

Teaching Work Sample (TWS) Aggregated Data and Narrative

The Teaching Work Sample is offered as evidence in support of meeting Standards 1.1 and 1.2 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge; Standard 2.3 Clinical Partnership and Practice; and Standard 3.5 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity.

The Teaching Work Sample has been adapted from the Teaching Work Sample model developed at the Western Oregon University. The teacher Work Sample (TWS) was created at Western Oregon University more than 25 years ago as a performance assessment that connects classroom instruction to gains in student performance. It allows teacher preparation programs the capability to document their candidates' ability to impact student learning through their instruction.

The Teaching Work Sample (TWS) is an instructional process and a performance assessment that measures a teacher candidates' impact on student learning. The TWS began as a strategy to shift from a focus on teaching to a focus on student learning. It allows candidates to provide evidence of effective teaching and documents appropriate curriculum design, instructional delivery, assessment and analysis of K-12 student learning during a unit of instruction. A teaching work sample demonstrates the connection between candidate performance and student learning.

The TWS is completed as part of the student teaching experience. It typically consists of approximately 10 lessons carried out over two weeks of instruction. Candidates plan a unit of instruction, pretest, teach, and post test to determine student progress within that instructional period in that unit. They need to demonstrate an ability to conduct both pre- and post-assessment as well as ongoing assessment throughout the unit. Candidates also need to demonstrate the ability to analyze the data gathered, reflect upon the strengths and weakness of the instruction provided and make recommendations for future instruction. Candidates also demonstrate the ability to communicate to parents about the unit and the progress for the whole class as well as for an individual sample student.

Once the TWS is completed, the Cooperating Classroom Teacher and University Supervisor review and evaluate the completed TWS submitted by the candidate. Each professional individually rates the TWS using a consistent rubric. Students can be rated as: Below Basic (0); Basic (1); Proficient (2); and Distinguished (3). Scores are averaged and combined score from both professionals is determined. The Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisor rate the TWS in the following areas: Contextual Factors, Goals and Objectives, Lesson Plans, Assessment, Data Analysis and Recommendations, and Summary (written summary by Candidate reflecting on the TWS process as a whole).

The College of Education and University Faculty use the data collected about candidate performance on the TWS for a variety of purposes. The University is vested in monitoring candidate progress through their student teaching experience and in seeing evidence that candidates have mastered key constructs before graduating and entering the P-12 school system. The University also highly values its relationship with P-12 professionals and utilizes the TWS as a way for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors to work collaboratively in evaluating candidates during the student teaching experience.

A general rubric provides guidance in the scoring of each element of the TWS. Additional detail is provided in a rubric that coincides specifically with each of the six elements.

General Rubric			
Teaching Work Sample Criteria Not Met		Teaching Work Sample Criteria Met	
Below Basic Significant discrepancies from criteria 0	Basic Some components do not meet criteria 1	Proficient All criteria met – product components complete 2	Distinguished Exemplary work – product exceeds expectations 3

The first of the six elements of the Teacher Work Sample assessed was that of Contextual Factors. The following rubric guided scoring of this element:

Contextual Factors	<i>Information regarding community/school district, school, classroom and student characteristics</i>
3	Exemplary work: exceeds expectations in all or most project requirements; includes original or unique components that evidence original thinking; high-quality professional product
2	This section includes information regarding understanding the characteristics of the: <input type="checkbox"/> Community, school district and school factors <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom and student characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Instructional implications for the above
1	The teacher candidate appears to understand the requirements but the response is incomplete and/or incorrect in some way.
0	The teacher candidate does not appear to understand the requirements and makes little or no attempt to respond.

The table below reflects the average scores of the clinical faculty member and the university supervisor on the Contextual Factors element for each of the three most recent academic years.

Contextual Factors										
Year	# of Candidates	# of Evaluations	0		1		2		3	
			Below Basic		Basic		Proficient		Distinguished	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2012-2013	65	130	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	48	36.92%	82	63.08%
2013-2014	55	110	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	30	27.27%	80	72.73%
2014-2015	36	72	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	26	36.11%	46	63.89%
Sum/Ave.	Ave=52	Ave=104	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	104	33.33%	208	66.67%

Discussion: An analysis of the data on Contextual Factors indicates that for each of the reporting years from 2012 – 2015 100% of Candidates achieved a rating of Proficient or Distinguished on the TWS. A review of this section will confirm that the instrument is aligned with the following InTASC Standards:

The Learner and Learning, Content, Instructional Practice (CAEP Standard 1.1, Content and Pedagogical Knowledge).

