UCM Student Teacher Work Sample
Initial Teacher Certification Programs

Alignment

Alignment to National Standards and Assurance of Alignment. The UCM Student Teacher Work Sample (STWS) is a summative performance evaluation tool to assess candidates immediately prior to program completion. The STWS aligns with national standards (CAEP and InTASC) as well as Missouri Teacher Standards.

Section	STWS Component/Standards	CAEP	InTASC	MTS
Section 1 Design for Instruction	Component: Contextual Factors	1	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8.	2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.2, 5.3, 6.2
	Component: Lesson Planning	1	6, 7, 8	2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.3, 4.2, 5.3, 7.1
Section 2 Analysis of Student Learning	Component: Analysis of Student Learning	1	6	2, 3.2, 3.3, 6.2, 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.5
Section 3	Component: Reflection and Self-Evaluation	1	9	8.1, 8.2
	Component: Cooperative Partnerships in Support of Student Learning:	2	9	7.6, 8, 9

Evidence Overview

Use of Assessment as Part of the Quality Assurance System. The STWS is a comprehensive unit-wide performance assessment used to evaluate candidates' ability to design, implement, and assess instruction and to reflect on teaching and learning processes, immediately prior to program completion. As a culminating program experience, the STWS provides credible documentation of the candidates' ability to facilitate learning for all students. EPP faculty and education stakeholder advisory groups reflect on STWS unit-wide outcomes bi-annually in order to identify and ensure continuous quality improvement. EPP quality is reflected in positive outcomes associated with STWS data.

Details and Directions of Assessment and Administration. As candidates enter student teaching, they receive the STWS overview, instructions document, rubric and due date (end of student teaching). They are required to complete three sections, adding additional documentation of teaching and learning as required (data tables, Pk-12 student work, charts/graphs, etc.). The STWS is scored by the student teacher's university supervisor immediately prior to the candidate's program completion.

How the Evaluation is used to Measure Candidate Progress. The STWS provides summative data about knowledge and skills in implementing teaching processes identified by research and best practice as fundamental to improving PK-12 student learning. The STWS has three sections with five components associated with documentation of effective teaching are assessed (i.e., use of contextual factors, design and implementation of teaching unit and lesson plans, analysis of student learning, reflection and self-evaluation and engagement in creating cooperative partnerships to support student learning). STWS data informs the EPP and its programs about strengths and weaknesses of candidates' actual teaching performance immediately at program completion.

Evidence and Analysis

Evaluation Instrument. See full instrument with rubric below.

Assurance of Reliability and Validity. The reliability of the STWS (initial and revised version) was assessed using a reliability analysis in SPSS to render a Cronhbach alpha reliability statistic; a generally accepted measure of internal consistency--how close a set of items on a scale are.

Reliability coefficient for the 11 item initial STWS scale used in the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 (n=213) was .545. The revised version of the revised STWS for Fall 2021, which included 7 additional scale items for a total of 18, as well as utilized an increased variation in scoring across the rubric yielded a reliability coefficient of .756. Improvements are observed from the first scale development to the revised scale, which yielded a higher value of Cronbach's alpha, and one that is in the acceptable range (DeVillis, 2003; Kline, 2005).

Face and Content Validity. Items on the STWS assess and represent knowledge, skills and dispositions that are identified by the InTASC, MTS and MEES standards as relevant to highly effective teaching. It is a performance based tool that assesses student teachers on how to select, plan, implement, differentiate and engage students during instruction and within positive learning environments, as well as use communication, professionalism technology and collaboration in their professional role. The STWS developed first from a standardized framework used in teacher education programs across the United States. Historically, the STWS had been adopted into the EPP prior to 2010 when University of Central Missouri were charter members of a consortium that created the Renaissance Student Teacher Work Sample model *(https://www.wku.edu/rtwsc/)*. After changes were made in teacher education requirements in 2018 at the state level, members of an

interdisciplinary team of clinical educators and faculty members convened and developed the current tool to serve as a unit wide performance based summative assessment of student teachers. As the tool moved from a performance based support for making student teacher learning visible towards an assessment or measure of teacher candidate summative performance, the instrument was reviewed multiple times by a core workgroup with additional stakeholder feedback and input. Final revisions were adopted formally during the three cycles of this accreditation cycle. A summary of the development is in Figure 1.

In Spring 2015, the STWS was replaced by a requirement of the State of Missouri, the MoPTA. The MoPTA was used from Fall 2015 through Spring 2018. In Fall 2018, the MoPTA was removed as a unit wide assessment at the EPP. At that time, the EPP's Teacher Education Council decided to investigate bringing back the STWS as a performance-based indicator. While this was not being mandated by the State's Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, it was being strongly recommended. In Fall 2018, a preliminary draft of the new TWS was presented to the TEC. This version was intended to focus on the unit plan and was piloted in the Art, Middle School, and Early Childhood programs. It would be required for all student teachers the following Spring. In December 2018, the TEC voted to approve the use of the TWS with the MEES. In Spring 2019, it was noted that the TWS was not a "one size fits all" format but overall the sections and requirements should be uniform across programs. Specifically, the requirements for lesson plans were such that the plan needed to be detailed enough that any educator could teach from it, with or without knowledge of prior lessons. Spring 2019 was the second pilot of the TWS, with the initial version rolled out in the Fall 2020 being approved by the TEC and implemented by the end of that semester with the decision that the TWS would be a pass/fail assignment and failure to submit would result in a "U" grade and responsibility for completion of the student teaching semester would lie between the student and their assigned USup. In Spring 2021, final revisions were completed after input from various education stakeholders, including clinical educators, advisory groups--including partnership district leaders and practitioners, and university faculty and supervisors.

