

## **Section IV: Evidence for Meeting Standards**

### **Assessment 5: Candidate Effect on Student Learning**

#### **Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS)**

- **Instructional Decision Making**
- **Analysis of Student Learning**
- **Candidate Reflection**

#### **1. Description and Use of Assessment**

Teacher candidates in our English Education Program design a Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS) centered on an instructional unit that provides evidence of their ability to plan, facilitate, and analyze student learning by:

- **Recognizing Context:** Using information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment.
- **Planning:** Setting significant, challenging, varied, and appropriate learning goals and unit objectives that are aligned with RI and NCTE standards.
- **Assessing:** Using multiple forms of assessment aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction.
- **Designing Instruction:** Crafting and aligning specific unit goals and objectives, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.
- **Instructional Decision-Making:** Using regular and systematic evaluations of student learning to make instructional decisions.
- **Interpreting Assessment Data:** Using assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.
- **Reflecting:** Demonstrating the habits of a reflective practitioner by synthesizing what he/she has learned from designing and implementing this unit of study.

During Student Teaching, candidates are required to teach a comprehensive unit for the purpose of completing the TCWS. The TCWS contains seven teaching processes identified by research and best practice as fundamental to improving student learning. These seven teaching processes fit into the FSEHD Conceptual Framework themes of Knowledge, Pedagogy, Diversity, and Professionalism. As a reflective practitioner, the teacher candidate also plans, acts, and reflects to inform practice.

Each Teaching Process of the TCWS is followed by the Task, a Prompt, and a Rubric that defines various levels of performance. The Rubrics are used by the supervising College professor (English Education faculty) to evaluate the candidate TCWS.

## **2. Description of How the Assessment Specifically Aligns with NCTE Standards**

For the purposes of this Assessment #5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning), our Program evaluates Teacher Candidate performance on the final three (3) products in the TCWS, as we see all three of these pieces as integral to our candidates' ability to assess student learning through making immediate and long-term decisions for individuals and groups (Instructional Decision-making); analyzing student learning as a class, in groups, and as individuals (Analysis of Student Learning); and reflecting on events and individuals that affect student learning (Candidate Reflection) . Each of these three pieces aligns with specific indicators within NCTE Standards 2.0 (Candidate Attitudes), 3.0 (Candidate Knowledge), and 4.0 (Candidate Pedagogy), as indicated below.

- Instructional Decision-making (NCTE 2.1,2.5, 3.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.10)
- Analysis of Student Learning (NCTE 2.3, 3.1, 4.2, 4.10)
- Candidate Reflection (NCTE 2.3, 3.1)

The Instructional Decision-making assignment requires candidates to explicitly describe how they have implemented changes in their teaching to meet an individual student's needs and that of a group. Candidates thus must be attentive to developing a safe, nurturing environment (NCTE 2.1), make connections between the curriculum and students' lives (2.5, 4.4), use a variety of instructional strategies (4.3), and assess student learning (4.10). For the Analysis of Student Learning assignment, candidates analyze student work across the whole class, specific groups, and individuals to determine students' strengths and areas of growth (4.2, 4.10), which requires reflection and collaboration with colleagues (usually the cooperating teacher, 2.3). In the Reflection, candidates discuss critical incidents from their student teaching and make plans for professional development based on a self-evaluation of their student teaching experience (2.3). All of these pieces are assessed on content as well as organization and conventions (3.1).

These three pieces of the TCWS showcase candidates' ability to make important pedagogical decisions; determine what individuals, groups and the class need in order to learn; and reflect on how individuals and situations affected their own development as teachers. Our candidates' successful completion of these three pieces of the TCWS demonstrates their ability to effectively connect assessment with instruction.

At the end of this document are the three assignments, as we give them to our students, with their respective scoring rubrics, which include how each indicator is aligned with State (RIPTS) and NCTE standards for English Language Arts Teacher Candidates.

### 3. Analysis of Data

In summer 2008, the FSEHD Assessment Committee designed a Teacher Candidate Work Sample adapted from the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project. The English Education program was one of two programs to pilot the TCWS in fall 2008, and one of several to pilot it in spring 2009. As a result of feedback from supervisors and candidates from pilot cohorts throughout the FSEHD, the Assessment Committee completed a thorough revision of the TCWS in summer 2009. The revision included clarifications of directions and samples; adding a writing usage section to each rubric; more rigorous requirements; and a new section called the Candidate Reflection, which is why this section is missing from the Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 cohorts. The requirements of the Candidate Reflection explicitly address the FSEHD Conceptual Framework's emphasis on teaching candidates to be reflective practitioners, the RIBTS, and NCTE standard 2.3.

