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Contextual Factors

Rubric

TWS Standard: The candidate uses information about the learning/teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals, plan instruction and assess learning.

 *CF = Conceptual Framework*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RatingIndicator | 1Does Not MeetStandard | 2Acceptable | 3Target/Exemplary | Score |
| Knowledge of Community, School and ClassroomFactors*CF: KnowledgeableInTASC 1,2,9* | Candidate displaysminimal, irrelevant, or biased knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom. | Candidate displays someknowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning. | Candidate displays acomprehensive understanding of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning. |  |
| Knowledge ofCharacteristics*CF: KnowledgeableInTASC 1,2* | Candidate displaysminimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledgeof student differences(e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities). | Candidate displays generalknowledge of student differences (e.g., development,interests, culture,abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning. | Candidate displaysgeneral and specific understanding (e.g.,development, interests,culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning |  |
| Knowledge ofStudents’ Varied Approaches to Learning*CF: KnowledgeableInTASC 1,2* | Candidate displaysminimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities). | Candidate displays generalknowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities). | Candidate displaysgeneral and specific understanding of the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities) that may affect learning. |  |
| Knowledge ofStudents’ Skills andPrior Learning*CF: KnowledgeableInTASC 1,2* | Candidate displays littleor irrelevant knowledge of students’ skills and prior learning. | Candidate displays generalknowledge of students’ skills and prior learning that may affect learning. | Candidate displaysgeneral and specific understanding of students’ skills and prior learning that may affect learning. |  |
| Implications forInstructional Planning and Assessment*CF: Knowledgeable, SkillfulInTASC 1,2, 6,7* | Candidate does notprovide implications for instruction andassessment based onstudent individual differences and community, school, and classroomcharacteristics OR provides inappropriate implications. | Candidate provides generalimplications for instruction and assessment based on studentindividual differences andcommunity, school, and classroom characteristics. | Candidate providesspecific implications for instruction andassessment based onstudent individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics. |  |

Learning Goals

Rubric

TWS Standard: The candidate sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals.

 *CF = Conceptual Framework*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RatingIndicator | 1Does Not MeetStandard | 2Acceptable | 3Target/Exemplary | Score |
| Significance, Challenge and Variety*CF: SkillfulInTASC 4* | Goals reflect only onetype or level of learning. | Goals reflect several types orlevels of learning but lack significance or challenge. | Goals reflect severaltypes or levels of learning and aresignificant andchallenging. |  |
| Clarity*CF: SkillfulInTASC 4* | Goals are not statedclearly and are activities rather than learning outcomes. | Some of the goals are clearlystated as learning outcomes. | Most of the goals areclearly stated as learning outcomes. |  |
| Appropriateness ForStudents*CF: Skillful, CaringInTASC 1, 4* | Goals are notappropriate for the development; pre- requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; or other student needs. | Some goals are appropriate forthe development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs. | Most goals areappropriate for the development; pre- requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs. |  |
| Alignment withNational, State or LocalStandards*CF: Knowledgeable, SkillfulInTASC 4* | Goals are not alignedwith national, state or local standards. | Some goals are aligned withnational, state or local standards. | Most of the goals areexplicitly aligned with national, state or local standards. |  |

Assessment Plan

Rubric

TWS Standard: The candidate uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during and after instruction.

 *CF = Conceptual Framework*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RatingIndicator | 1Does Not MeetStandard | 2Acceptable | 3Target/Exemplary | Score |
| Alignment withLearning Goals andInstruction*CF: SkillfulInTASC 6* | Content and methods ofassessment lack congruence with learning goals or lack cognitive complexity. | Some of the learning goals areassessed through the assessment plan, but many are not congruent with learning goals in content and cognitive complexity. | Each of the learninggoals is assessed through the assessment plan; assessments are congruent with the learning goals in content and cognitivecomplexity. |  |
| Clarity of Criteria andStandards forPerformance*CF: SkillfulInTASC 6* | The assessmentscontain no clear criteria for measuring student performance relative to the learning goals. | Assessment criteria have beendeveloped, but they are not clear or are not explicitly linked to the learning goals. | Assessment criteria areclear and explicitly linked to the learning goals. |  |
| Multiple Modes andApproaches*CF: Skillful, CaringInTASC 6* | The assessment planincludes only one assessment mode and does not assess students before, during, and after instruction. | The assessment plan includesmultiple modes but all are either pencil/paper base d (i.e. they are not performance assessments) and/or do not require the integration of knowledge, skills and reasoning ability. | The assessment planincludes multiple assessment modes (including performance assessments, lab reports, research projects, etc.) and assesses student performance throughout the instructional sequence. |  |
| Technical Soundness*CF: SkillfulInTASC 6* | Assessments are notvalid; scoringprocedures are absent or inaccurate; items orprompts are poorlywritten; directions and procedures are confusing to students. | Assessments appear to havesome validity. Some scoring procedures are explained; some items or prompts are clearly written; some directions and procedures are clear tostudents. | Assessments appear tobe valid; scoring procedures areexplained; most items or prompts are clearlywritten; directions and procedures are clear tostudents. |  |
| Adaptations Based on the Individual Needs of Students*CF: Skillful, Caring, EthicalInTASC 1, 2, 6* | Candidate does notadapt assessments to meet the individualneeds of students or these assessments areinappropriate. | Candidate makes adaptations toassessments that are appropriate to meet theindividual needs of some students. | Candidate makesadaptations to assessments that areappropriate to meet the individual needs of moststudents. |  |

