CANDIDATE WORK SAMPLE

ASSIGNMENT INSTRUCTIONS AND RUBRIC

PURPOSE The purpose of the Candidate Work Sample is

Submitting Parts: Each part of the paper must be proofread and modified prior to submitting for evaluation from the CWS Evaluator. Each Part has a rubric that is aligned with the instructions; make sure you reference the rubric while you are writing to ensure you're including the required content. Revisit the rubric before submission. Along with content indicators for each rubric, there is also a writing conventions indicator.

Submit each Part into the appropriate assignment link within BbLearn

CRITERIA	DUE DATES	PTS POSSIBLE	MINIMUM PTS NEEDED
• Part I/Section 1 - Indicator 1*	end of week 2	6	4
• Part II/Section 2 – Indicators 2-3*	end of week 5	9	6
o You must score a 6 for Parts a & b			
• Part III/Sections 3 & 4 – Indicators 4-13*	end of week 10	33	22
• Part IV/Sections 5 & 6 – Indicators 14-18*	end of week 12	18	12

*all Parts include Indicator 1 (Mechanics/Usage/Grammar)

Levels of Development There are four levels of development for a pre-service teacher candidate. The expectation is that a candidate demonstrates a consistent level of development denoted by an overall "2" average with no more than one "1" in each rubric Part. No "0's" on any indicator in each of the four Parts is acceptable. If you earn a "0" on any indicator on your first attempt, you must seek assistance and revise for resubmission. . If the results do not meet the minimum scoring criteria, you will be referred to your program for remediation and advisement. You will be required to work with your program to determine the next steps.

"0"	Does Not Meet Criteria	Candidate does not provide information associated with indicator.
"1"	Developing	Candidate relies on external feedback and input to guide practice of planning, teaching assessing, and analyzing student learning. Candidate struggles with integrating theory to the practice of teaching.
"2"	Meeting	Candidate demonstrates initiative to intentionally plan, teach, assess, and analyze student learning. Candidate demonstrates an understanding of integrating theory to practice to impact student learning.
"3"	Exceeding	Candidate demonstrates confidence in planning, teaching, assessing, and analyzing student learning. Candidate provides evidence of integrating theory to practice leading to a positive impact on student learning. Candidate demonstrates a uniquely innovating level of practice, student engagement and learning.

Getting Started: Respond to your CWS Evaluator message through the Candidate Work Sample course (email within the course) within the first week of your CWS experience. Provide them with the following information:

1. Subject Line: INTRODUCTION
2. State your name, your cooperating teacher's name, grade level, content for the CWS (i.e. Math, Biology, etc.)
3. Start and end dates of the experience. If you are in 2 placements, provide the start and end dates for CWS work (see info below.)
4. Note the "Due by end of Week" in the upper right corner of each Part, provide the anticipated due date for Part I and plan forward for Part II your CWS evaluator.

Guidelines for completing the CWS: If you are a College of Education, Music, or PE major, you will need to work within these guidelines

- Elementary and Special Education dual majors complete one assignment during the special education placement.
- Early Childhood majors complete one

Part I/Section 1 - Indicator 1
Part I/Section 1: Identification of Learning/Learner Characteristics Indicators 1, 19

Section 1 is intended to capture the background information of the students in your classroom. Below is a list of questions that should be completed with your cooperating teacher within the first two weeks of the CWS experience. The responses to these questions will provide the information necessary to complete Part I. Part I must be submitted in BbLearn by the end of Week 2 of your CWS experience. In collaboration with your cooperating teacher, describe the community, school, classes, and students. Then, describe how these demographics will influence your planning, teaching, and student learning.

Address the following ideas in this section:

- Provide an overall picture of your community, school, and grade level team that might affect student learning (e.g., social, economic, grade level team cohesiveness)
- What specific needs in your classroom, or chosen student population, related to learner development and differences are present in your class, and how might t3-G19(3-GhCID 12 >>BDC B 0 Td6(e)-6(a)-3.3(7 Td .9(t)-2.9(3-G19(3-GhCID 12 >>BDC B 0 Td6(e)-)-0.7(i)6-3(v)5.4(e)-3(l tll)10.6l)10.6l)10

ns for assignment submissions		
rrect grammar, spelling, and syntax, when writing the assignment.		

EVALUATION

Part II/Section 2: Indicators 2, 3, 19
Section 2: – Evaluation of Prior Knowledge/Skills - Indicators 2, 3

NOTE: The preassessment instrument must also be used as the postassessment. The preassessment must will be administered prior to the delivery of any lessons for this unit. The results of the preassessment should guide your lesson planning. The postassessment must be administered at the end of the unit/lessons.

Identify the AZ Career and College Readiness Standards (Arizona Department of Education, 2014) and other content-specific standards and learning objectives. Discuss the connection between the selected standards and objectives to the class curriculum plan. Then discuss how the preassessment you created, selected, or adapted was aligned to the targeted objectives, and describe why the preassessment process you chose.6

specific implications for selection of instructional strategies based on information about learning characteristics and results from pre assessment. [Attribute: Breadth] (InTASC 7d)	extremely detailed about how information about learning/ learner characteristics and results from pre-assessment impacted the selection of instructional strategies, adaptations, or differentiation strategies to meet the needs of ALL learners (e.g., ELL, special needs, and students with high scores on pre-assessment); and how to revise learning objectives and/or instruction after evaluating pre-assessment data to meet the challenges of remediation and enrichment.	somewhat detailed about how information about learning/ learner characteristics and results from pre-assessment impacted the selecti2.3(l6-6.2(e)-1(w)-0S 9.9(o)- 8s.2(ai)2.48 Tw 0.228 3(t)-3(e)n)2.2(s)- adaptations, or differentiation strategies to meet the neeoare,ds	

