College of Education
TWS RUBRIC

Candidate Name:	Candidate ID Number:	Evaluator Name:
Date:	School:	☐ Junior Field ☐ Graduate Practicum ☐ Student Teaching
Content Area:	Grade Level:	Semester and Year:

To pass student teaching, candidates must demonstrate **Sufficient** or above for each component on the Teacher Work Sample Rubric. If a candidate demonstrates **Needs Improvement** in any component, please provide sufficient qualitative evidence in the comment box at the end of the rubric to support the rating.

	Needs Improvement	Sufficient	Proficient	Score
SECTION 1				
1.1 - Preparation through Collaboration *(4e)*	Candidate's summary does not provide evidence that they were responsive to collaboration in advance of planning the unit and lessons.	Candidate's summary provides evidence that they were responsive to collaboration in advance of planning the unit and lessons. InTASC: 9a,b; 10a,b,n	Candidate's summary provides evidence that they actively sought and were responsive to collaboration in advance of planning the unit and lessons. InTASC: 9a,b,d; 10a,b,n	

	Needs Improvement	Sufficient	Proficient	Score
1.2 – Creating the Continual Growth Plan *(4e)*	Candidate does not identify a component to explore for personal growth. OR The questions will not prompt additional self-reflection of the chosen component/elements.	Candidate identifies a component to explore for personal growth supported by reflective self- assessment. At least some of the questions will prompt additional self- reflection of the chosen component/elements and potentially lead to enhanced professional practice. InTASC: *9a,b,g,k; 10f*	Candidate identifies a component to explore for personal growth supported by reflective self- assessment. All three questions will prompt additional self- reflection of the chosen component/elements and potentially lead to enhanced professional practice. InTASC: *9a,b,g,k; 10f*	
1.3 - Preparation through Knowledge of Students *(1b)* *See Table 1*	The chart does not portray the accommodations, modifications, and IEP/IFSP goals for each student with an IEP/IFSP/504 plan.	The chart portrays the accommodations, modifications, and IEP/IFSP goals for each student with an IEP/IFSP/504 plan. *InTASC: 1b, e; 2a, b, f, g, h; 7i*	The chart portrays the accommodations, modifications, and IEP/IFSP goals for each student with an IEP/IFSP/504 plan. Comments go beyond required accommodations and modifications as needed to support individual learners. *InTASC: 1a, b, c, d, e, f, g; 2a, b, f, g, h, j; 7b, d, e, i, j, l, m*	
1.4 - Planning *(also reflects 1.6 in TWS Narrative)*				
1.4.1 – Description, Standards, and Outcomes (1a,c) UNIT & LESSON	Most instructional outcomes are not aligned to standards and/or not measurable.	Most instructional outcomes are aligned to standards and measurable. *InTASC: 4a, j, n*	All instructional outcomes are aligned to standards and measurable. *InTASC: 4a, j, n*	

	Needs Improvement	Sufficient	Proficient	Score
1.4.2 – Relevance (1b) LESSON	Candidate makes little to no connections between the content or skill and the students' interests, cultural heritage, and/or future experiences (e.g., profession).	Candidate makes general connections between the content or skill and the students' interests, cultural heritage, and/or future experiences (e.g., profession). *InTASC: 1b, e, g; 2a, c, d, j; 7a, d, i*	Candidate makes specific connections between the content or skill and the students' interests, cultural heritage, and/or future experiences (e.g., profession). *InTASC: 1b, e, g; 2a, c, d, j, k; 7a, d, i*	
1.4.3 – Assessment (1f) UNIT & LESSON	Candidate designs assessment(s) that would not serve as evidence of students' progress toward instructional outcomes.	Candidate designs assessment(s) to collect data as evidence of students' progress toward some instructional outcomes using technology as appropriate. *InTASC: 6a, b, i, j, k, o*	Candidate designs assessment(s) to collect data as evidence of students' progress toward all instructional outcomes using technology as appropriate. *InTASC: 6a, b, i, j, k, o*	
1.4.4 – Knowledge of Students and Differentiation (1b) UNIT & LESSON	Candidate does not use knowledge of students' levels of development, backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and educational needs/goals in designing instruction.	Candidate uses general knowledge of the class as a whole with regard to levels of development, backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and educational needs/goals in designing assessments and instruction. *InTASC: 1b, f, g; 2c, d, e, h, i, j, k; 6h, p; 7b, c, d, i, k, l*	Candidate actively uses knowledge of individual students' levels of development, backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and educational needs/goals in designing assessments and instruction. *InTASC: 1b, c, e, f, g; 2a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k; 6h, p; 7a, b, c, d, e, f, i, j, k, l, m*	