Figure 1. Development of the Student Teacher Work Sample

Presentation of Data

Unit Mean Scores - Student Teacher Work Sample
Fall 2020 and Spring 2021

Section	Points Possible	Fall 2020 N=65*	Spring 2021 N=168*
Knowledge of community	3	2.9	2.99
Knowledge of student factors	3	3.0	2.96
Knowledge of district and classroom factors	3	2.9	2.97
Analysis of data	26	24.9	25.0
Focus students	15	14.5	14.64
Evidence of impact	10	9.7	9.73
Instructional strategy based on contextual factors	10	9.6	9.70
Self-evaluation	10	9.8	9.87
Professional development implications	10	9.8	9.79
Cooperative partnerships	5	4.9	4.82
Professionalism	5	4.9	4.82
TOTAL	100	97.2	97.35

*Teacher candidates employed on provisional certificates do not complete the Student Teacher Work Sample.

Unit Mean Scores - Revised Student Teacher Work Sample
Fall 2021 and Spring 2022

Section	Points Possible	Fall 2021 N=63*	Spring 2022 N=177*
Knowledge of community	2	2.0	1.99
Knowledge of student factors	2	1.98	2
Knowledge of district and classroom factors	2	1.97	1.99
Measurable objectives aligned to standards	3	2.95	2.86
Lesson sequence	11	10.5	10.37
Resources	2	1.98	1.94
Differentiation	3	2.77	2.77
Accommodations and modifications	3	2.86	2.84
Assessment	5	4.70	4.64
Analysis of data	16	15.0	14.79
Focus students	8	7.61	7.49
Evidence of impact	5	4.89	4.74
Instructional strategy based on contextual factors	5	4.77	4.72
Self-evaluation	9	8.42	8.34
Professional development implications	9	8.35	8.47
Cooperative partnerships	5	4.80	4.51
Professionalism	5	4.68	4.64
Technology	5	4.83	4.74
TOTAL	100	95.09	93.86

*Teacher candidates employed on provisional certificates do not complete the Student Teacher Work Sample.

Disaggregated by Nature of Program

	Points Possible	Fall 2020		Spring 2020	
		Traditional Program (N=54)	Alternative Certification Program* (N=15)	Traditional Program (N=153)	Alternative Certification Program* (N=15)
Knowledge of community	3	2.96	3.0	3.0.	3.0
Knowledge of student factors	3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Knowledge of district and classroom factors	3	2.96	3.0	3.0	3.0
Analysis of data	26	25.0	24.5	25.1	24.5
Focus students	15	14.5	14.4	14.7	14.4
Evidence of impact	10	9.7	10.0	9.7	10.0
Instructional strategy based on contextual factors	10	9.6	9.6	9.7	9.6
Self-evaluation	10	9.8	9.8	9.9	9.8
Professional development implications	10	9.8	10.0	9.8	10.0
Cooperative partnerships	5	4.96	5.0	4.8	5.0
Professionalism	5	4.91	5.0	4.8	5.0
TOTAL	100	97.3		97.3	97.3

	Points Possible	Fall 2021		Spring 2022	
		Traditional Program (N=61)	Alternative Certification Program (N=2)*	Traditional Program (N=161)	Alternative Certification Program (N=2)*
Knowledge of community	2	2.0	2.0	1.99	2.00
Knowledge of student factors	2	1.98	2.0	2.00	2.00

Knowledge of district and classroom factors	2	1.97	2.0	1.99	2.00
Measurable objectives aligned to standards	3	2.95	3.0	2.85	2.94
Lesson sequence	11	10.46	10.5	10.37	10.38
Resources	2	1.98	2.0	1.94	2.00
Differentiation	3	2.81	2.0	2.77	2.81
Accommodations and modifications	3	2.86	3.0	2.83	2.88
Assessment	5	4.69	5.0	4.66	4.38
Analysis of data	16	14.97	16.0	14.86	14.06
Focus students	8	7.66	7.5	7.50	7.31
Evidence of impact	5	4.90	5.0	4.77	4.34
Instructional strategy based on contextual factors	5	4.80	4.5	4.73	4.68
Self-evaluation	9	8.49	7.5	8.39	7.81
Professional development implications	9	8.34	8.0	8.50	8.12
Cooperative partnerships	5	4.78	5.0	4.53	4.31
Professionalism	5	4.68	4.0	4.64	4.56
Technology	5	4.83	4.5	4.76	4.50
TOTAL	100	95.15	93.5	94.12	91.19

*Teacher candidates employed on provisional certificates do not complete the Student Teacher Work Sample.

Disaggregated by Certification Area
Fall 2020 and Spring 2021

	Points Possible	Semester	Early Childhood	Elementary	Middle School	Special Education	Secondary and K-12 Programs
NUMBER OF STUDENTS		Fall '20	**10**	**15**	**9**	**3**	**23** Includes 1 Bio, 1 FCS, 2 Bus 1 Mod Lang, 4 Eng, 3 Math, 7 SS, 1 Art, 3 Music
		Spr. '21	**24**	**53**	**20**	**14**	48 Includes 5 PE, 3 FCS, 3 Ag, 3 Bio, 1 ETTE, 7 Eng, 3 Mat, 2 Mod Lang, 5 SS, 5 Art, 11 Music
Knowledge of community	3	Fall '20	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.0
		Spr. '21	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.0
Knowledge of student factors	3	Fall '20	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
		Spr. '21	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9
Knowledge of district and classroom factors	3	Fall '20	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9
		Spr. '21	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.9
Analysis of data	26	Fall '20	26.0	24.2	24.4	26.0	25.1
		Spr. '21	25.7	25.4	22.7	25.0	25.4
Focus students	15	Fall '20	14.6	14.7	14.1	15.0	14.3
		Spr. '21	15.0	14.9	13.6	15.0	14.6
Evidence of impact	10	Fall '20	10.0	9.8	9.3	10.0	9.5
		Spr. '21	10.0	9.8	9.6	10.0	9.6
Instructional strategy based on contextual	10	Fall '20	9.4	9.6	9.7	10.0	9.7
		Spr. '21	9.9	9.8	9.4	9.79	9.6

factors							
Self-evaluation	10	Fall '20	9.4	10.0	9.7	10.0	10.0
		Spr. '21	10.0	9.8	9.7	9.79	9.9
Professional development implications	10	Fall '20	9.7	9.8	9.7	10.0	9.9
		Spr. '21	9.7	9.9	9.9	9.79	9.7
Cooperative partnerships	5	Fall '20	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8
		Spr. '21	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.86	4.8
Profes-sionalism	5	Fall '20	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.8
		Spr. '21	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.86	4.7
TOTAL	100	Fall '20	98	97.1	95.7	100	97.2
		Spr. '21	99.1	98.3	93.4	98.1	97.1

