

## Professional Teacher Work Sample

### A. Brief Description and Use in Program

The **Professional Teacher Work Sample (PTWS)** is a key performance-based assessment used by the Grace College School of Education (SOE) to document the impact of program completers on P-12 student learning. The assessment requires teachers to complete a full "**Plan-Do-Study-Act**" (**PDSA**) cycle:

- Analyzing contextual factors.
- Linking instruction to research.
- Aligning assessments with state standards.
- Providing empirical evidence of student growth.

### B. Alignment with Standards

- **Primary Standards: \* CAEP 4.1 (Impact on P-12 Student Learning):** The provider documents, using multiple measures, that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. This includes growth measures, state-supported impact measures, and provider-led objectives.
- **Secondary Standards: \* CAEP 5.2 (Quality Assurance System)**
  - **InTASC Standards 6, 7, & 9**

## II. Evidence Analysis

Reporting Cycles: Spring 2021 – Spring 2026

### A. Data Reliability and Rater Calibration (Standard 5)

A significant strength of the Grace College Quality Assurance System is the continuous monitoring of assessment integrity. Between the Fall 2024 and Spring 2026 cycles, the SOE conducted a longitudinal review of rater behavior.

- **Identification of Peer Bias:** Internal audits suggested that the "Blended Rater Model" (utilizing both faculty and peer-completer scores) resulted in an upward bias, particularly in the "Exemplary" category.
- **Structural Modification:** In Spring 2026, the SOE transitioned to an **Exclusively Faculty-Led Scoring Model**. This shift was designed to eliminate subjective inflation and ensure that "Exemplary" ratings are reserved for candidates demonstrating advanced clinical reasoning and sophisticated data triangulation.
- **Impact on Findings:** This transition from a "Developmental" scoring phase to a "Calibrated" phase resulted in a more differentiated data set. While **100% of candidates** continue to meet the "Target" proficiency, the 2026 cohort's distribution (40% Exemplary, 60% Target) reflects a more rigorous and valid application of the rubric.

## III. Longitudinal Performance Analysis (Standard 4.1)

### A. Planning and Research Integration (Criteria 1 & 2)

Completers consistently demonstrate high proficiency in the pre-instructional phase. Prior to calibration, "Contextual Factors" and "Research" scores frequently reached 80–100% Exemplary. Under the calibrated 2026 faculty-only model, 100% of candidates maintained "Target" or higher ratings, confirming that completers effectively utilize P-12 student demographics and evidence-based practices to drive instructional design.

### B. Data Alignment and Impact on Learning (Criteria 3 & 4)

These criteria provide the direct evidence required for CAEP 4.1.

- **Consistency:** Across all N=19 cases, candidates provided credible evidence that the majority of their P-12 students met or exceeded learning goals.
- **Growth Area:** "Data Analysis" remains the most rigorous category. The 2026 shift to 60% "Target" underscores the high bar set for the "Exemplary" rating, which requires a detailed rationale for the future growth of students who did not meet the learning goal.

**C. Professional Reflection (Criterion 5)**

Completers exhibit a strong capacity for self-evaluation. Even under the more stringent 2026 faculty scoring, candidates successfully "address successful and unsuccessful learning experiences" (Target). The program identifies "**exploring multiple hypotheses for student outcomes**" as a continued area for professional development to move more candidates into the Exemplary range.

---

**IV. Summary of Proficiency Levels (N=19)**

Performance Level	Frequency	Percentage
Exemplary	12	63%
Target	7	37%
Emerging/Unacceptable	0	0%

**Note:** The 2026 shift in scoring protocol explains the transition from high-Exemplary frequencies to a more balanced and accurate distribution between Target and Exemplary levels.

---

**V. Continuous Improvement Plan**

Based on the analyzed data, the Grace College School of Education has identified the following actions:

1. **Instrument Maintenance:** The SOE will maintain the faculty-only scoring model for the PTWS to ensure ongoing data reliability and eliminate rater bias.
2. **Standard 4.1 Reporting:** The SOE will continue to use the PTWS as primary evidence of completer impact, leveraging the calibrated 2026 data as a more accurate benchmark for future cohorts.

---

**VI. Conclusion**

The PTWS data provides robust, credible evidence that Grace College completers contribute to expected levels of student learning and development. The recent calibration of the scoring process further strengthens the validity of these findings, meeting the rigorous demands of CAEP Standard 4.1 and Standard 5.2.


