



Teacher Work Sample

Analytic & Holistic Scoring Rubrics

June 2002

The June 2002 analytic scoring rubric was revised by representatives from the eleven Renaissance Partnership Project sites:

California State University at Fresno, Eastern Michigan University, Emporia State University, Idaho State University, Kentucky State University, Longwood College, Middle Tennessee State University, Millersville University, Southeast Missouri State University, University of Northern Iowa, Western Kentucky University.

Notice: The materials in this document were developed by representatives of the Renaissance Partnership Institutions and may not be used or reproduced without citing The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project <http://fp.uni.edu/itq>

The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality is a Title II federally funded project with offices at Western Kentucky University. Director: Roger Pankratz roger.pankratz@wku.edu

Candidate's Full Name _____

WKU ID _____

Evaluator's Name _____

Date Scored _____

**Contextual Factors
Rubric**

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

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
1. Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors	Teacher displays minimal, irrelevant, or biased knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom.	Teacher displays some knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning.	Teacher displays a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning.	
2. Knowledge of Characteristics of Students	Teacher displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge of student differences (e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities).	Teacher displays general knowledge of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning.	Teacher displays general & specific understanding of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning.	
3. Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning	Teacher displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities).	Teacher displays general knowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities).	Teacher displays general & specific understanding of the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities) that may affect learning.	
4. Knowledge of Students' Skills And Prior Learning	Teacher displays little or irrelevant knowledge of students' skills and prior learning.	Teacher displays general knowledge of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.	Teacher displays general & specific understanding of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.	
5. Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment	Teacher does not provide implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics OR provides inappropriate implications.	Teacher provides general implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.	Teacher provides specific implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.	

**Learning Goals
Rubric**

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

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
1. Significance, Challenge and Variety	Goals reflect only one type or level of learning.	Goals reflect several types or levels of learning but lack significance or challenge.	Goals reflect several types or levels of learning and are significant and challenging.	
2. Clarity	Goals are not stated clearly and are activities rather than learning outcomes.	Some of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes.	Most of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes.	
3. Appropriateness For Students	Goals are not appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; or other student needs.	Some goals are appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs.	Most goals are appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs.	
4. Alignment with National, State or Local Standards	Goals are not aligned with national, state or local standards.	Some goals are aligned with national, state or local standards.	Most of the goals are explicitly aligned with national, state or local standards.	

**Assessment Plan
Rubric**

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

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
1. Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction	Content and methods of assessment lack congruence with learning goals or lack cognitive complexity.	Some of the learning goals are assessed through the assessment plan, but many are not congruent with learning goals in content and cognitive complexity.	Each of the learning goals is assessed through the assessment plan; assessments are congruent with the learning goals in content and cognitive complexity.	
2. Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance	The assessments contain no clear criteria for measuring student performance relative to the learning goals.	Assessment criteria have been developed, but they are not clear or are not explicitly linked to the learning goals.	Assessment criteria are clear and are explicitly linked to the learning goals.	
3. Multiple Modes and Approaches	The assessment plan includes only one assessment mode and does not assess students before, during, and after instruction.	The assessment plan includes multiple modes but all are either pencil/paper based (i.e. they are not performance assessments) and/or do not require the integration of knowledge, skills and reasoning ability.	The assessment plan includes multiple assessment modes (including performance assessments, lab reports, research projects, etc.) and assesses student performance throughout the instructional sequence.	
4. Technical Soundness	Assessments are not valid; scoring procedures are absent or inaccurate; items or prompts are poorly written; directions and procedures are confusing to students.	Assessments appear to have some validity. Some scoring procedures are explained; some items or prompts are clearly written; some directions and procedures are clear to students.	Assessments appear to be valid; scoring procedures are explained; most items or prompts are clearly written; directions and procedures are clear to students.	
5. Adaptations Based on the Individual Needs of Students	Teacher does not adapt assessments to meet the individual needs of students or these assessments are inappropriate.	Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of some students.	Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of most students.	