Fall 2021 and Spring 2022

	Points Possible	Semester	Early Childhood	Elementary	Middle School	Special Education	Secondary and K-12 Programs
NUMBER OF STUDENTS		Fall 2021	**15**	**21**	**5**	**3**	**17** Includes 1 FCS, 1 Chem. 1 Bus, 3 Eng, 1 Math, 5 SS, 1 Spe/Thea, 1 Art, 3 Music
		Spring 2022	**21**	**60**	**14**	**10**	**72** Includes 5 Ag, 6 Art, 2 Bio, 4 Business, 1 ETTE, 9 English, 5 FCS, 7 Math, 2 Mod Lang, 11 Music, 11 PE, 7 SS, 2 Spe/Thea
Knowledge of community	2	Fall 2021	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
		Spring 2022	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.98

Knowledge of student factors	2	Fall 2021	1.93	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
		Spring 2022	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Knowledge of district and classroom factors	2	Fall 2021	2.0	1.95	1.8	2.0	2.0
		Spring 2022	2.00	2.00	1.93	2.00	2.00
Measurable objectives aligned to standards	3	Fall 2021	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9
		Spring 2022	2.95	2.93	2.86	2.90	2.76
Lesson sequence	11	Fall 2021	10.6	10.52	10.0	11.0	10.3
		Spring 2022	10.86	10.53	10.50	10.10	10.11
Resources	2	Fall 2021	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9
		Spring 2022	2.00	1.98	2.00	1.70	1.92
Differentiation	3	Fall 2021	2.87	2.95	2.2	3.0	2.7
		Spring 2022	2.95	2.80	2.86	2.80	2.68
Accommodations and modifications	3	Fall 2021	3.0	2.95	2.6	3.0	2.7
		Spring 2022	2.90	2.88	2.86	2.90	2.76
Assessment	5	Fall 2021	4.93	4.57	4.6	5.0	4.6
		Spring 2022	4.67	4.72	4.57	4.60	4.58
Analysis of data	16	Fall 2021	15.2	15.09	13.8	16.0	14.8
		Spring 2022	14.00	14.93	15.79	14.50	14.75
Focus students	8	Fall 2021	7.87	7.57	7.6	8.0	7.6
		Spring 2022	7.38	7.57	7.79	7.40	7.42
Evidence of impact	5	Fall 2021	5.0	4.86	4.8	5.0	4.9
		Spring 2022	4.81	4.73	4.86	4.90	4.68
Instructional strategy based on contextual factors	5	Fall 2021	4.87	4.81	4.6	5.0	4.8
		Spring 2022	4.86	4.80	4.71	4.60	4.64
Self-evaluation	9	Fall 2021	8.53	8.57	7.8	8.33	8.6
		Spring 2022	8.62	8.55	8.57	8.40	8.03

Professional development implications	9	Fall 2021	8.6	8.52	7.4	8.33	8.2
		Spring 2022	8.71	8.52	8.79	8.10	8.35
Cooperative partnerships	5	Fall 2021	4.73	5.0	4.2	5.0	4.7
		Spring 2022	4.48	4.72	4.79	4.80	4.26
Professionalism	5	Fall 2021	4.8	4.86	4.6	5.0	4.3
		Spring 2022	4.48	4.80	4.79	4.70	4.51
Technology	5	Fall 2021	4.87	5.0	4.2	5.0	4.8
		Spring 2022	4.67	4.90	4.92	4.70	4.60
TOTAL	100	Fall 2021	96.8	96.24	89.2	98.67	93.6
		Spring 2022	94.33	95.37	96.57	93.10	92.04

Disaggregated by Race

	Points Possible	Fall 2020		Spring 2020	
		White (N=58)	Students of Color (N=8)	White (N=158)	Students of Color (N=15)
Knowledge of community	3	2.95	3.0	3.0	3.0
Knowledge of student factors	3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Knowledge of district and classroom factors	3	2.98	2.9	3.0	3.0
Analysis of data	26	25.1	24.4	25.0	25.1
Focus students	15	14.5	14.5	14.6	15.0
Evidence of impact	10	9.6	10.0	9.8	10.0
Instructional strategy based on contextual factors	10	9.8	8.9	9.7	10.0
Self-evaluation	10	9.9	9.6	9.9	10.0
Professional development implications	10	9.7	10.0	9.8	10.0
Cooperative partnerships	5	4.9	5.0	4.8	5.0
Professionalism	5	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.5
TOTAL	100	97.5	96.25	97.2	98.6

*Teacher candidates employed on provisional certificates do not complete the Student Teacher Work Sample.

	Points Possible	Fall 2021		Spring 2022	
		White (N=59)	Students of Color (N=4)*	White (N=158)	Students of Color (N=15)
Knowledge of community	2	2.0	2.0	1.99	2.00
Knowledge of student factors	2	1.98	2.0	2.00	2.00
Knowledge of district and classroom factors	2	1.98	1.75	1.99	2.00
Measurable objectives aligned to standards	3	2.95	3.0	2.85	2.87

Lesson sequence	11	10.46	10.5	10.45	9.6
Resources	2	1.98	2.0	1.95	1.87
Differentiation	3	2.77	3.0	2.77	2.87
Accommodations and modifications	3	2.88	2.75	2.84	2.87
Assessment	5	4.72	4.5	4.63	4.67
Analysis of data	16	14.96	15.5	14.82	14.67
Focus students	8	7.65	7.75	7.51	7.27
Evidence of impact	5	4.91	4.75	4.77	4.67
Instructional strategy based on contextual factors	5	4.77	5.0	4.75	4.60
Self-evaluation	9	8.49	8.0	8.41	7.60
Professional development implications	9	5.40	7.25	8.49	8.40
Cooperative partnerships	5	4.79	4.75	4.57	3.93
Professionalism	5	4.68	4.25	4.64	4.67
Technology	5	4.81	5.0	4.77	4.47
TOTAL	100	95.19	93.75	94.20	91.00

*Teacher candidates employed on provisional certificates do not complete the Student Teacher Work Sample.