We have separated data into two tables to differentiate the two semester pilot cohorts from the two most recent semesters of implementation, including the changes in points for each product.

<b>Pilot Cohorts</b>	<b>Instructional Decision Making</b> (18 points)	<b>Analysis of Student Learning</b> (24 points)	<b>Candidate Reflection</b> (not administered)
<b>Fall 2008</b> (7 students)	17	20.1	N/A
<b>Spring 2009</b> (11 students)	14.7	18.2	N/A

<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Instructional Decision Making</b> (42 points)	<b>Analysis of Student Learning</b> (42 points)	<b>Candidate Reflection</b> (30 points)
<b>Fall 2009</b> (7 students)	34.7	35.8	24.6
<b>Spring 2010</b> (15 students)	36.6	35	25.2

The two cohorts from Fall 09 and Spring 10 provide the more useful and reliable information, as the pilots were the first time English Education faculty had taught and assessed the TCWS, and the candidates were unfamiliar even with some of the terminology used within it.

The second cohorts demonstrate more consistency in scoring and also show improvement in candidates' ability to meet the requirements. After the pilot cohorts, English Education faculty devoted significantly more time in Practicum and Student Teaching Seminar to teaching candidates how to articulate their teaching decisions, determine the effectiveness of their assessments, and reflect on their practice. We are particularly pleased with candidates' improved performance (the average aggregate score, out of 100, was 84% in the second two cohorts) in the Analysis of Student Learning, which requires candidates to view student work as data and to determine which students do well and which do not on particular assessments. As English majors, putting data into charts and graphs and making sense of it presented a challenge. However, candidates' analyses and narratives consistently demonstrated their understandings of student learning.

Interestingly, the scores on the Instructional Decision-making and Candidate Reflections were similar, with candidates scoring in the Acceptable and Target ranges for averages (out of 100) around 84% and 83%, respectively. These sections were more easily accessible to most candidates, and some chose to write deeply reflective pieces that did not necessarily match the parameters of the assignment and rubric, thus bringing down their scores. Perhaps their comfort level with the assignment supported them going "outside the box," and making it their own, instead of abiding by the guidelines. This is a case where a strictly defined rubric can limit an assessor's ability to judge the product on its own merits instead of the requirements. Regardless, all requirements were satisfactorily met by all program completers.

#### **4. Interpretation of Data as Evidence of Standards Met**

As discussed in Section #2, the Teacher Candidate Work Sample addresses an array of NCTE standards, and all candidates who completed student teaching also successfully completed the TCWS, indicating their ability to meet NCTE standards 2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.10. Candidates choose classes and units for the TCWS with input from their cooperating teacher and college supervisor; and the TCWS is assessed by English education faculty members.

For each product (Instructional Decision-making, Analysis of Student Learning, and Candidate Reflection) used to demonstrate candidates' effect on student learning, candidates scored in the Acceptable to Target range (see chart in Section #3). Because each indicator of these products is aligned to specific NCTE standards, it is clear to us that candidates met these standards.

#### **TCWS Assignments for Assessment #5:**

##### **1. Instructional Decision-Making**

**Teaching Process :** The candidate uses on-going analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions.

**Task:** Provide two examples of instructional decision-making prompted by students' learning or responses on a planned assessment or other task. For one example the group of students (small, large, or whole class) within the class prompts the revision, while in the other an individual student prompts the adjustment.

**Prompt: Part I**

Think of a time during your unit when learning or responses for a group of students within the class caused you to modify your original design for instruction. (The resulting revision may affect students besides those who prompted the change.)

- Generally describe the students' learning, motivation, engagement, or other responses that caused you to *rethink your plans* for class instruction. The students' learning or response may come from a planned assessment (**not** the pre-assessment) or another task.
- Describe the *revisions* in the instructional unit that you made and *explain* why you thought your decision would improve students' progress toward the learning goals and unit objectives.
- Include specific evidence that supports your decision-making and describes the effect on student progress.

**Part II**

Now, think of another time during your unit when an individual student's learning or response caused you to revise a different portion of your original design for instruction. (The resulting revision may affect students besides the one who prompted the change.)

- Describe this student's learning or response that caused you to *rethink your plans*. The student's learning or response may come from a planned assessment (**not** the pre-assessment) or another task.
- Describe what *revisions* you made and *explain* why you thought your decision would improve this student's progress toward the learning goals and unit objectives.
- Include specific evidence that supports your decision-making and describes the effect on student progress.