**Design for Instruction
Rubric**

TWS Standard: *The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.*

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
1. Alignment with Learning Goals	Few lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Few learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Not all learning goals are covered in the design.	Most lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Most learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Most learning goals are covered in the design.	All lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. All learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. All learning goals are covered in the design.	
2. Accurate Representation of Content	Teacher's use of content 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.	Teacher's use of content appears to be mostly accurate. Shows some awareness of the big ideas or structure of the discipline.	Teacher's use of content appears to be accurate. Focus of the content is congruent with the big ideas or structure of the discipline.	
3. Lesson and Unit Structure	The lessons within the unit are not logically organized organization (e.g., sequenced).	The lessons within the unit have some logical organization and appear to be somewhat useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals.	All lessons within the unit are logically organized and appear to be useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals.	
4. Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources	Little variety of instruction, activities, assignments, and resources. Heavy reliance on textbook or single resource (e.g., work sheets).	Some variety in instruction, activities, assignments, or resources but with limited contribution to learning.	Significant variety across instruction, activities, assignments, and/or resources. This variety makes a clear contribution to learning.	
5. Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources	Instruction has not been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Activities and assignments do not appear productive and appropriate for each student.	Some instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Some activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student.	Most instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Most activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student.	
6. Use of Technology	Technology is inappropriately used OR teacher does not use technology, and no (or inappropriate) rationale is provided.	Teacher uses technology but it does not make a significant contribution to teaching and learning OR teacher provides limited rationale for not using technology.	Teacher integrates appropriate 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 teacher uses on-going analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions.*

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
1. Sound Professional Practice	Many instructional decisions are inappropriate and not pedagogically sound.	Instructional decisions are mostly appropriate, but some decisions are not pedagogically sound.	Most instructional decisions are pedagogically sound (i.e., they are likely to lead to student learning).	
2. Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning	Teacher treats class as “one plan fits all” with no modifications.	Some modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs, but these are not based on the analysis of student learning, best practice, or contextual factors.	Appropriate modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual 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 student progress.	
3. Congruence Between Modifications and Learning Goals	Modifications in instruction lack congruence with learning goals.	Modifications in instruction are somewhat congruent with learning goals.	Modifications in instruction are congruent with learning goals.	

**Analysis of Student Learning
Rubric**

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

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
1. Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation	Presentation is not clear and accurate; it does not accurately reflect the data.	Presentation is understandable and contains few errors.	Presentation is easy to understand and contains no errors of representation.	
2. Alignment with Learning Goals	Analysis of student learning is not aligned with learning goals.	Analysis of student learning is partially aligned with learning goals and/or fails to provide a comprehensive profile of student learning relative to the goals for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.	Analysis is fully aligned with learning goals and provides a comprehensive profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.	
3. Interpretation of Data	Interpretation is inaccurate, and conclusions are missing or unsupported by data.	Interpretation is technically accurate, but conclusions are missing or not fully supported by data.	Interpretation is meaningful, and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data.	
4. Evidence of Impact on Student Learning	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 learning goals.	Analysis of student learning includes incomplete evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals.	Analysis of student learning 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 teacher analyzes the relationship between his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.*

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
1. Interpretation of Student Learning	No evidence or reasons provided to support conclusions drawn in “Analysis of Student Learning” section.	Provides evidence but no (or simplistic, superficial) reasons or hypotheses to support conclusions drawn in “Analysis of Student Learning” section.	Uses evidence to support conclusions drawn in “Analysis of Student Learning” section. Explores multiple hypotheses for why some students did not meet learning goals.	
2. Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment	Provides no rationale for why some activities or assessments were more successful than others.	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities or assessments and superficially explores reasons for their success or lack thereof (no use of theory or research).	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provides plausible reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack thereof.	
3. Alignment Among Goals, Instruction and Assessment	Does not connect learning 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 connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction.	
4. Implications for Future Teaching	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment.	Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment but offers no rationale for why these changes would improve student learning.	Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment and explains why these modifications would improve student learning.	
5. Implications for Professional Development	Provides no professional learning goals or goals that are not related to the insights and experiences described in this section.	Presents professional learning goals 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 number of professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section. Describes specific steps to meet these goals.	

Holistic Score _____

Rate the TWS overall using the following holistic scale:

1 = Beginning	2 = Developing	3 = Proficient	4 = Exemplary
----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------

Beginning

The Beginning performance provides *little or no evidence* of the teacher's ability to plan, deliver, and assess a standards-based instructional sequence, analyze student learning, and reflect on his or her instruction and student learning to improve teaching practice.

Developing

The Developing performance provides *limited evidence* of the teacher's ability to plan, deliver, and assess a standards-based instructional sequence, analyze student learning, and reflect on his or her instruction and student learning to improve teaching practice.

Proficient

The Proficient performance provides *sufficient* evidence of the teacher's ability to plan, deliver, and assess a standards-based instructional sequence, analyze student learning, and reflect on his or her instruction and student learning to improve teaching practice.

Exemplary

The Exemplary performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher's ability to plan, deliver, and assess a standards-based instructional sequence, analyze student learning, and reflect on his or her instruction and student learning to improve teaching practice.