Disaggregated by Gender

	Points Possible	Fall 2020		Spring 2020	
		Male (N=19)	Female (N=48)	Male (N=29)	Female (N=139)
Knowledge of community	3	3.0	2.95	3.0	3.0
Knowledge of student factors	3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Knowledge of district and classroom factors	3	2.9	2.97	3.0	3.0
Analysis of data	26	24.1	25.3	25.1	25.0
Focus students	15	14.5	14.5	14.7	14.6
Evidence of impact	10	9.4	9.8	9.6	9.8

Instructional strategy based on contextual factors	10	9.6	9.7	9.8	9.7
Self-evaluation	10	9.8	9.8	10.0	9.8
Professional development implications	10	9.6	9.8	9.6	9.8
Cooperative partnerships	5	5.0	4.9	4.8	4.8
Professionalism	5	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8
TOTAL	100	95.8	97.8	97.8	97.3

*Teacher candidates employed on provisional certificates do not complete the Student Teacher Work Sample.

	Points Possible	Fall 2021		Spring 2022	
		Male (N=6)	Female (N=57)*	Male (N=39)	Female (N=134)
Knowledge of community	2	2.0	2.0	2.00	1.99
Knowledge of student factors	2	2.0	1.98	2.00	2.00
Knowledge of district and classroom factors	2	2.0	1.96	2.00	1.99
Measurable objectives aligned to standards	3	2.83	2.96	2.67	2.91
Lesson sequence	11	10.0	10.51	9.77	10.56
Resources	2	1.83	2.0	1.90	1.96
Differentiation	3	2.83	2.78	2.72	2.81
Accommodations and modifications	3	2.67	2.89	2.77	2.86
Assessment	5	4.5	4.73	4.41	4.70
Analysis of data	16	14.67	15.04	14.79	14.84
Focus students	8	7.67	7.65	7.49	7.49
Evidence of impact	5	4.67	4.93	4.72	4.77
Instructional strategy based on contextual factors	5	4.83	4.78	4.54	4.79
Self-evaluation	9	8.67	8.44	7.85	8.48

Professional development implications	9	8.33	8.33	8.10	8.59
Cooperative partnerships	5	4.67	4.80	4.28	4.59
Professionalism	5	4.17	4.71	4.36	4.72
Technology	5	5.0	4.8	4.54	4.81
TOTAL	100	93.33	95.29	90.90	94.85

*Teacher candidates employed on provisional certificates do not complete the Student Teacher Work Sample.

Disaggregated by First Generation Status

	Points Possible	Fall 2020		Spring 2020	
		First Gen (N=11)	Not First Gen (N=58)	First Gen (N=29)	Not First Gen (N=136)
Knowledge of community	3	2.95	2.97	3.0	2.99
Knowledge of student factors	3	3.0	3.0	2.91	2.96
Knowledge of district and classroom factors	3	2.95	2.97	2.91	2.99
Analysis of data	26	25.36	24.76	24.18	25.18
Focus students	15	14.82	14.27	14.09	14.74
Evidence of impact	10	9.73	9.64	9.73	9.74
Instructional strategy based on contextual factors	10	9.86	9.55	9032	9.76
Self-evaluation	10	10.0	9.73	9.73	9.89
Professional development implications	10	10.0	9.64	9.59	9.82
Cooperative partnerships	5	4.91	4.94	4.73	4.84
Professionalism	5	5.0	4.88	4.82	4.82
TOTAL	100	98.73	96.33	94.95	97.74

*Teacher candidates employed on provisional certificates do not complete the Student Teacher Work Sample.

	Points Possible	Fall 2021		Spring 2022	
		First Gen (N=14)	Not First Gen (N=46)	First Gen (N=63)	Not First Gen (N=124)
Knowledge of community	2	2.0	2.0	1.98	2.0
Knowledge of student factors	2	2.0	1.98	2.0	2.0
Knowledge of district and classroom factors	2	1.93	1.98	2.0	1.99
Measurable objectives aligned to standards	3	3.0	2.93	2.75	2.91
Lesson sequence	11	10.21	10.53	10.09	15.51
Resources	2	2.0	1.98	1.91	1.96
Differentiation	3	2.86	2.8	2.64	2.84
Accommodations and modifications	3	2.86	2.87	2.84	2.84
Assessment	5	4.71	4.69	4.45	4.73
Analysis of data	16	14.64	15.07	14.66	14.86
Focus students	8	7.71	7.64	7.43	7.53
Evidence of impact	5	4.92	4.89	4.68	4.77
Instructional strategy based on contextual factors	5	4.93	4.76	4.71	4.75
Self-evaluation	9	8.36	8.53	8.05	8.47
Professional development implications	9	8.0	8.44	8.32	8.55
Cooperative partnerships	5	4.64	4.82	4.43	4.58
Professionalism	5	4.71	4.67	4.55	4.68
Technology	5	4.79	4.84	4.64	4.79
TOTAL	100	94.29	95.42	92.14	94.74

UNIVERSITY OF
CENTRAL MISSOURI
COLLEGE OF
EDUCATION

Student Teacher Work Sample

Date	
Student Teacher	
University Supervisor	
Cooperating Teacher	
Placement District	
Student Teaching Assignment/s, Content area/Grade Level	

Student Teacher Work Sample

Introduction. The **UCM Student Teacher Work Sample** is a summative performance assessment through which Teacher Candidates provide evidence of the ability to facilitate student learning by:

- Using information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set goals, objectives, and plan instruction and assessment.
- Setting significant, challenging, varied, and appropriate goals and objectives.
- Using multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with the goals and objectives to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction.
- Designing a plan for a lesson that will be taught during the student teaching semester.
- Designing instruction for specific objectives, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.
- Using regular and systematic evaluations of student learning to make instructional decisions.
- Using assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.
- Reflecting on their instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.
- Using technology to enhance student learning.