**D. Assessment Tool:**

<b>Grace College</b> <b>Professional Teacher Work Sample</b>	
<p>You will design a Professional Teacher Work Sample (PTWS) that employs a range of strategies and builds on each student’s strengths, needs, and prior experiences. Through this performance assessment, you will provide credible evidence of your ability to facilitate learning. During an instructional unit or segment of teaching, you will document how you nurture and assess the growth and learning of your students. Before you teach the unit, you will describe contextual factors, identify a learning goal based on state approved standards, create an assessment plan designed to measure student performance before (pre-assessment and after (post-assessment), and plan your instruction.</p> <p>After you teach the unit, you will analyze student learning, then reflect upon, and evaluate your teaching as related to student learning as you examine the documentation you have gathered. All documentation will be submitted electronically.</p>	
<b>STEP 1 – Contextual Factors:</b>	<b>Timeline:</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Review Contextual Factors that affect your teaching and learning situation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This may include Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) to help determine areas of need</li> </ul> <input type="checkbox"/> Determine your area of focus	Completed BEFORE unit starts
<p><b>PROMPT:</b> <i>Discuss relevant factors and how they may affect the teaching-learning process. Include any supports and challenges that affect instruction and student learning. Address how the contextual characteristics of the community, classroom, and students have implications for instructional planning and assessment. Include specific instructional implications for factors that will influence how you plan and implement your unit.</i></p>	
<b>STEP 2 – Research Review</b>	<b>Timeline:</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Review research pertaining to your area of focus  <input type="checkbox"/> Determine what you believe will make a difference to student learning	Completed BEFORE unit starts
<p><b>PROMPT:</b> <i>Provide a description of research pertaining to your area of focus and determine what you believe will make a difference to student learning</i></p>	
<b>STEP 3 Learning Goal</b>	<b>Timeline:</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Identify 1 learning goal you wish your students to meet by the end of the unit	Completed BEFORE unit starts
<p><b>PROMPT:</b> <i>Identify and justify your learning goal</i></p>	

<p><b>STEP 4 Instructional Plan &amp; Data Collection</b></p>	<p><b>Timeline:</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Develop a comprehensive plan that matches with your focus and learning goal and includes lesson plans with a reference to research.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Include an overview of your assessment plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Create Pre-and post-assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Completed BEFORE unit starts, with adjustments made while teaching the unit based on student response and needs</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Completed BEFORE unit starts, with adjustments made during and at end of unit</li> </ul>
<p><b>PROMPT:</b> Describe the key components of your instructional plan, including an overview of your assessment plan that aligns with your learning goal. Please send all documents (unit/lesson plans, pre-assessment, post-assessment) to <a href="mailto:PTWS@grace.edu">PTWS@grace.edu</a>.</p>	
<p><b>STEP 5 – Data Analysis &amp; Professional Reflection</b></p>	<p><b>Timeline:</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Analyze results of pre-assessment plan and make any adjustments to unit based on student needs</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Generate and analyze Graphs/tables of student learning to make adjustments to unit as needed and to assess results at the end of unit</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Summary of class learning (Post assessment data)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Summary of three individuals at various readiness levels</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Summary of Subgroup differences</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Reflection of Unit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Before unit starts</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> After collection of pre-assessment data (before unit)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> After collection of post assessment data (after unit)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> After unit</li> </ul>
<p>Reflect on successful and unsuccessful aspects of your unit including ideas that could improve student learning. Be prepared to share your PTWS in a Celebration of Learning. You will want to prepare a PowerPoint (or other presentation format) to present to your cohort. Be sure to address the above categories.</p>	

The following rubric will be used to assess your PTWS. Please submit your responses to the above prompts in a professional presentation format. Student learning and growth will be assessed.