Design for Instruction Rubric

TWS Standard: The candidate designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.
*CF = Conceptual Framework*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RatingIndicator | 1Does Not MeetStandard | 2Acceptable | 3Target/Exemplary | Score |
| Alignment withLearning Goals*CF: SkillfulInTASC 4, 5* | Few lessons areexplicitly linked to learning goals. Fewlearning activities, assignments andresources are aligned with learning goals.Not all learning goals are covered in thedesign. | Most lessons are explicitlylinked to learning goals. Most learning activities, assignmentsand resources are aligned with learning goals. Most learninggoals are covered in the design. | All lessons are explicitlylinked to learning goals. All learning activities,assignments and resources are alignedwith learning goals. All learning goals arecovered in the design. |  |
| Accurate Representation of Content*CF: KnowledgeableInTASC 4* | Candidate’s use ofcontent appears to contain numerous inaccuracies. Content seems to be viewed more as isolated skills and facts rather than as part of a larger conceptual structure. | Candidate’s use of contentappears to be most accurate. Shows some awareness of the big ideas or structure of the discipline. | Candidate’s use ofcontent appears to be accurate. Focus of the content is congruent with the big ideas or structure of the discipline. |  |
| Lesson and UnitStructure*CF: SkillfulInTASC 3, 4* | The lessons within theunit are not logically organized organization(e.g., sequenced). | The lessons within the unithave some logical organization and appear to be somewhatuseful in moving studentstoward achieving the learning goals. | All lessons within theunit are logically organized and appear tobe useful in movingstudents toward achieving the learning goals. |  |
| Use of a Variety ofInstruction, Activities, Assignments, and Resources*CF: Skillful, CaringInTASC 7, 8* | Little variety ofinstruction, activities, assignments, and resources. Heavy reliance on textbook or single resource (e.g., work sheets). | Some instruction has beendesigned with reference to contextual factors and pre- assessment data. Some activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student. | Significant variety acrossinstruction, activities, assignments, and/or resources. This variety makes a clear contribution to learning. |  |
| Use of ContextualInformation andData to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources*CF: Skillful, Caring, EthicalInTASC 1, 2, 6, 7, 8* | Instruction has not beendesigned with reference to contextual factorsand pre-assessmentdata. Activities and assignments do notappear productive andappropriate for each student. | Candidate uses technology butit does not make a significant contribution to teaching andlearning OR candidate provideslimited rationale for not using technology. | Most instruction hasbeen designed with reference to contextualfactors and pre-assessment data. Most activities andassignments appearproductive and appropriate for each student. |  |
| Use of Technology*CF: Knowledgeable, SkillfulInTASC 8* | Technology isinappropriately used OR candidate does not use technology, and no (or inappropriate) rationale is provided. | Candidate uses technology butit does not make a significant contribution to teaching and learning OR candidate provides limited rationale for not using technology. | Candidate integratesappropriate technology that makes a significant contribution to teaching and learning OR provides a strong rationale for not using technology. |  |

Instructional Decision-Making

Rubric

TWS Standard: The candidate uses on-going analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions.

