

**Analysis of Teaching – Work Sample Scoring Guide W14/S14**  
**Scoring Guide for Analysis of Class Set of Student Work – Pre/Post Assignments/Assessments**

The following pieces of assignment are required (assignment evaluated as incomplete if missing piece(s)):

- ☐ Table comparing pre/post scores **(for pilot you won't have this)**
- ☐ Copies of student work cited in narrative

Narrative:

- ☐ Description of Context
- ☐ Overview of assignments/assessments
- ☐ Analysis of trends/patterns
- ☐ Changes to instruction
- ☐ Instructional modifications
- ☐ Communicating with Parents/Guardians

Criteria	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Needs Revision
<b>Teaching Context</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially complete discussion of teaching context.	<input type="checkbox"/> Complete discussion of teaching context.	<input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete discussion of context or cursory discussion of context.
<b>Task content &amp; cognitive demand</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Description of content of the assignments referencing pieces of the assignments.</li> <li>➤ Description in everyday language and evidence that big ideas were considered.</li> <li>➤ Description mentions enduring understandings/essential questions where appropriate.</li> <li>➤ Evaluation of cognitive demand of the tasks using descriptive language tied &amp; to assessment questions.</li> <li>➤ Evidence to justify shift in demand due to instruction somewhat limited.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thorough and in-depth focus on the content of the assignments.</li> <li>➤ Discussion used evidence and justification from the two assignments.</li> <li>➤ Discussion considers unit's enduring understandings/essential questions where appropriate.</li> <li>➤ Discussion of cognitive demand of the task with justification/ examples based on language from cog. demand charts and the assignment.</li> <li>➤ Discussion of how instruction impacted cognitive demand with evidence to justify claims.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Assignment or broad terms stated, or general comments on the content, or focus on type of questions (Multiple choice, etc.).</li> <li>➤ Cognitive demand discussion missing or level stated with little or no explanation.</li> <li>➤ Impact of instruction on cognitive demand missing or in-appropriately limited.</li> </ul>
<b>Analytic stance on student work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Detailed description of students' work with some examples.</li> <li>➤ Discussion focuses more on student scores and observation, rather than inferences about understanding.</li> <li>➤ Some themes or patterns identified on what students understood.</li> <li>➤ More emphasis on what students didn't understand than what was understood.</li> <li>➤ Identified pre/post shifts by stating results or what students did, little discussion or skimpy analysis of trends.</li> <li>➤ Claims of what group seems to understand but lacks detail or evidence from group connected to content to support.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thorough analysis of student work cited examples from selected students' work to illustrate argument.</li> <li>➤ Discussion focused on what is understood about important content and skills and what more understanding was needed at each level.</li> <li>➤ Themes and patterns were identified at each level and discussion covered an analysis of pre/post learning for each level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Claims on Ss understanding not supported, show only scores/rubric w/out Ss work.</li> <li>➤ Specific content not mentioned in themes.</li> <li>➤ Lacks synthesis of content &amp; trends</li> <li>➤ Stated what students did/didn't do with little or no reference to what was understood or what more was needed to be understood.</li> <li>➤ Themes missing or seem to be based on one or a few students' work.</li> <li>➤ Little or no discussion of pre/post changes.</li> </ul>
<b>Changes/ modification to instruction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Detailed discussion of changes tied to specific students' needs.</li> <li>➤ Justified changes with some evidence from</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thorough discussion of changes linked to Ss understanding and needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Changes to unit suggested with little or no evidence from analysis of student work or previous</li> </ul>

	<p>analysis of student work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Pre/post analysis linked to modifications.</li> <li>➤ Analysis was substantive but seemed to only cover a limited number of possible modifications that could be justified by analysis.</li> <li>➤ Changes loosely/implicitly tied to specific needs or no discussion of Ss specific content needs for TAG, ELL, IEP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Focus of discussion used evidence to justify instruction or content changes.</li> <li>➤ Discussion of pre/post gains and challenges linked to changes.</li> <li>➤ Discussion may include how assignment structure, instructional strategies, assessment, and/or management may need to change.</li> <li>➤ Changes tied to Ss specific needs, e.g., TAG, ELL, IEP.</li> </ul>	<p>discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Little or no discussion of pre/post analysis impact on instructional changes.</li> <li>➤ Focus of changes very limited in scope.</li> <li>➤ Modifications vague or reviewed what was already done.</li> </ul>
<b>Communication with Parents/Guardians</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Plan for communicating with parents and guardians clearly articulated including attention to course content, ways to identify missing work, and progress on course standards. Plan includes means for parent/guardians who do not have access to technology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Plan for communication innovative and complete as described in the meets column.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Plan supports parent/guardians only connecting to information available online.</li> </ul>
<b>Quality of written communication to illustrate thinking &amp; purpose</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Written narrative mostly used standard rules of grammar and editing to communicate ideas related to purpose of assignment.</li> <li>➤ Argument structured but has minor flaws.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Written narrative clearly communicated thinking related to the purpose of the assignment.</li> <li>➤ Argument well structured to detail analysis and justification of findings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Written narrative needed editing or restructuring to clearly communicate assignment's purpose.</li> <li>➤ Argument seriously hampered.</li> </ul>