Structure. The **Work Sample** consists of four sections and an appendix. In each section, candidates will be asked to provide information and/or respond to prompts. Candidates may be asked to create documents and supply examples of student work. The sections are:

- Section 1 - Design for Instruction
- Section 2 - Analysis of Student Learning
- Section 3 - Reflection and Self-Evaluation
- Section 4- Cooperative Partnerships, Professionalism and Technology
- Appendix

  The **Appendix** is used to support design, analysis, and reflection of teaching and learning. This includes the following:
  - One lesson plan from the unit
  - Assessments used during the unit with scoring criteria (rubrics, answer keys, etc.)
  - Any instructional artifacts

Scoring.

Students should refer to the STWS Rubric for scoring information. A minimum score of 75 points is required.

Submission of the Student Teacher Work Sample.

Teacher candidates complete steps 1 and 2 of the following:

STEP 1:

Candidates complete the Student Teacher Work Sample to the University Supervisor. Due dates are as follows:

- ☐ Section 1 Midterm
- ☐ Section 2 Two weeks before Finals Week
- ☐ Section 3 and 4 One week before Finals Week

STEP 2:

Candidates must use the STWS Google Form to submit the completed STWS, Lesson Plan, and Additional Supporting Documents **one week before Finals Week** to be stored digitally at UCM.

- ☐ Submit the completed STWS
- ☐ Lesson Plan
- ☐ Additional Supporting Documents

Section 1 - Design for Instruction

Part 1 - Contextual Factors

STWS Component: Contextual Factors- *What you must demonstrate:*

The teacher uses information about the teaching-learning context and individual student background characteristics to set learning goals, design instruction, and plan assessment [MTS 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.2, 5.3, 6.2; CAEP Standard 1; InTASC Standard 1, 2, 3, 4 , 7]. This includes:

- Knowledge of community, school, and classroom factors
- Knowledge of characteristics of students
- Knowledge of students' varied approaches to learning
- Knowledge of students' skills and special considerations

Task- *What you must do:*

This step of the Work Sample **requires completion of each of the three tables on pages 5-7.** This will allow you to familiarize yourself with your students, school, district, and community as well as other relevant factors that may affect the teaching-learning process.

Resources for completing this task:

- *Websites to find district and school building information*
  - *Department of Elementary and Secondary Education School Data https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=1&view=2*
  - *http://www.publicschoolreview.com*
  - *www.city-data.com*

Table 1. Community Factors

Geographic Area *select one*	☐ **Rural** ☐ **Urban** ☐ **Suburban**
Community Population *briefly describe the community*	
Socio-economic Profile	
% of Population 25+ years with college education	
% Free/Reduced Lunch	

Table 2. Student Factors

Student Factor	**Number of Students**	**Percent of Class**
Total <u>number</u> of students in the class described in this STWS. (Student Teachers with multiple class sections will select **one class** to analyze for the STWS).		
Gender	Male	
	Female	
	Non-binary	
Learner Characteristics	Students with IEPs	

	Students with 504 plans	
	ESL/ELL students	
Race	African American	
	Asian	
	Hispanic	
	While	
	Native American	
	Native American Pacific Islander	
	Multi-race Non-Hispanic	

Table 3. District/School/Classroom Factors

Technology Available *(briefly describe the technology used in the district/classroom)*	
State/District Assessments *(briefly describe MAP, EOC, pacing guide, curriculum guides)*	
Student Transience	

(number or percentage of students who move during the school year)	
Opportunities for Family Engagement *(briefly describe opportunities to develop relationships with families)*	
Physical Learning Environment *(briefly describe physical features that impact student learning)*	
Other special considerations	

Section 1 - Design for Instruction

Part 2 - Lesson Planning

STWS Component: Lesson Planning - *What you must demonstrate:*
The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners, and the community context. [MTS Standard 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.3, 4.2, 5.3, 7.1 CAEP Standard 1, InTASC Standard 6, 7, 8]

Task - *What you must do:*
Design a plan for a lesson that will be taught as part of a unit you are teaching during your student teaching semester. A variety of formats may be used for lesson plans; however, **all plans must include the following components:**

- Measurable student learning objectives aligned with appropriate standards
- Lesson sequence (include introduction and closure, instructional strategies, estimated pacing, connections to learner background knowledge, etc.)
- Resources (include technology as appropriate)
- Differentiation (process, product, content)
- Accommodations and modifications
- Assessment methods

You may use the template provided. Please check with your program faculty and university supervisor for specific formats and additional requirements.

Prompt - *How you must do it:*
In this section, you will design a lesson plan that you will teach during your student teaching semester. The lesson plan must include ALL components listed above. Demonstrate your knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners, and the community context.

Section 2 - Analysis of Student Learning

STWS Component: Analysis of Student Learning- *What you must demonstrate:*
The teacher uses assessment evidence to analyze student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement [MTS Standard 2, 3.2, 3.3, 6.2, 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.5, CAEP Standard 1, InTASC Standard 6].

Task- *What you must do:*
Analyze your assessment data, including pre-assessments/baseline data, formative assessments, and summative assessments to determine students' progress related to the unit learning objectives. Use visual representations, data, and narrative to communicate the performance of the whole class and two individual diverse learners. Conclusions drawn from this analysis should be provided in the "Reflection and Self-Evaluation" section.