**Instructional Decision-Making Rubric**

**Teaching Process: The candidate uses on-going analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions.**

Rating →	1-2	3-4	5-6	SCORE
Indicator ↓	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target	
<b>Part I</b>				

Rating → Indicator ↓	1-2 Unacceptable	3-4 Acceptable	5-6 Target	SCORE
<b>Rethinking Your Plans for a Group of Students</b>  (RIPTS 3; NCTE 2.1, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4, 4.10)	Instructional decisions lack evidence that support the need for a change in plans; are inappropriate and not pedagogically sound.	Instructional decisions show <i>some</i> evidence that support the need for a change in plans; are appropriate and pedagogically sound.	Instructional decisions show <i>significant</i> evidence that support the need for a change in plans; are appropriate and pedagogically sound.	
<b>Revisions for a Group of Students Based on Analysis of Student Learning</b>  (RIPTS 4; NCTE 2.1, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4, 4.10)	Candidate treats class as “one plan fits all” with no revisions or revisions of the instructional plan are not connected to students’ responses or learning.	<i>Some</i> revisions of the instructional plan are made: to address student needs; based on the analysis of student learning; based on best practice; based on contextual factors.	<i>Many</i> appropriate revisions of the instructional plan are made: to address student needs; are informed by a thorough and thoughtful analysis of student learning/performance; based on best practice; based on contextual factors.	
<b>Explanation of the Modifications Made for a Group of Students (re: Learning Goals &amp; Unit Objectives)</b>  (RIPTS 4; NCTE 2.1, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4, 4.10)	Explanation of revisions is not connected to learning goals & unit objectives. The connections between the revisions and learning goals/unit objectives are superficial or absent.	Explanation of the revisions made provides <i>some</i> connection to learning goals & unit objectives. The connections between the revisions and learning goals/unit objectives are appropriate.	Explanation of revisions made specifies connection to learning goals & unit objectives clearly and completely. The connections between the revisions and learning goals/unit objectives are significant and insightful.	
<b>Part II</b>				
<b>Rethinking Your Plans for an Individual Student</b>  (RIPTS 3; NCTE 2.1, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4, 4.10)	Instructional decisions lack evidence that support the need for a change in plans; are inappropriate and not pedagogically sound.	Instructional decisions show <i>some</i> evidence that support the need for a change in plans; are appropriate and pedagogically sound.	Instructional decisions show <i>significant</i> evidence that support the need for a change in plans; are appropriate and pedagogically sound.	

Rating → Indicator ↓	1-2 Unacceptable	3-4 Acceptable	5-6 Target	SCORE
<b>Revisions for an Individual Student Based on Analysis of Student Learning</b>  (RIPTS 3; NCTE 2.1, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4, 4.10)	Candidate treats class as “one plan fits all” with no revisions or revisions of the instructional plan are not connected to this student’s responses or learning.	<i>Some</i> revisions of the instructional plan are made: to address this student’s needs; based on the analysis of this student’s learning; based on best practice; based on contextual factors.	<i>Many</i> appropriate revisions of the instructional plan are made: to address this student’s needs; are informed by a thorough and thoughtful analysis of this student’s learning/performance; based on best practice; based on contextual factors.	
<b>Explanation of the Revisions Made for an Individual Student (re: Learning Goals &amp; Unit Objectives)</b>  (RIPTS 3; NCTE 2.1, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4, 4.10)	Explanation of revisions made lack detail with respect to learning goals & unit objectives. The connections between the revisions and learning goals/unit objectives are superficial or absent.	Explanation of revisions made provide <i>some</i> detail with respect to learning goals & unit objectives. The connections between the modifications and learning goals/unit objectives are appropriate.	Explanation of revisions made provide <i>much</i> detail with respect to learning goals & unit objectives. The connections between the revisions and learning goals/unit objectives are significant and insightful.	
<b>Organization, readability, spelling, and grammar</b>  (RIPTS 8; NCTE 3.1)	This section is unorganized, difficulty to read, and/or has many spelling and/or grammar errors.  Unprofessional presentation.	This section is organized, readable, and uses appropriate spelling and grammar. Contains few errors.  Adequate presentation.	This section is well-organized, readable, and uses appropriate spelling and grammar.  Highly professional presentation.	

## 2. Analysis of Student Learning

**Teaching Process: The teacher candidate uses assessment data to profile student learning, communicate information about student progress and achievement, and evaluate his/her own teaching.**

**Task:** Analyze your assessment data, including pre-, formative, and post-assessments, to determine students' progress related to TWO unit objectives. When considering which objectives to analyze, choose one that most students were able to meet and one that presented problems for some students. Use visual representations (such as charts and graphs) and narrative to communicate the performance of the whole class, subgroups, and two individual students.

