Assessment 5A: Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment Rubric							
Scoring Sheet							
CAEP	InTAS C	KTS	Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
LGA1				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.3 1.4	1,7	2.1	<b>LGA 1</b> 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	<b>LGA 2</b> 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	<b>LGA 3</b> Alignment of Learning Goals with standards	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.
LGA4				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.3 1.4	4,5 1,7	1.2 2.2	<b>LGA 4</b> Appropriatenes s 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	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

						world, and other relevant connections.	
LGA5				○	○	○	○
1.1 D	2,3	3.1	<b>LGA 5</b> 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	<b>LGA 6</b> 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	<b>LGA 7</b> 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	<b>LGA 8</b> 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	<b>LGA 9</b> 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 <u>and</u> discussion is missing for 2 or more groups or two or more goals.  Inaccurate reflection and evaluation of instructional	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.	Clear reflection and evaluation of instructional practice to inform future teaching.  Competently identifies small groups for specific content/skills based on data representations and clearly evaluates instructional practice	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

			<p>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>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>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	<b>ASL 4</b> 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. 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>	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
-------------------	-----	-----	---	--	---	--	--

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

CAEP	InTASC	KTS	Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<b>D12</b>				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.3 1.4	4,5 1,7	1.1 1.2 1.3 2.1 2.5	<b>DI 2</b> 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>	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

				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.	
<b>DI3</b>				○	○	○	○
<b>1.1</b> <b>1.5</b> <b>T</b>	<b>1,6,8,9,10</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>DI 3</b> 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.
<b>DI4</b>				○	○	○	○
<b>1.1</b> <b>1.3</b> <b>1.4</b>	<b>4,5</b> <b>1,7</b>	<b>1.1</b> <b>1.2</b> <b>1.3</b> <b>2.4</b> <b>2.5</b>	<b>DI 4</b> Instructional Strategies	Provides a 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.
<b>DI5</b>				○	○	○	○
<b>1.1</b> <b>1.2</b> <b>1.3</b> <b>1.4</b>	<b>1,7</b> <b>6</b>	<b>2.3</b> <b>5.4</b>	<b>DI 5</b> 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)
<b>TOTAL</b> . . . . .	<b>100%</b>	_____	<b>(200)</b>

Format . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_ (10)  
 (Separate score based on instructor preference)

Critical Performance Holistic Scoring Guide		
Level	Percentage	Descriptor
<b>4</b>	97-100%	No revision required; rich, insightful, in-depth and elaborate; establishes and maintains purpose throughout; accurate, relevant, and thorough
<b>3</b>	85-97%	Standard-met with few errors that do not deter from accuracy and/or meaning; focused, effective, and relevant
<b>2</b>	77-84%	Significant gap in understanding, although an attempt was made; unelaborated with several errors present
<b>1</b>	76% or less	Minimal understanding; only small portions are addressed; response is limited, incorrect, missing, random, weak, and/or ineffective
<b>0</b>	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
<b>CF 1</b> School Information  <b>KTS 2.2, 3.3</b>	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.
<b>CF 2</b> Knowledge of Classroom Information  <b>KTS 2.2, 3.3</b>	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.
<b>CF 3</b> Knowledge of Student Characteristics  <b>KTS 2.2, 3.3</b>	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**

<b>Prompt Areas</b>	<b>Beginning</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<b>LGA 1</b> List 2 to 3 learning goals  <b>KTS 2.1</b>	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.
<b>LGA 2</b> Levels of learning goals  <b>KTS 3.1</b>	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.
<b>LGA 3</b> Alignment of Learning Goals with standards  <b>KTS 2.1</b>	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.
<b>LGA 4</b> Appropriateness of Learning Goals  <b>KTS 2.2, 1.2</b>	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.
<b>LGA 5</b> Mastery levels for each Learning Goal  <b>KTS 3.1</b>	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.
<b>LGA 6</b> Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Learning Goals  <b>KTS 5.1, 5.3</b>	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.