	Needs Improvement	Sufficient	Proficient	Score
1.4.5 – Classroom Management and Environment (2c,d,e) UNIT & LESSON See Table 2	Candidate does not provide plans for positive expectations and behavioral supports, efficient transitions, management of materials, and instructional grouping that facilitates student learning.	Candidate generally plans positive expectations and behavioral supports, efficient transitions, management of materials, and instructional grouping that facilitates student learning. *InTASC: 3d, i, j; 10o*	Candidate collaborates with learners, families, and/or colleagues to explicitly plan positive expectations and behavioral supports, efficient transitions, management of materials, and instructional grouping that facilitates student learning. *InTASC: 3a, c, d, e, i, j, k; 10d, m, o*	
1.4.6 – Coherent Instruction (1b,c,d,e,f) UNIT	Candidate designs an overview of a series of lessons that only engages students at a single cognitive level.	Candidate designs an overview of a series of lessons that will engage students in lower levels of cognitive activity. A single lesson integrates IEFA. A single lesson includes use of technology to enhance instruction and learning. Lesson overviews differentiate for student needs. *InTASC: 1b, e, f, g; 2a, b, e, f, h, i, k; 4c, g, m, n; 5c, g, l, p; 7a, c, g, i, j; 9f; MCA 20-1-501*	Candidate designs an overview of a series of lessons that will engage students in increasing levels of cognitive activity. Multiple lessons integrate IEFA. Multiple lessons include use of technology to enhance instruction and learning. Lesson overviews differentiate for student needs. *InTASC: 1b, d, e, f, g; 2a, b, c, e, f, g, h, i, j, k; 4a, b, c, g, m, n; 5c, g, l, m, n, p; 7a, c, g, i, j; 9f; MCA 20-1-501*	

	Needs Improvement	Sufficient	Proficient	Score
1.4.7 – Instructional Procedures and Resources (1a,d,e,f; 2e) LESSON	Candidate's instructional activities and assessments are not aligned with the learning outcome(s), are vaguely described with task analysis, or are not scaffolded to support most students' learning. Candidate does not identify resources to support students' learning. Candidate's grouping of students does not align with the instructional strategy. Candidate does not plan for most transitions. Candidate's plan does not anticipate areas of the lesson in which to support students' behavior.	Candidate's instructional activities and assessments are aligned with most learning outcome(s), are mostly described with task analysis, and are scaffolded to support most students' learning. Candidate uses resources to support most students' learning. Candidate's grouping of students aligns with the instructional strategy. Candidate's plan identifies some procedures for transitions. Candidate's plan anticipates some areas of the lesson in which to support students' behavior. *InTASC: 1a, b, d, e, f, g; 2c, d, e, h, j; 3d, i, j; 4a, b, d, f, g, j; 5a, c; 6a, b, e, g, j, k, l, o, p; 7a, c, d, g, k, m; 8a, d, e, i, j, k, m, n, o*	Candidate's instructional activities and assessments are clearly aligned with learning outcome(s), are fully described with clear task analysis, and are scaffolded to support all students' learning. Candidate uses resources to support all students' learning. Candidate's grouping of students aligns with the instructional strategy and supports all students' learning. Candidate's plan includes efficient transitions and utilizes established routines. Candidate anticipates and proactively supports students' behavior. *InTASC: 1a, b, d, e, f, g; 2a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, j; 3d, i, j; 4a, b, d, f, g, i, j; 5a, c, p; 6a, b, e, g, h, j, k, l, o, p; 7a, b, c, d, g, i, j, k, m; 8a, c, d, e, f, i, j, k, l, m, n, o*	
1.5 – Receptivity to Feedback (also reflects 1.7 in TWS Narrative) (4e) **See Tables 2 and 3**	Candidate does not clearly document feedback. OR Most of the candidate's plans to implement feedback will not sufficiently address the feedback received.	Candidate clearly documents feedback. Most of the candidate's plans to implement feedback are clear and will mostly address the feedback received. *InTASC: 9d, g, k; 10a*	Candidate clearly documents feedback. Candidate's plans to implement feedback are clear and will fully address the feedback received. *InTASC: 9d, g, k; 10a*	