Prompt- *How you must do it:*
Analyze assessment evidence/data to explain progress and achievement toward learning objectives demonstrated by I) whole class; 2) individual diverse learners; and 3) instructional strategy by addressing the following:

I. **Whole class***
Describe and summarize the learning of the class as a whole on **ONE student learning objective** within a unit you are teaching. You will summarize the data for the whole class in an appropriate manner depending on the nature of your assessment evidence. Qualitative data should be described in pictures and words, and quantitative data in a table, graph, or chart. Include assessment information on this objective collected throughout the unit such as pre-assessment unit data/baseline data, formative, and summative data for your selected objective. (Suggested word limit of 600 - 800 plus images, etc.) Selected representations of data must demonstrate student growth over time; from pre- to post- assessment.

In the special education setting, the teacher candidate should select three focus students for individual analysis if whole class analysis is not possible.

II. **Individual Diverse Learners***
Select two diverse learners who demonstrate different learning needs from the whole class. Explain why these students were selected and how their needs differ from the whole class. Use pre-, formative, and summative assessment evidence with examples of the students' work to draw conclusions about the extent to which these

students attained **the objective selected for the Whole Class section above**. Use samples of the students' work to support your instructional decisions. (Suggested word limit of 250 - 350 words per student)

In the special education setting, the teacher candidate should select two focus students who demonstrate varying ability levels and needs.

III. Instructional Strategy

Based on the known contextual factors from Section 1 Part 1 and your Analysis of Student Learning describe an instructional strategy you found highly effective to meet the unique needs of your students. Provide relevant information and make a clear connection to how the information [could] affect(s) learning including specific justification for instructional decisions based on student individual differences and community, school, and/or classroom characteristics. (For example, what did you do to help ELL student populations learn?) (Suggested word limit of 250 - 350 words)

Section 3 - Reflection and Self-Evaluation

STWS Component: Reflection and Self-Evaluation- *What you must demonstrate:*
The teacher uses ongoing analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions and analyzes the relationship between his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice [MTS Standard 8.1, 8.2, CAEP Standard 1, InTASC Standard 9].

Task- *What you must do:*

- Reflect on your performance as a teacher and link your performance to student learning results.
- Provide examples of instructional decision-making based on students' learning or responses.
- Evaluate your performance and identify future actions for improved practice and professional growth.

Prompt- *How you must do it:*
Think about the data you analyzed in Part 2 and respond to the following prompts. (Suggested word limit of 600 - 800 words)

If you taught this Unit again,

1. What would you change and why? Provide justification or evidence to support your answer.
2. What did you learn from teaching this Unit that will make you a more effective teacher?
3. Align your self-evaluation with learning goals and objectives, meaningful analysis of data and appropriate conclusions drawn, and evidence of student progress and impact of student learning.

Identify actions for improved practice and professional development. (Suggested word limit of 250 - 350 words)

1. Describe two professional learning goals that emerged from your insights and experiences as a Student Teacher. Identify steps you will take to improve.
2. Provide ideas for redesigning learning objective, instruction, and/or assessment and explain why these modifications would improve student learning.

Section 4 - Cooperative Partnerships, Professionalism, and Technology

Complete the three tables below:

Document each area as completely as possible based on the opportunities in your teaching context; you might not use every empty cell and you can add cells as needed.

STWS Component: Cooperative Partnerships in Support of Student Learning: (MEES Standard 9; MTS 7.6, 8, 9; CAEP 2; InTASC 9, 10)
Creating and building relationships with students, parents, colleagues, district personnel, and the community is so important to the success of Student Teachers. Document the activities and events you are involved in at your school (phone calls, creating newsletters, parent letters, PTA meetings, evening academic events, and community events, etc.).

Complete **Table 4 Cooperative Partnerships and Professionalism** below by documenting your involvement in the following areas:

Table 4. Cooperative Partnerships in Support of Student Learning	
Students/Parents	
Colleagues	
District	
Community	

Table 5 Professionalism: The Student Teacher actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally in order to improve learning for all students. (MEES Standard 8; InTASC 3**)**

Describe the ways in which you demonstrate self-awareness and improvement by engaging in professional development (school or district provided professional development, involvement in professional organizations, webinars, book study, conferring with mentor teachers, seeking feedback, and collaborating with the grade level or subject area team, etc.) by completing the table below. List specific information (title, date, event, agenda, meeting, etc.) about the activities in which you are involved that provide opportunities for professional growth in order to improve learning for all students.
Document each area as completely as possible based on the opportunities in your teaching context; you might not use every cell and you can add cells as needed.

Table 5. Professionalism				
Professional Development	**Collaboration**	**Webinars/ Book Study**	**Observing/ Feedback**	**Involvement in Professional Organizations**

Table 6 Technology to Enhance Student Learning

Describe the ways in which you demonstrate the use of technology to enhance student learning by completing the table below.

Document each area as completely as possible based on the opportunities in your teaching context; you might not use every cell and you can add cells as needed.

Table 6. Technology to Enhance Student Learning			
Available Technology (listed in Section 1 Table 3) **List one technological tool or resource per cell below in this column**	**Use of Technology: Indicate with the appropriate letter code if the technology was used for:** **P = Planning** **L = Lesson Implementation** **A = Assessment**	**Why was this technology selected?**	• **Was the use of technology effective?** • **Did the technology increase student engagement and student learning?** • **Share specific information and examples of how the use of technology enhanced student growth.**

Student Teacher Work Sample
Scoring Rubric

Student Teacher Name _____ 700 number: _____

Pass score: 75 points (100 points possible)

In the event of an unacceptable score, the University Supervisor will assign a grade of Incomplete to the Student Teacher and advise the Certification Office. The Certification Office will notify the Program Coordinator who is responsible for advising the Student for satisfactory completion of the STWS and amending the incomplete grade.