The second of the six elements of the Teacher Work Sample assessed was that of Goals and Objectives. The following rubric guided scoring of this element:

Goals and Objectives	<i>Goals and objectives based on assessment of the unit of study (generally 2 weeks in length) vary in kind and complexity, but include concept attainment and application of knowledge and skills.</i>
3	Exemplary work: exceeds expectations in all or most project requirements; includes original or unique components that evidence original thinking; high-quality professional product
2	<p>This section includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Unit plan which includes goals based on assessment of students' current level of performance <input type="checkbox"/> Goals and objectives consistent with district and state standards, goals, and benchmarks <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives which describe expected actions or behaviors and conditions under which students will meet the objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives which are expressed in observable and measurable terms <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate number of objectives per lesson (usually 2-5) which are linked to state content standards
1	The teacher candidate appears to understand the requirements but the response is incomplete and/or incorrect in some way.
0	The teacher candidate does not appear to understand the requirements and makes little or no attempt to respond.

The table below reflects the average scores of the clinical faculty member and the university supervisor on the Goals and Objectives element for each of the three most recent academic years.

Goals and Objectives										
Year	# of Candidates	# of Evaluations	0		1		2		3	
			Below Basic		Basic		Proficient		Distinguished	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2012-2013	65	130	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	57	43.85%	73	56.15%
2013-2014	55	110	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	34	30.91%	76	69.09%
2014-2015	36	72	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	28	38.89%	44	61.11%
Sum/Ave.	Ave=52	Ave=104	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	119	38.14%	193	61.86%

Discussion: An analysis of the data on Goals and Objectives indicates that for each of the reporting years from 2012 – 2015 100% of Candidates achieved a rating of Proficient or Distinguished on the TWS. A review of this section will confirm that the instrument is aligned with the following InTASC Standards: Content, Instructional Practice (CAEP Standard 1.1, Content and Pedagogical Knowledge).

The third of the six elements of the Teacher Work Sample assessed was that of Lesson Plans. The following rubric guided scoring of this element:

Lesson Plans (including technology)	<i>Daily lesson plans to accomplish the learning goals for the identified group(s) of students.</i>
3	Exemplary work: exceeds expectations in all or most project requirements; includes original or unique components that evidence original thinking; high-quality professional product
2	<p>Daily lesson plans identify/include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Reflection for each lesson at beginning of next days' lesson and in the reflection log <input type="checkbox"/> Contextual factors/learner characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Goals and objectives aligned to state standards <input type="checkbox"/> An appropriate and organized selection of instructional materials and equipment <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction <input type="checkbox"/> Content delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Closure <input type="checkbox"/> An estimation of the time required for each part of the lesson <input type="checkbox"/> Enough details for a substitute teacher <input type="checkbox"/> Adaptations and modifications for students with special needs <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate adjustment based on reflection of previous lesson(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Technology embedded in the lesson as a natural part of the instruction
1	The teacher candidate appears to understand the requirements but the response is incomplete and/or incorrect in some way.
0	The teacher candidate does not appear to understand the requirements and makes little or no attempt to respond.

The table below reflects the average scores of the clinical faculty member and the university supervisor on the Lesson Plans element for each of the three most recent academic years.

Lesson Plans										
Year	# of Candidates	# of Evaluations	0 Below Basic		1 Basic		2 Proficient		3 Distinguished	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2012-2013	65	130	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	48	36.92%	82	63.08%
2013-2014	55	110	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	30	27.27%	80	72.73%
2014-2015	36	72	0	0.00%	2	2.78%	25	34.72%	45	62.50%

Sum/Ave.	Ave=52	Ave=104	0	0.00%	2	0.64%	102	32.69%	207	66.35%
----------	--------	---------	---	-------	---	-------	-----	--------	-----	--------

Discussion: An analysis of the data on Lesson Plans indicates that for the reporting years from 2012 – 2015 154 out of 156 Candidates achieved a rating of Proficient or Distinguished on the TWS. Two Candidates were rated as Basic during the 2014-2015 academic year. A review of this section will confirm that the instrument is aligned with the following InTASC Standards: Content, Instructional Practice (CAEP Standard 1, Content and Pedagogical Knowledge).

The fourth of the six elements of the Teacher Work Sample assessed was that of Assessment. The following rubric guided scoring of this element:

Assessment	<i>Gathering and organization of data.</i>
3	Exemplary work: exceeds expectations in all or most project requirements; includes original or unique components that evidence original thinking; high-quality professional product
2	<p>This section includes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Daily data which is collected and recorded <input type="checkbox"/> Post-assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Assessments related to unit goals and objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Assessments which properly test all objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Samples of student work
1	The teacher candidate appears to understand the requirements but the response is incomplete and/or incorrect in some way.
0	The teacher candidate does not appear to understand the requirements and makes little or no attempt to respond.

The table below reflects the average scores of the clinical faculty member and the university supervisor on the Assessment element for each of the three most recent academic years.