	Needs Improvement	Sufficient	Proficient	Score
SECTION 2:				
2.1 - Formative Assessment *(1f, 3d) See Table 4*	Candidate's formative assessment(s) are either not aligned with most instructional outcomes or did not result in measurable, actionable data.	Candidate's formative assessment(s) are aligned with most instructional outcomes and they resulted in actionable data on whole group progress. *InTASC: 6a, b, c, e, j, k, l, o; 7d*	Candidate's formative assessment(s) are clearly aligned with all instructional outcomes and they resulted in actionable data on individual student progress. *InTASC: 6a, b, c, e, g, j, k, l, o, p; 7d, f*	
2.2 – Summative Assessment *(1f, 3d) See Tables 5 and 6*	Candidate's summative assessment is not aligned with most instructional outcomes, or does not include assessment criteria, or does not provides evidence of student progress.	Candidate's summative assessment is aligned with most instructional outcomes and provides evidence of whole group progress. *InTASC: 6a, b, c, e, j, k, l, o; 7d*	Candidate's summative assessment is clearly aligned with instructional outcomes and provides objective evidence of individual student progress. *InTASC: 6a, b, c, e, g, j, k, l, o, p; 7d, f*	
2.3 – Reflecting on Assessment Data *(3d, 3e, 4a)*	Candidate's reflection is not supported by assessment data or does not include a plan to use assessment results to plan for future instruction.	Candidate's reflection is accurately supported by assessment data and includes a clear plan to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for the whole group, purposeful student groupings, OR individual students. *InTASC: 2c; 5; 6a, b, c, e, j, k, l, o; 7a, d, l*	Candidate's reflection is accurately supported by assessment data and includes a clear plan to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for the whole group, purposeful student groupings, AND individual students. *InTASC: 2a, b, c, f; 6a, b, c, e, g, j, k, l, o, p; 7a, b, d, f, j, l*	

SECTION 3:				
3.1 – Reflecting on Instruction *(4a)*	Candidate does not identify aspects of their teaching experience to reflect on (What), or does not provide reasons for selecting the identified teaching experiences (So What), or does not provide general reflections on how to improve future teaching practice (Now What).	Candidate identifies some aspects of their teaching experience to reflect on (What), provides reasons for selecting the identified teaching experiences (So What), and provides general reflections on how to improve future teaching practice (Now What). *InTASC: 9c, g, h*	Candidate identifies key aspects of their teaching experience that impacted student learning (What), provides the significance of those identified teaching experiences (So What), and provides specific and actionable reflections on how to improve future teaching practice (Now What). *InTASC: 9c, g, h*	
3.2 – Finalizing the Continual Growth Plan *(4e)*	Candidate does not reflect on the initial Danielson components and questions identified in creating the continual growth plan. OR Candidate does not identify at least two professional goals, or does not identify resources/activities they plan to engage in, or does not provide a timeline to meet their professional goals.	Candidate provides general reflection on the initial Danielson components and questions identified in creating the continual growth plan. AND Candidate identifies at least two professional goals, identifies general resources/activities they plan to engage in, and a timeline that is mostly realistic to meet their professional goals. InTASC: *9a,b,c,d,g,k; 10f,*	Candidate provides specific and actionable reflection on the initial Danielson components and questions identified in creating the continual growth plan. AND Candidate identifies at least two professional goals. At least one of the goals is specific to reflection regarding their personal biases and accesses resources to deepen their own understanding of cultural, ethnic, gender, and learning differences. They also identify evidence-based resources/activities they plan to engage in, and a realistic timeline to meet their professional goals. InTASC: *9a,b,c,d,e,g,i,k; 10f,h,l*	
Comments:				