STWS Section 1 Score: _____ STWS Section 2 Score: _____

STWS Section 3 Score: _____ STWS Section 4 Score: _____

Total Score: _____

Is an Appendix with supporting evidence provided: _____yes _____ no

University Supervisor Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

University Supervisor Signature: _____

Date: _____

Section 1 – 33 Points Total
Planning for Instruction

Section 1 Part 1 Contextual Factors - 6 points possible

[MTS 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.2, 5.3, 6.2; CAEP Standard 1; InTASC Standard 1, 2, 3, 4 , 7]

	Not Submitted 0	Indicator Not Met 1 point	Indicator Met 2 points	Score
Knowledge of community **2 points**		Table is not complete or contains inaccurate information.	Table is complete with required information.	
Knowledge of student factors **2 points**		Table is not complete or contains inaccurate information.	Table is complete with required information.	
Knowledge of District/School/ and Classroom Factors **2 points**		Table is not complete or contains inaccurate information.	Table is complete with required information.	
Comments:				

Section 1 Part 2 Lesson Planning – 27 points possible

[MTS Standard 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.3, 4.2, 5.3, 7.1 CAEP Standard 1, InTASC Standard 6, 7, 8]

	Not Submitted 0	Indicator Not Met 1 point	Indicator Partially Met 2 points	Indicator Met 3 points	Score
Measurable Student Objectives Aligned with Appropriate Standards **3 points**		Lists learning targets/ objectives that reflect key concepts of the discipline but are not aligned with relevant state or national standards.	Lists measurable learning targets/ objectives that reflect key concepts of the discipline and are aligned with state and national standards.	Lists measurable learning targets/ objectives that reflect key concepts of the discipline, are aligned with state and national standards, and are	

				based on students' needs and abilities.	
Comments:					
	Not Submitted 0	**Indicator Not Met 3 points**	**Indicator Partially Met 7 points**	**Indicator Met 11 points**	**Score**
Lesson Sequence (include introduction and closure, instructional strategies, estimated pacing, etc.) **11 points**		The candidate does not plan appropriate sequencing and pacing of learning experiences. T asks, methods, strategies are not stated. The candidate uses limited instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop an understanding of the content. If technology is used, the lesson plan does not provide evidence it will be used to enhance instruction or student learning.	The candidate plans appropriate sequencing and pacing of learning experiences; but tasks, methods and strategies are not identified and/or not appropriate or effective for the lesson. The candidate uses a variety of instructional strategies that encourage learners to develop an understanding of the content and to apply that knowledge in meaningful ways. If technology is used, the lesson plan indicates it will be used in a manner that will enhance instruction and student learning.	The candidate plans appropriate sequencing and pacing of learning experiences. All tasks, methods, and strategies are stated and/or are appropriate and effective for the lesson. The candidate uses pedagogical content knowledge to use a variety of instructional strategies that encourage all learners to develop both an understanding of the content and apply knowledge that in authentic ways. If technology is used, the lesson plan indicates it will be used in a manner that facilitates and enhances instruction and student learning, and supports differentiation.	
Comments:					
	Not Submitted 0	**Indicator Not Met 1 points**		**Indicator Met 2 points**	**Score**

Resources (include technology as appropriate) **2 points**		Materials and resources are not listed or not appropriate.	.	Materials and resources are listed with specific citation information; a range of resources and technological tools are reflected in the lesson plan.	
Comments:					
	Not Submitted 0	**Indicator Not Met 1 point**	**Indicator Partially Met 2 points**	**Indicator Met 3 points**	**Score**
Differentiation (process, product, content) **3 points**		Plans and designs instruction based on data.	Plans and designs instruction that is based on data choosing appropriate strategies, resources/provisions, support, and/or materials to differentiate instruction for groups of learners	Plans and designs instruction that is based on multiple sources of data choosing appropriate strategies and resources/provisions, support, and/or materials to differentiate instruction for individual learners.	
Comments:					
	Not Submitted 0	**Indicator Not Met 1 point**	**Indicator Partially Met 2 points**	**Indicator Met 3 points**	**Score**
Accommodations and modifications **3 points**		Learner differences are not addressed.	Plans for accommodating learner differences show a limited understanding of student needs	Plans for accommodating learner differences are appropriate and specific for a variety of student needs and are designed to facilitate success for a variety of students.	
Comments:					
	Not Submitted 0	**Indicator Not Met 1 point**	**Indicator Partially Met 3 points**	**Indicator Met 5 points**	**Score**

Assessment methods **5 points**		Plans methods of assessment that are somewhat related to the stated learning targets/ objectives. Data collected will not be useful in informing future instruction.	Plans methods of formative assessment that align with and directly measure student performance on the stated learning targets/ objectives. Data collected has limited value in informing future instruction.	Plans methods of formative assessment that are implemented throughout the lesson to assess student learning on the lesson objectives/learning targets. Data that is collected could be used to inform future instruction.	
Comments:					

Section 2 – 34 Points Total
Analysis of Student Learning

[MTS Standard 2, 3.2, 3.3, 6.2, 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.5, CAEP Standard 1, InTASC Standard 6]

	Not Submitted 0	Indicator Not Met 4 points	Indicator Partially Met 10 points	Indicator Met 16 points	Score
Analysis and Interpretation of assessment data including visual representation of data (whole class) **In the special education setting, the teacher should select three focus students for individual analysis rather if whole class analysis is not possible.** **16 points**		Teacher demonstrates limited use of quantitative and/or qualitative data to determine students' progress related to the unit learning objectives: • pre-assessment/baseline data • formative assessments • summative assessments Quantitative and/or qualitative data may be limited or incomplete. Interpretation is inaccurate, and conclusions are missing or	Teacher partially uses qualitative and/or quantitative data for the following to determine students' progress related to the unit learning objectives: • pre-assessment/baseline data • formative assessments • summative assessments Interpretation is technically accurate, but conclusions are missing or not fully supported by data.	Teacher uses qualitative and/or quantitative data to determine students' progress related to the unit learning objectives: • pre-assessment/baseline data, • formative assessments, • summative assessments Interpretation is meaningful and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data. Selected representations of data demonstrate student growth over time; from pre- to post-	