Assessment										
Year	# of Candidates	# of Evaluations	0		1		2		3	
			Below Basic		Basic		Proficient		Distinguished	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2012-2013	65	130	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	48	36.92%	82	63.08%
2013-2014	55	110	0	0.00%	1	0.91%	37	33.64%	72	65.45%
2014-2015	36	72	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	32	44.44%	40	55.56%
Sum/Ave.	Ave=52	Ave=104	0	0.00%	1	0.32%	117	37.50%	194	62.18%

Discussion: An analysis of the data on Assessment indicates that for the reporting years from 2012 – 2015, 155 out of 156 Candidates achieved a rating of Proficient or Distinguished on the TWS. During the 2013- 2014 academic year, one student was rated as Basic in this area. A review of this section will

confirm that the instrument is aligned with the following InTASC Standards: The Learner and Learning, Instructional Practice, (CAEP Standard 1.1, 1.2 - Content and Pedagogical Knowledge).

The fifth of the six elements of the Teacher Work Sample assessed was that of Data Analysis and Recommendations. The following rubric guided scoring of this element:

Data Analysis and Recommendations	<i>Data related to learning gains or lack thereof resulting from instruction, analyzed for each student, and summarized in relation to students' level of knowledge prior to instruction</i>
3	Exemplary work: exceeds expectations in all or most project requirements; includes original or unique components that evidence original thinking; high-quality professional product
2	<p>This section includes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Analyzed data from pre-, on-going and post-assessment for individuals and the class <input type="checkbox"/> Summarized data on student achievement in relationship to instructional objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendations for future instructions are written from analysis of all data
1	The teacher candidate appears to understand the requirements but the response is incomplete and/or incorrect in some way.
0	The teacher candidate does not appear to understand the requirements and makes little or no attempt to respond.

The table below reflects the average scores of the clinical faculty member and the university supervisor on the Data Analysis and Recommendations element for each of the three most recent academic years.

Data Analysis and Recommendations										
Year	# of Candidates	# of Evaluations	0		1		2		3	
			Below Basic		Basic		Proficient		Distinguished	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2012-2013	65	130	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	47	36.15%	83	63.85%
2013-2014	55	110	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	39	35.45%	71	64.55%
2014-2015	36	72	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	34	47.22%	38	52.78%
Sum/Ave.	Ave=52	Ave=104	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	119	38.14%	192	61.54%

Discussion: An analysis of the data on Data Analysis and Recommendations indicates that for each of the reporting years from 2012 – 2015 100% of Candidates achieved a rating of Proficient or Distinguished on the TWS. A review of this section will confirm that the instrument is aligned with the following INTASC Standards: The Learner and Learning, Instructional Practice, Professional Responsibility (CAEP Standard 1.1, 1.2 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge).

The sixth and final element of the six elements of the Teacher Work Sample assessed was a Summary of Student Progress. The following rubric guided scoring of this element:

Summary of Student Progress	<i>Descriptions of the uses to be made of the data on learning gains in planning further instruction on this and subsequent topics. Also samples of reporting progress to parents or guardians and students</i>
3	Exemplary work: exceeds expectations in all or most project requirements; includes original or unique components that evidence original thinking; high-quality professional product
2	This section includes: <input type="checkbox"/> A sample report which could be posted on a class web site for parents describing the unit and over-all results <input type="checkbox"/> A sample letter/report to one student’s parents/guardians describing results <input type="checkbox"/> An organized 3-way conference (or separate conferences) with cooperating teacher and university supervisor to present data analysis and recommendations for future instruction in this or related area
1	The teacher candidate appears to understand the requirements but the response is incomplete and/or incorrect in some way.
0	The teacher candidate does not appear to understand the requirements and makes little or no attempt to respond.

The table below reflects the average scores of the clinical faculty member and the university supervisor on the Summary of Student Progress element for each of the three most recent academic years.

Summary of Student Progress										
Year	# of Candidates	# of Evaluations	0 Below Basic		1 Basic		2 Proficient		3 Distinguished	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2012-2013	65	130	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	46	35.38%	84	64.62%
2013-2014	55	110	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	28	25.45%	82	74.55%
2014-2015	36	72	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	23	31.94%	49	68.06%
Sum/Ave.	Ave=52	Ave=104	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	97	31.09%	215	68.91%

Discussion: An analysis of the data on Summary of Student Progress indicates that for each of the reporting years from 2012 – 2015 100% of Candidates achieved a rating of Proficient or Distinguished on the TWS. A review of this section will confirm that the instrument is aligned with the following InTASC Standards: The Learner and Learning, Instructional Practice, Professional Responsibility (CAEP Standard 1.1, 1.2 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge).