**MAT Candidates**

**Teacher Work sample**

**2019-2020 Academic Year**

**Description of Teacher Work Sample (TWS)** The TWS is an assessment designed to measure the candidate’s ability to plan, deliver, and assess instruction and to use the assessment data to restructure instruction to ensure that all children learn. In developing the TWS, candidates are taught to plan instruction, assess instruction and, make decisions based on assessment results. They are also taught to adapt instruction for children with learning differences and to locate needed resources. The instructor helps candidates work through the process of describing the class and its needs, identifying any potential problems, planning the goals and objectives of the class, and planning appropriate assessments, such as pre and posttests. The instructor also assists candidates to reflect on the outcomes of the assessments and to become familiar with the resources and reasoning skills that are necessary for understanding and identifying children who need assistance. This process prepares the candidate for preparing the completed TWS in directed teaching.

The TWS is one of the culminating experiences for the teacher intern. During directed teaching, the candidate plans a ten day unit and during this unit, he/she will develop the TWS to match the teaching unit. When the performance outcomes are assessed, the teacher intern then identifies a group of students who have had similar problems with the lesson and he/she prepares alternative means for teaching the objectives that were not reached. If students continue to have problems, the candidate is encouraged to seek out solutions for meeting the academic needs of these students. This activity provides the candidate with experiences that allow him/her to see where instruction has succeeded and when it needs to be adapted. Candidates are expected to score an overall mean of 2.0 on the Teacher Work sample.

**Academic Year 2019-2020**

**FALL 2019 N=1 SPRING 2020 N=6 NOTE: Data for Spring 2020 are not available due to COVID 19**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Program** | **Gender/race** | **Score****Formative/****summative** | **Mean Score**  | **Group mean** | **Variance** | **Standard Deviation** |
| **Teaching Process One- Contextual Factors** |  |  |  |
| Knowledge of community, schools and classroom factors  | Physical ED | M/B | 3/3 | 3.0 | 2.12 | .30 | .54 |
| Knowledge of characteristics of students  | Physical ED | M/B | 2/2 | 2.0 | **Statistical data was calculated by Teaching processes due to only one candidate during Fall 2019.** |
| Knowledge of students’ varied approaches to learning  | Physical ED | M/B | 1/2 | 1.5 |
| Implications for Instructional planning and assessment  | Physical ED | M/B | 2/2 | 2.0 |
| **Teaching Process Two-Learning Goals** |  |  |  |
| Significance, Challenge and variety | Physical ED | M/B | 1/2 | 1.5 | 2.16 | .39 | .62 |
| Clarity | Physical ED | M/B | 2/2 | 2.0 | **Statistical data was calculated by Teaching processes due to only one candidate during Fall 2019.** |
| Alignment with National, State or Local Standards  | Physical ED | M/B | 3/3 | 3.0 |
| **Teaching Process Three- Assessment Plan** |  |  |  |
| Alignment with learning Goals and Instruction  | Physical ED | M/B | 2/2 | 2.0 | 2.17 | .056 | .24 |
| Adaptions to Assessment based instructional monitoring  | Physical ED | M/B | 2/2 | 2.0 | **Statistical data was calculated by Teaching processes due to only one candidate during Fall 2019.** |
| Quality of Assessment Instruments  | Physical ED | M/B | 2/3 | 2.5 |
| **Teaching Process Four- Design for Instruction** |  |  |  |
| Alignment with learning goals **ACEI 3.1** | Physical ED | M/B | 2/2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | .13 | .35 |
| Alignment with assessment plan | Physical ED | M/B | 1/2 | 1.5 | **Statistical data was calculated by Teaching processes due to only one candidate during Fall 2019.** |
| Lesson and unit structure | Physical ED | M/B | 2/2 | 2.0 |
| Lesson activities **ACEI 3.3** | Physical ED | M/B | 2/3/ | 2.5 |
| **Teaching Process Five – Instructional Decision Making** |  |  |  |
| Modifications based on pre-assessment of student learning **ACEI 4.0** | Physical ED | M/B | 1/2 | 1.5 | 2.0 | .17 | .41 |
| Continuous monitoring of student learning **ACEI 4.0** | Physical ED | M/B | 2/3 | 2.5 | **Statistical data was calculated by Teaching processes due to only one candidate during Fall 2019.** |
| Congruence between modifications and learning goals **ACEI 5.1** | Physical ED | M/B | 2/2 | 2.0 |
| **Teaching Process Six- Analysis of Student Learning** |  |  |  |
| Accuracy and completeness of data collection | Physical ED | M/B | 2/2 | 2.0 | 2.5 | .17 | .41 |
| Graphic presentation of data | Physical ED | M/B | 3/3 | 3.0 | **Statistical data was calculated by Teaching processes due to only one candidate during Fall 2019.** |
| Interpretation of data | Physical ED | M/B | 2/3 | 2.5 |
| **Teaching Process Seven- Reflection and Evaluation** |  |  |  |
| Reflection on learning goals **ACEI 5.1** | Physical ED | M/B | 3/3 | 3.0 | 2.83 | .56 | .24 |
| Implications for future teaching **ACEI 5.1** | Physical ED | M/B | 2/3 | 2.5 | **Statistical data was calculated by Teaching processes due to only one candidate during Fall 2019.** |
| Implications for professional development **ACEI 5.1** | Physical ED | M/B | 3/3 | 3.0 |

**Interpretation of the Data**

The EPP had a total of seven candidates in the MAT program during the 2019-2020 academic year; however, data is only available for the one candidate during Fall 2019 due to the COVID 19 pandemic in Spring 2020, data for Spring candidates are not available. The candidates included enrolled during Spring included: one Physical Education major (Fall 2019), two Biology majors, one English major, one mathematics major and one Physical Education major. During the 2019-2020 academic Year, the EPP had three females- two African Americans females and one Caucasian female; and four male, all African Americans.

In reviewing data from the Fall 2019 semester, the candidate performed very well overall. Because there was only one candidate and in order to perform population standard deviations, there must be at least two candidates; therefore statistical data was performed by Teaching Processes for this assessment. The candidate scored 2.0 or higher on all Teaching Processes. It was observed that Teaching Process Seven- Reflection and Evaluation had the highest mean score of 2.83. The EPP noticed that he candidate showed growth from first evaluation to second evaluation across almost all Teaching Process items. The EPP noticed that Teaching Processes Four: Design for Instructions and Five: Instructional Decision Making had a mean score of 2.0, although the candidate had a score of Met which is 2.0, the EPP will monitor future candidates in these areas to make sure better understanding for these processes are provided for higher scores in these two areas.