<b>LGA 7</b> Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Adaptations  <b>KTS 2.2</b>	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.
<b>LGA 8</b> Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Modes of Assessments  <b>KTS 5.1, 5.3</b>	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.
<b>LGA 9</b> Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Scoring Criteria  <b>KTS 5.1</b>	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**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Beginning</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<b>DI 1</b> Results of pre-assessment  <b>KTS 5.4, 2.2</b>	<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.</p> <p>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>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>

<p><b>DI 2</b> Unit Overview</p> <p><b>KTS 2.1, 1.3, 2.5, 1.1, 1.2</b></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><b>DI 3</b> Integration of Technology</p> <p><b>KTS 6.1</b></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><b>DI 4</b> Instructional Strategies</p> <p><b>KTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.4, 2.5</b></p>	<p>Provides a 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><b>DI 5</b> Formative Assessments  <b>KTS 2.3, 5.4</b></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><b>ASL 1</b> Visual Representation of Student Performance  <b>KTS 6.4</b></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.		
<b>ASL 2</b> Analysis of Student Performance <b>KTS 5.4, 7.1</b>	<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.
<b>ASL 3</b> Instructional Implications from Data <b>KTS 2.4, 7.2</b>	<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><b>ASL 4</b> Analysis of an Individual Student</p> <p><b>KTS 1.5</b></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
<b>R 1</b> Self-assessment of KTS  <b>KTS 9.1</b>	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.
<b>R 2</b> Identify Teaching Strengths  <b>KTS 7.2, 7.3, 9.1</b>	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.
<b>R3</b> Identify areas of Professional Development  <b>KTS 7.2, 7.3, 9.1, 9.2</b>	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.

SPED 350 Final Project

Characteristic with Proficient possible score	Exemplary +2	Proficient receive full points <b>Read this area First</b>	Basic Less ½ pts	Lacking/missing Less 2/3 pts
PLOP Quality 10 pts	Uses data to support PLOP in what student can do	For at least three areas, strengths and weak areas set up for IEP goals. Written in positive format.	For at least two areas, set up for IEP goals. And/or Written in more weakness format.	Incorrectly marking PLOP sections.
Annual Goals 15 pts	Goals easily understood without questions meeting all requirements with document to show measurement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● CABDEF format</li> <li>● Measurable</li> <li>● Observable</li> <li>● Aligns with PLOP</li> </ul>	<u>1- 2 of these</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● CABDEF format missing one or more element</li> <li>● Measurable is not easily understood</li> <li>● May not be observable</li> <li>● Aligns with PLOP</li> </ul>	<u>1-2 missing</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● CABDEF format</li> <li>● Measurable</li> <li>● Observable</li> <li>● Aligns with PLOP</li> </ul>
Specially Designed Instruction 9 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● RB SDI &gt;2 for each goal.</li> <li>● Present extra documents defining SDI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Research-based (RB)strategies SDI align with each goal.</li> <li>● List at least two SDI per goal</li> <li>●</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● List teaching methods but not (RB)</li> <li>● List only one SDI</li> </ul>	Left blank or lists item(s) that does not meet definition of SDI
Objectives/ sub goals 10 pts	Sub goals obviously show growth towards annual goal using SDI methods.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● CABDEF format</li> <li>● Measurable</li> <li>● Observable</li> <li>● Aligns with annual goal</li> </ul>	<u>1- 2 of these</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● CABDEF format missing one or more element</li> <li>● Measurable is not easily understood</li> <li>● May not be observable</li> <li>● Aligns with annual goal</li> </ul>	<u>1-2 missing</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● CABDEF format</li> <li>● Measurable</li> <li>● Observable</li> <li>● Aligns with annual goal</li> </ul>
Required documentation 8 pts	All 6 presented and completed to pre-meeting level.	ARC notice/invitation Parent rights ARC agenda ARC conference Summary Eligibility forms	At least five documents presented but some may not be completed.	4 or less presented
Other documents considered or presented 8 pts	> 5 documents presented	At least 5 presented	3, 4 documents presented And/or Documents not presented but referenced	0-2 documents presented
Presentation quality 10 pts	Professionally presented plus documentation presenting overall organization of presentation content, i.e. ppt/handouts/etc.	<u>Professionally presented:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Equal participation</li> <li>● Professional documentation</li> <li>● Well-rehearsed</li> <li>● Uses at least 3 aspects of Zoom.</li> </ul>	Lacking in one area for professional presentation	Lacking in 2 or more professional presentation