Reflect upon and evaluate the relationship among unit objectives, your instruction, and student learning in order to improve your teaching practice. In this narrative, make specific references to your analysis of the assessment data and student work samples to draw your conclusions.

### **Prompt: Part I**

For the TWO unit objectives that you select, analyze assessment data for the whole class, subgroups of students, and two individual students.

- **Whole class.** To analyze the progress of your whole class, create a table that shows pre-, formative, and post-assessment data on every student for the two unit objectives you have chosen. Then, create a visual representation (e.g., charts and graphs) that shows the extent to which your students made progress (from pre- to post-) toward the achievement of these unit objectives in your Assessment Plan section. Interpret what the graph tells you about your students' learning for the objectives selected.
- **Subgroups.** Select a group characteristic (e.g., gender, pre-test performance level, socio-economic status, language proficiency) to analyze in terms of your two chosen unit objectives. Provide a rationale for your selection of this characteristic to form subgroups. Create a visual representation (e.g., charts and graphs) that compares pre-, formative, and post-assessment results for the subgroups on these two unit objectives. Interpret what these data show about student learning for these selected objectives.
- **Individuals.** Select two students who demonstrated different levels of performance. In a narrative, Explain why these particular students performed the way they did. Use pre-, formative, and post-assessment data with examples of the students' work to draw conclusions about student performance on the two unit objectives. Create a visual representation (e.g., charts and graphs) that compares pre-, formative, and post-assessment results for the subgroups on these two unit objectives. Interpret what these data show about student learning for these selected objectives.

### **Part II:**

- Discuss the unit objective that most students were able to meet. Provide two or more possible reasons for this success. Which instructional tasks best supported student engagement and learning? Consider the selected unit objectives, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other contextual factors not under your control. Support these conclusions with data from Part I and student work samples.
- Discuss the unit objective that presented problems for some students. Provide two or more possible reasons for this lack of success. Which instructional tasks could have

been redesigned or discarded? Consider the selected unit objectives, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other contextual factors not under your control. Support these conclusions with data from Part I and student work samples.

- Given your analysis of the two unit objectives, provide an honest and thoughtful self-evaluation in which you offer specific ideas for enhancing student learning, either by restating unit objectives, revising instruction, and/or developing new assessments. Give a rationale for why these revisions would improve student learning.

### Analysis of Student Learning Rubric

**Teaching Process: The teacher candidate uses assessment data to profile student learning, communicate information about student progress and achievement, and evaluate his/her own teaching.**

Rating → Indicator ↓	1-2 Unacceptable	3-4 Acceptable	5-6 Target	SCORE
<b>Part I</b>				
<b>Alignment with Selected Unit Objectives</b>  <b>(RIPTS 9; NCTE 4.2, 4.10)</b>	Analysis of student learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is not aligned with selected unit objectives;</li> <li>• and/or provides a superficial profile of student learning relative to the objectives for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.</li> </ul>	Analysis of student learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is partially aligned with selected unit objectives;</li> <li>• provides a somewhat comprehensive profile of student learning relative to the objectives for the whole class, subgroups, and/or two individuals.</li> </ul>	Analysis of student learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is fully aligned with selected unit objectives;</li> <li>• provides a comprehensive profile of student learning for two of the following groups: the whole class, subgroups, and/or two individuals.</li> </ul>	
<b>Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation of Graphs</b>  <b>(RIPTS 9; NCTE 3.1, 4.2, 4.10)</b>	Presentation is not clear; does not accurately reflect the data.	Presentation is clear and logical; reflects the data somewhat accurately.	Presentation is clear and logical; accurately reflects the data.	

Rating → Indicator ↓	1-2 Unacceptable	3-4 Acceptable	5-6 Target	SCORE
<b>Interpretation of Data</b> (RIPTS 9; NCTE 2.3, 4.2, 4.10)	Interpretation is inaccurate; conclusions are missing or unsupported by data.	Interpretation is somewhat accurate; some conclusions supported by data.	Interpretation is meaningful and technically accurate; appropriate conclusions are supported by the data.	
<b>Evidence of Impact on Student Learning</b> (RIPTS 9; NCTE 4.2, 4.10)	Analysis of student learning fails to include evidence of impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward the selected unit objectives and the amount of improvement they made.	Analysis of student learning includes some evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward the selected unit objectives and the amount of improvement they made.	Analysis of student learning includes clear evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of proportion of students who made progress toward the selected unit objectives and the amount of improvement they made.	
<b>Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment</b> (RIPTS 10; NCTE 2.3, 4.2, 4.10)	Lacks reasonable hypotheses for why some students did not meet the selected objectives.  Provides an inaccurate or no description of why some tasks or assessments were more successful than others.	Explores reasonable hypotheses for why some students did not meet the selected objectives.  Provides a basic description of successful and unsuccessful tasks or assessments.	Explores reasonable hypotheses for why all 3 categories of students did not meet the selected objectives.  Provides a detailed explanation of successful and unsuccessful tasks and assessments.	

