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Questions

Is there evidence within the final content area work sample that teacher candidates chose appropriate strategies, accommodations, resources and materials to differentiate for the instructional needs of individuals and groups?  
(addresses InTASC standard 7b)

Is there evidence within the final content area work sample that teacher candidates collaboratively planned with other professionals to meet unique learning needs?  
(addresses InTASC standard 7e)
Data Collection Tools/Methods:

- Case study of one SDEP final content area work sample from Spring 2013.
- Student self ratings compared to consensus ratings made by 3 faculty focusing on two InTASC standards.
- Faculty members reviewed work samples to identify evidence of the same 2 standards addressed in the ratings that reflect inclusion and collaboration.
Teacher Candidate & Faculty Consensus Ratings

InTASC standard 7(b): The teacher plans how to achieve each student’s learning goals, choosing appropriate strategies and accommodations, resources, and materials to differentiate instruction for individuals and groups of learners.

Rating scale:
4 - More competent compared to other teachers
3 - Competent compared to other teachers
2 - Starting to understand
1 - Not there

Teacher candidate self rating 3
Faculty consensus rating 4
7(b) The teacher plans how to achieve each student’s learning goals, choosing appropriate strategies and accommodations, resources, and materials to differentiate instruction for individuals and groups of learners.

Evidence reported by Teacher Candidate:
Armed with knowledge in special education techniques as well as my content knowledge of Language Arts, I feel I have shown competent ability to differentiate instruction and meet students individually at their learning level. I consider a wealth of strategies to meet students with different learning, language and social needs. As a prime example of growth, I recently supported a student in a writing assignment. At the beginning of this year, and indeed with students with similar challenges throughout the first year and a half of the program, I struggled to know how to differentiate learning. The student needs structured assignments and a clear concept of the finished product's constraints. In the past, I continued to keep the same expectations for the student as for his classmates. This week, it was natural to respond to his agitated request for assignment boundaries with an individualized description (You need to mark the text with four margin notes).
Faculty Work Sample Review

7(b) The teacher plans how to achieve each student’s learning goals, choosing appropriate strategies and accommodations, resources, and materials to differentiate instruction for individuals and groups of learners.

Evidence found in work sample when reviewed by faculty:

- Student survey and teacher observation to create learner profile table identifying specific learning supports and preferences of each student. New skills are modeled and practiced with intentional partners before assessed independently.
- Structured routines for practicing new concepts and skills.
- Expectations explicitly taught.
- Randomized response systems (e.g., popsicle sticks).
- Student-friendly targets posted and chorally recited at beginning and end of class.
- Explicit guided writing with text structures (e.g., signal words, graphic organizers).
- Universal design features include use of sentence frames, margin notes, video mentor texts and, explicit modeling of key concepts.
- Option for moving toward independence more quickly offered for those more advanced students.
- Color coding in lesson plan identifies specific differentiation procedures for individual needs.
- Disaggregated learning gain data indicate significant growth for student with IEPs (ranging from 19% to 54% increase), English language learners (53% increase), and native speakers (33% increase).
Teacher Candidate & Faculty Consensus Ratings

**InTASC standard 7(e):** The teacher plans collaboratively with professionals who have specialized expertise (e.g., special educators, related service providers, language learning specialists, librarians, media specialists) to design and jointly deliver as appropriate effective learning experiences to meet unique learning needs.

Rating scale:
4 - More competent compared to other teachers
3 - Competent compared to other teachers
2 - Starting to understand
1 - Not there

Teacher candidate self rating 3
Faculty consensus rating 4
Teacher Candidate Self Report

7(e) The teacher plans collaboratively with professionals who have specialized expertise (e.g., special educators, related service providers, language learning specialists, librarians, media specialists) to design and jointly deliver as appropriate effective learning experiences to meet unique learning needs.

Evidence reported by Teacher Candidate:
Thus far in my work, I have spent limited time collaborating with related service providers, language specialists, librarians, media specialists or assistive technology specialists. When it was appropriate for me (as the student teacher) to collaborate with these providers, I was direct, communicative, and open to their expertise. For example, language specialists advised me on best practices for individual students with language learning needs. Two librarians supported me in finding technology supports for students.
Faculty Work Sample Review

7(e) The teacher plans collaboratively with professionals who have specialized expertise (e.g., special educators, related service providers, language learning specialists, librarians, media specialists) to design and jointly deliver appropriate effective learning experiences to meet unique learning needs.

Evidence found in work sample when reviewed by faculty:

- In the lesson procedures, she has a column for what other adults (i.e., teacher, paraprofessional) in the classroom will do to support targeted individuals and groups.
- She directs the adult as to how to differentiate for specific students throughout the lesson.
- Co-planning with the cooperating teacher and the Literacy PLC.
- Collaborated with a long-term sub specifically about enhancements for higher level students.
- Collaborated with the students to make the content in lessons more relevant and meaningful.
Analysis/Conclusions:

Data analysis suggests that:

• In our case study work sample, there was clear evidence that the teacher candidate demonstrated strong competence in both of the two standards we assessed.

• In her self reporting, she rated herself on par with other teachers in the areas of differentiation and collaboration and was able to provide abundant evidence.

• In the two standards examined, faculty consensus ratings suggest that her skill set is at an exemplary level for a novice teacher.
Action steps:

1. Convert the current work sample self report and faculty review assessment tool into a rubric format indicating specific criteria for each level (i.e., unsatisfactory, emerging, proficient, exemplary)

2. Implement the new assessment tool with a larger sample of work samples after Spring 2015.
Reliability and Validity plan:

What we have completed so far:
1. Recruited faculty member to be a third reader on a Spring 2013 work sample
2. Three faculty reviewers identified where in the work sample evidence could be found to reflect the two selected InTASC standards
3. Examined one work sample to establish consensus with evidence found and ratings

What we plan to do:
Based on the consensus work, we will create a rubric and use with a sampling of work samples in Spring 2015.