**SPED 400 Autobiographical Experience**

<b>Skills</b>	3 points	2 points	1 points	0 points
<b>Describes positive and negative literacy events</b>	Reflection includes thorough description of one positive and one negative behavioral experience at school	Reflection describes one positive and one negative behavioral experience at school	Reflection only includes 1 specific example, either positive or negative.	Reflection does not include any specific examples.
<b>Evaluates how the classroom climate influenced your learning in these settings.</b>	Reflection explicitly makes the connection between the events described and the classroom climate	Reflection makes the connection between the events described and the classroom climate	Reflection briefly connects the events described to the classroom climate	Reflection does not describe the classroom climate
<b>Depth of Reflection:</b> What does that mean for you as a teacher?	Thoughtfully evaluates the relationship among classroom climate, behavioral experiences, and teaching with several specific details	Evaluates the relationship among classroom climate, behavioral experiences, and teaching	Attempts to evaluate the relationship among classroom climate, behavioral experiences, and teaching	Reflection does not evaluate the relationship among classroom climate, behavioral experiences, and teaching

<b>Conventions</b>	No spelling, conventions, and/or grammar errors.	Few spelling, conventions, and/or grammar errors.	Some spelling, conventions, and/or grammar errors.	Many spelling, conventions, and/or grammar errors.
--------------------	--	---	--	--

### SPED 400 Behavior Observation Assignment

1. Write a definition of the target behavior, make sure it is observable and measureable. Provide examples and nonexamples.
2. Choose a behavior measurement system and provide a rationale (e.g. partial interval recording, duration recording, time sampling, etc).
3. Collect data using your measurement system for one-hour minimum. Upload a copy of the raw data
4. Hypothesize the function of the behavior based on the observations you conducted.
5. Write a reflection of your observation. Answer the following key questions:
  - Why did you choose to measure the behavior you chose? Discuss why this behavior was important to decrease or increase.
  - Under what circumstances did the behavior occur?
  - Under what circumstances did the behavior not occur?
  - How does knowing the circumstances when the behavior does or does not occur help with identifying potential interventions.
  - How did the experience of observing one student and one target behavior differ from your other experiences working with a classroom of students?
  - Overall, what did you take-away from this observation?

	3	2	1	0
Behavior is defined in measureable/observable terms	Clear definition with multiple examples/nonexamples	Definition is observable and measureable with one example/nonexample	Definition is observable and measureable	Definition is not observable or measureable
Behavior measurement system is defined	Measurement system is well-defined and appropriate	Measurement system is aligned, but not well-defined	Measurement system is aligned but not defined	Measurement system is not aligned
Data collection method rationale	Data collection method allows student to effectively	Data collection method is aligned but not effective	Data collection method is not aligned	There is not data collection method

	collect data on the target behavior			
One hour behavior observation	Evidence of 1 hour minimum of behavior observation			Behavior observation is less than 1 hour
Data collection form	Data collection form reflects topography of behavior and measurement system			Data collection form reflects topography of behavior and measurement system
Hypothesize the function of the behavior	The statement of function is appropriate given the data			The statement of function is not appropriate given the data
Reflection: Circumstances under which behavior occurs	Provides extensive information using only the data about the circumstances under which the behavior occurs	Provides information using only the data about the circumstances under which the behavior occurs	Provides information only loosely based on the data about the circumstances under which the behavior occurs	Does not discuss circumstances under which the behavior occurs
Reflection: Circumstances under which behavior occurs intervention components	Provides clear rationale about how circumstances can be used to change behavior based on observations	Provides clear rationale about how circumstances can be used to change behavior not based on observations	Provides basic rationale about how circumstances can be used to change behavior	Does not provide rationale

Reflection: Experience observing one student and one target behavior	Provides 2+ clear, details about observing one student versus working with classroom	Provides at least one clear, details about observing one student versus working with classroom	Discusses observation in broad terms	Does not provide details of observation
Writing style	Paper has fewer than one grammatical errors	Paper has 3 or fewer grammatical errors	Paper has 5 or fewer grammatical errors	Paper has more than 5 errors