 *CF = Conceptual Framework*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RatingIndicator | 1Does Not MeetStandard | 2Acceptable | 3Target/Exemplary | Score |
| Sound ProfessionalPractice*CF: Skillful, Caring, EthicalInTASC 9* | Many instructionaldecisions are inappropriate and not pedagogically sound. | Instructional decisions aremostly appropriate, but some decisions are not pedagogically sound. | Most instructionaldecisions are pedagogically sound (i.e., they are likely to lead to student learning) |  |
| Modifications Based on Analysis ofStudent Learning*CF: Skillful, Caring, EthicalInTASC 9* | Candidate treats class as“one plan fits all” with no modifications. | Some modifications of theinstructional plan are made to address individual studentneeds, but these are not basedon the analysis of student learning, best practice, or contextual factors. | Appropriatemodifications of the instructional plan aremade to addressindividual student needs. These modifications are informed by the analysis of student learning/performance, best practice, or contextual factors. Include explanation of why the modifications would improve students’ progress. |  |
| Congruence Between Modifications and Learning Goals*CF: Skillful, EthicalInTASC 9* | Modifications ininstruction lack congruence with learning goals. | Modifications in instruction aresomewhat congruent with learning goals. | Modifications ininstruction are congruent with learning goals. |  |

Analysis of Student Learning

Rubric

TWS Standard: The candidate uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.

 *CF = Conceptual Framework*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RatingIndicator | 1Does Not MeetStandard | 2Acceptable | 3Target/Exemplary | Score |
| Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation*CF: SkillfulInTASC 9* | Presentation is not clearand accurate; it does not accurately reflect thedata. | Presentation is understandableand contains few errors. | Presentation is easy tounderstand and contains no errors ofrepresentation. |  |
| Alignment withLearning Goals*CF: SkillfulInTASC 9* | Analysis of studentlearning is not aligned with learning goals. | Analysis of student learning ispartially aligned with learning goals and/or fails to provide acomprehensive profile ofstudent learning relative to goals for the whole class, subgroups and two individuals. | Analysis is fully alignedwith learning goals and provides acomprehensive profile ofstudent learning for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals. |  |
| Interpretation ofData*CF: Skillful, EthicalInTASC 9* | Interpretation isinaccurate, and conclusions are missing or unsupported by data. | Interpretation is technicallyaccurate, but conclusions are missing or not fully supported by data. | Interpretation ismeaningful, and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data. |  |
| Evidence of Impact on Student Learning*CF: Skillful, EthicalInTASC 9* | Analysis of studentlearning fails to include evidence of impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals. | Analysis of student learningincludes incomplete evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals. | Analysis of studentlearning includes evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal. |  |

Reflection and Self-Evaluation

Rubric

TWS Standard: The candidate analyzes the relationship between his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.

 *CF = Conceptual Framework*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RatingIndicator | 1Does Not MeetStandard | 2Acceptable | 3Target/Exemplary | Score |
| Interpretation ofStudent Learning*CF: Skillful, EthicalInTASC 9* | No evidence or reasonsprovided to support conclusions drawn in“Analysis of StudentLearning” section. | Provides evidence but no (orsimplistic, superficial) reasons or hypotheses to supportconclusions drawn in “Analysisof Student Learning” section. | Uses evidence to supportconclusions drawn in“Analysis of Student Learning” section. Explores multiple hypotheses for why some students did not meet learning goals. |  |
| Insights on EffectiveInstruction andAssessment*CF: Skillful, EthicalInTASC 9* | Provides no rationalefor why some activities or assessments weremore successful thanothers. | Identifies successful andunsuccessful activities or assessments and superficiallyexplores reasons for theirsuccess or lack thereof (no use of theory or research). | Identifies successful andunsuccessful activities and assessments andprovides plausiblereasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack thereof. |  |
| Alignment AmongGoals, Instruction and Assessment*CF: Skillful, EthicalInTASC 9* | Does not connectlearning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction and/or the connections are irrelevant or inaccurate. | Connects learning goals,instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction, but misunderstandings or conceptual gaps are present. | Logically connectslearning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction. |  |
| Implications forFuture Teaching*CF: Skillful, CaringInTASC 9* | Provides no ideas orinappropriate ideas for redesigning learninggoals, instruction, andassessment. | Provides ideas for redesigninglearning goals, instruction, and assessment but offers norationale for why these changeswould improve student learning. | Provides ideas forredesigning goals, instruction, andassessment and explainswhy these modifications would improve student learning. |  |
| Implications for Professional Development*CF: SkillfulInTASC 9, 10* | Provides noprofessional learning foals or goals that are not related to theinsights and experiences described in thissection. | Presents professional learninggoals that are not strongly related to the insights and experiences described in this section and/or provides a vague plan for meeting the goals. | Presents a small numberof professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section. Describes specific steps to meet these goals. |  |