lesson plans. [Attributes: Breadth and Appropriateness of sequencing or scaffolding of instruction] (InTASC 7c)	determined through pre assessment and formative assessment data. The candidate's intentional selection, organization, and sequence of instructional tasks always allows learners to practice, review, and master learning.	determined through pre-assessment and formative assessment data. The candidate's intentional selection, organization, and sequence of instructional tasks sometimes allows learners to practice, review, and master learning.	skills determined through pre-assessment and formative assessment data. The candidate's intentional selection, organization, and sequence of instructional tasks seldom allows learners to practice, review, and master learning.	
8. Discussion of instructional technology strategies that demonstrates they were intentionally selected to address content standards/objectives. [Attribute: Breadth] (InTASC 5l)	The candidate's initiative to locate a variety of appropriate technology resources for instruction was extremely apparent. The candidate's narrative addressed in much detail how technology was selected and integrated to address content standards/ objectives and promote critical thinking and problem solving, and/or described potential integration of technology for future implementations of lesson.	The candidate's initiative to locate a variety of appropriate technology resources for instruction was somewhat apparent. The candidate's narrative addressed in some detail how technology was selected and integrated to address content standards/ objectives and promote critical thinking and problem solving.	The candidate's initiative to locate a variety of appropriate technology resources for instruction was vaguely apparent. The candidate's narrative addressed in limited detail how technology was selected and integrated to address content standards/ objectives and promote critical thinking and problem solving.	The candidate did not discuss the use of instructional technology strategies.

learner development that promote active student engagement. [Attributes: Breadth and Relevance] (InTASC 3i; 3j)	development and active engagement in the learning process through the use of strategies that support autonomous learning, leadership, and collaboration in the classroom; motivating students to adopt new learning strategies; and motivating students to build skills for outside the classroom.	engagement in the learning process through the use of strategies that support autonomous learning, leadership, and collaboration in the classroom; motivating students to adopt new learning strategies; and motivating students to build skills for outside the classroom.	and active engagement. Content was delivered in a rigid, unchanging format, providing few opportunities for student engagement, and offering no real potential for student growth or change.	learner development.
11. Reflection of application of adaptations/ differentiation by student groupings or individual students. [Attributes: Breadth and Relevance] (InTASC 2g)	The candidate provided multiple relevant reflections on the use of adaptations and differentiation by student groupings and individual students. The candidate's discussion of the effectiveness or challenges of the selected strategies was consistently relevant.	The candidate provided some relevant reflections on the use of adaptations and differentiation by student groupings and individual students. The candidate's discussion of the effectiveness or challenges of the selected strategies was somewhat relevant.	The candidate provided few relevant reflections on the use of adaptations and differentiation by student groupings and individual students. The candidate's discussion of the effectiveness or challenges of the selected strategies was vaguely relevant.	The candidate did not evaluate the use of adaptation or differentiation of instruction.
12. Reflection of the integration of instructional technology strategies, tools, and applications. [Attributes: Breadth and Relevance] (InTASC 8g; 8o)	The candidate described in much detail how the use of instructional technology in the classroom advanced the lesson, promoted student learning, and encouraged student use of relevant learning tools.	The candidate described in some detail how the use of instructional technology in the classroom supported the lesson, promoted student learning, and provided students with the opportunity to use learning tools.	The candidate discussed in limited detail how the use of instructional technology strategies, tools, and applications were integrated into instruction.	The candidate did not evaluate how the use of instructional technology strategies, tools, or applications were integrated into instruction.
13. Use of formative assessment data to monitor learning and adjust instruction, if necessary. [Attributes: Breadth	The candidate described multiple and relevant ways of how instruction was adjusted based on formative assessment data (e.g., results of in-class tests, quizzes, and checks for	The candidate described		

and Relevance] (InTASC 6a; 6g)	comprehension).		comprehension).	
Writing Quality – Rubric row 19 – Indicator included in all sections for assignment submissions				
The candidate must				

Candidate Work Sample

assessment questions or performance tasks students were more or less successful with completing. [Attribute: Breadth] (InTASC 6l)	students were more or less successful with completing.		successful with completing.	
16. Interpretation of assessment results in terms of growth/ learning/ achievement. [Attribute: Clarity] (InTASC 6c)	Based on the analysis of assessment results, the candidate's interpretations of learning was extremely clear. The candidate demonstrated this by considering learners' attainment of standards/objectives; discussing levels of achievement for all learners (including, for example, special populations of learners); discussing extended achievement in relation to standards/objectives of students who excelled on the pre-assessment; and describing possible reasons for the variation in student achievement.	Based on the analysis of assessment results, the candidate's interpretations of learning was somewhat clear. The candidate demonstrated this by considering learners' attainment of standards/objectives; discussing levels of achievement for all learners (including, for example, special populations of learners) and describing possible reasons for the variation in student achievement.	Based on the analysis of assessment results, the candidate's interpretations of learning was vaguely clear. The candidate demonstrated this by considering learners' attainment of standards/objectives. The candidate conducted a limited reflection of previous learning, which resulted in few changes to instructional delivery.	The candidate did not summarize assessment results in terms of growth or learning achievement.