Rating → Indicator ↓	1-2 Unacceptable	3-4 Acceptable	5-6 Target	SCORE
<b>Self Evaluation and Implications for Future Teaching</b> <b>(RIPTS 10; NCTE 2.3, 4.2, 4.10)</b>	Provides few or no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning unit objectives, instruction, and assessment.  Lacks rationale.	Provides some ideas for redesigning unit objectives, instruction, and assessment.  Offers a general rationale for why these changes would improve student learning.	Provides ideas for redesigning unit objectives, instruction, and assessment.  Offers a specific rationale as to why these modifications would improve student learning.	
<b>Organization, readability, spelling, and grammar</b> <b>(RIPTS 8; NCTE 3.1)</b>	This section is unorganized, difficult to read, and/or has many spelling and/or grammar errors.  Unprofessional presentation.	This section is organized, readable, and uses appropriate spelling and grammar. Contains few errors.  Adequate presentation.	This section is well-organized, readable, and uses appropriate spelling and grammar.  Highly professional presentation.	

TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_/42

### 3. Candidate Reflection on Student Teaching Experience

**Teaching Process: Reflective practitioners continually and consciously evaluate their choices and actions.**

**Task:** Draw upon your teaching journal/blog, lesson reflections, and/or other sections of this Work Sample to write a thoughtful, coherent reflection of your professional growth throughout the Student Teaching experience.

**Prompt:** Think back to 2-3 critical/significant incidents that occurred during Student Teaching and write a reflection that

- Describes the incidents;
- Describes how they affected the Student Teaching experience;
- Describes what you learned about yourself (examples may include what you learned about working with students, how school structures impact teaching, your habits and tendencies in the teaching role, interactions with colleagues and family, and/or other issues that were of significance this semester);

- Addresses your plans/needs for future professional development in specific, concrete terms, based on what you learned about yourself.

### Candidate Reflection on Student Teaching Experience Rubric

**Teaching Process: Reflective practitioners continually and consciously evaluate their choices and actions.**

Rating → Indicator ↓	1-2 Unacceptable	3-4 Acceptable	5-6 Target	RIPTS
<b>Description of Incidents</b>  (RIPTS 10; NCTE 2.3)	Candidate provides a general description that lacks examples of incidents to tell what was learned during the Student Teaching experience.	Candidate provides a description containing some examples to tell what was learned during the Student Teaching experience.	Candidate provides a detailed description using specific and concrete examples to tell what was learned in Student Teaching.	10
<b>Description of effect on Student Teaching experience</b>  (RIPTS 10; NCTE 2.3)	Candidate provides little or no description of how the incidents affected the Student Teaching experience.	Candidate provides superficial description of how the incidents affected the Student Teaching experience.	Candidate provides rich, in depth description of how the incidents affected the Student Teaching experience.	10
<b>Description of self learning</b>  (RIPTS 10; NCTE 2.3)	Candidate provides little or no description of self learning.	Candidate provides some description of self learning, but it lacks connection to description of incidents and their affect on Student Teaching.	Candidate provides rich, thoughtful description of self learning that connects to description of incidents and their affect on Student Teaching.	10
<b>Plans for Professional Development</b>  (RIPTS 10; NCTE 2.3)	Candidate demonstrates no or vague plans for professional development.	Candidate describes some general plans for professional development, but they may not reflect self learning.	Candidate describes some specific, concrete plans for professional development that reflect self learning.	10
<b>Organization, readability, spelling, and grammar</b>  (RIPTS 8; NCTE 3.1)	This section is unorganized, difficulty to read, and/or has many spelling and/or grammar errors.  Unprofessional	This section is organized, readable, and uses appropriate spelling and grammar. Contains few errors.	This section is well-organized, readable, and uses appropriate spelling and grammar.	

Rating → Indicator ↓	1-2 Unacceptable	3-4 Acceptable	5-6 Target	RIPTS
	presentation.	Adequate presentation.	Highly professional presentation.	

TOTAL \_\_\_\_/30