		unsupported by data. Teacher did not use data that may include: charts, graphs, examples of actual student work and/or databases.	Teacher uses a limited number and no variations of data that may include: charts, graphs, examples of actual student work and/or databases.	assessment. Teacher uses multiple and varied representations of data which will include: charts, graphs, examples of actual student work and/or databases.	
Comments:					
	Not Submitted 0	**Indicator Not Met 4 points**	**Indicator Partially Met 6 points**	**Indicator Met 8 points**	**Score**
Focus Students **In the special education setting, the teacher should continue analysis of two of the three focus students from the section above. Students selected should demonstrate varying ability levels and needs.** **8 points**		Teacher may select an above average, or a below average performing student. Limited explanation of why it is important to understand the learning performance of these particular students. Pre-assessments, formative and summative assessment evidence with examples of the students' work to draw conclusions about the extent to which these students' attained the learning objective is not present. No student work samples used to support instructional decisions.	Teacher may select an above average, a below average performing student, and explain why it is important to understand the learning performance of these particular students. Pre-assessments, formative, and summative assessment evidence with examples of the students' work to draw conclusions about the extent to which these students' attained the learning objective may be used. May use samples of the students' work to support instructional decisions.	Teacher selects an above average, a below average performing student, and explains why it is important to understand the learning performance of these particular students. Pre-assessments, formative, and summative assessment evidence with examples of the students' work to draw conclusions about the extent to which these students attained the learning objective are used. Uses samples of the students' work to support instructional decisions.	
Comments:					
	Not Submitted 0	**Indicator Not Met 1 points**	**Indicator Partially Met 3 points**	**Indicator Met 5 points**	**Score**
Evidence of Impact on Student Learning **5 points**		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 objectives.	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 objectives.	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 objective.	

Comments:					
	Not Submitted 0	**Indicator Not Met 1 points**	**Indicator Partially Met 3 points**	**Indicator Met 5 points**	**Score**
Instructional Strategy based on Contextual Factors **5 points**		Teacher does not provide justification for instructional decisions based on student individual differences and community, school, and/or classroom characteristics OR provides inappropriate implications.	Teacher demonstrates partial knowledge of students' skills that affect learning. Teacher provides general justifications for instructional decisions based on student individual differences and community, school, and/or classroom characteristics.	Teacher provides relevant information and makes a clear connection to how the information [could] affect(s) learning. Teacher provides specific justification for instructional decisions based on student individual differences and community, school, and/or classroom characteristics.	
Comments:					

Section 3 – 18 Points Total
Reflection and Self-Evaluation

[MTS Standard 8.1, 8.2, CAEP Standard 1, InTASC Standard 9]

	Not Submitted 0	**Indicator Not Met 3 points**	**Indicator Partially Met 6 points**	**Indicator Met 9 points**	**Score**
Self-evaluation **9 points**		Teacher's self-evaluation contains limited alignment with learning goals and objectives, inaccurate analysis of data and inappropriate conclusions drawn, little evidence of student progress and impact of student learning.	Teacher's self-evaluation contains partial alignment with learning goals and objectives, some meaningful analysis of data and appropriate conclusions drawn, partial Evidence of student progress and impact of student learning.	Teacher's self-evaluation contains alignment with learning goals and objectives, meaningful analysis of data and appropriate conclusions drawn, Evidence of student progress and impact of student learning.	
Comments:					
	Not Submitted	**Indicator Not Met**	**Indicator Partially Met**	**Indicator Met**	**Score**

	0	3 points	6 points	9 points	
Implications for Future Teaching and your Professional Development plans **9 points**		Provides limited ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning learning objectives, instruction, and/or assessment. Provides limited professional learning goals or goals that are not related to the insights and experiences described in this section.decisions.	Provides ideas for redesigning learning objectives, instruction, and/or assessment but offers no rationale for why these changes would improve student learning. Presents professional learning goals that are not strongly related to the insights and experiences described in this section and/or provide a vague plan for meeting the goals.	Provides ideas for redesigning learning objective, instruction, and/or assessment and explains why these modifications would improve student learning. Presents professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section. Describes specific steps to meet these goals.	

Section 4– 15 Points Total
Cooperative Partnerships, Professionalism, and Technology

(MEES Standard 9; MTS 7.6, 8, 9; CAEP 2; InTASC 3, 9, 10)

	Not Submitted 0	Indicator Not Met 1 point	Indicator Partially Met 3 points	Indicator Met 5 points	Score
Cooperative Partnerships **5 points**		Few cooperative partnership activities cited, 5 or less Activities cited are irrelevant or do not relate to building cooperative partnerships or the implementation of a plan for involvement in school and/or community activities.	Cooperative partnership activities are limited; 10 or fewer and may not relate to building cooperative partnerships or demonstrate an involvement in school and/or community activities.	Numerous cooperative partnership activities are cited and demonstrate an involvement in school and/or community engagement and involvement in activities that reflect a commitment to students, school, and community.	
Comments:					
	Not Submitted	**Indicator Not Met**	**Indicator Partially Met**	**Indicator Met**	**Score**

	0	1 point	3 points	5 points	
Professionalism **5 points**		Few professional learning opportunities cited, 5 or less Activities cited are irrelevant or do not relate to promoting professional growth that leads to student learning.	Professional learning opportunities are limited, 10 or less and may not relate to promoting professional growth that leads to student learning.	Numerous professional learning opportunities are cited and are relevant to promoting professional growth that leads to student learning.	
Comments:					
	Not Submitted **0**	**Indicator Not Met** **1 point**	**Indicator Partially Met** **3 points**	**Indicator Met** **5 points**	**Score**
Technology to Enhance Student Learning **5 Points**		Few technological resources listed, resources listed do not relate to planning, lesson implementation, or assessment and are not related to student engagement and learning.	Technological resources provided are limited and lack evidence of impact on student engagement and student learning.	Numerous technological resources are provided with evidence of relevance to student engagement and student learning..	