**E. Assessment Rubric**

Rating →	3	2	1	Reflection Notes
Indicator ↓	Exemplary	 Target	Emerging	
<b>CONTEXTUAL FACTORS:</b> <b>Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select a Variety of Instruction, Strategies, Learning Tasks, and Resources</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional draws upon contextual factors and pre-assessment data to design activities and learning tasks that are productive, appropriate, and differentiated.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional draws upon contextual factors and pre-assessment data to design activities and learning tasks that are productive and appropriate for students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional designs instruction with <i>minimal</i> reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Activities and learning tasks <i>are not</i> productive or appropriate for students.	
<b>RESEARCH:</b> <b>Variety of Instruction, Strategies, Learning Tasks, and Resources Linked to Research</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional uses a <i>significant</i> variety of instruction, activities, learning tasks and/or resources that <i>lead to deep understanding</i> . Research-based strategies <i>make a clear contribution to learning</i> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional uses a variety of instruction, activities, learning tasks, or resources that contribute to student learning. Research-based strategies are appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional uses a <i>minimal</i> variety of instruction, activities, learning tasks, and resources, <i>relying heavily on textbook or single resource (e.g., work sheets)</i> . Research-based strategies are <i>inappropriate or missing</i> .	
<b>DATA ALIGNMENT &amp; LEARNING GOAL(S):</b> <b>Data Alignment with Learning Goal(s)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional <i>fully</i> aligns analysis of student learning with learning goal(s) and provides a <i>comprehensive</i> profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, and three individuals with various levels of readiness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional aligns analysis of student learning with learning goal(s) and provides a profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, and three individuals with varying levels of readiness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional <i>partially</i> aligns analysis of student learning with learning goal(s) <i>and/or fails</i> to provide a profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, <i>and/or</i> three individuals with varying levels of readiness.	
<b>DATA ANALYSIS:</b> <b>Evidence of Impact on Student Learning</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional’s analysis of student learning includes <i>clear</i> evidence that learning goal(s) were met by the majority of students. Includes a rationale for future growth of students not meeting the learning goal(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional’s analysis of student learning includes adequate evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward the learning goal(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional’s analysis of student learning <i>reveals students’ lack of progress</i> toward meeting learning goals.	

<b>PROFESSIONAL REFLECTION:</b>  <b>Interpretation of Student Learning</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional provides evidence to support conclusions drawn in “Data Analysis” section. Teacher professional explores multiple hypotheses for successful and unsuccessful learning experiences throughout the unit.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional provides evidence to support conclusions drawn in “Data Analysis” section by addressing successful and unsuccessful learning experiences throughout the unit.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher professional provides evidence but no (or simplistic, superficial, or inaccurate) reasons or hypotheses to support conclusions drawn in “Data Analysis” section.	
--	--	---	---	--

**F. Data Charts:**

Professional Teacher Grade Level	School District	Years of Experience
First Grade	Seymour Community Schools	2
Fifth/Sixth Grade	Warsaw Community Schools	1
Seventh/Eighth Grade ELA	Warsaw Community Schools	1.5
Elementary SPED	Triton School Corporation	3

Professional Teacher Work Sample									
Spring 2021									
N = 4									
Criterion	Performance Rating of Frequency (percentage)								
	Exemplary		Target		Emerging		Unacceptable		
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	
<b>CONTEXTUAL FACTORS:</b> Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select a Variety of Instruction, Strategies, Learning Tasks, and Resources	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	
<b>RESEARCH:</b> Variety of Instruction, Strategies, Learning Tasks, and Resources Linked to Research	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	
<b>DATA ALIGNMENT &amp; LEARNING GOAL(S):</b> Data Alignment with Learning Goal(s)	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	
<b>DATA ANALYSIS:</b> Evidence of Impact on Student Learning	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	
<b>PROFESSIONAL REFLECTION:</b> Interpretation of Student Learning	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	

Professional Teacher Grade Level	School District	Years of Experience
First Grade	Wa-Nee Community Schools	3
Fourth Grade	Green Local Schools	1
Sixth Grade	Warsaw Community Schools	2
High School Mathematics	Clear Fork Valley Local Schools	1

Professional Teacher Work Sample									
Spring 2023									
N = 4									
Average of Scores from College Faculty and Professional Teachers									
Criterion	Performance Rating of Frequency (percentage)								
	Exemplary		Target		Emerging		Unacceptable		
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	
<b>CONTEXTUAL FACTORS:</b> Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select a Variety of Instruction, Strategies, Learning Tasks, and Resources	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
<b>RESEARCH:</b> Variety of Instruction, Strategies, Learning Tasks, and Resources Linked to Research	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
<b>DATA ALIGNMENT &amp; LEARNING GOAL(S):</b> Data Alignment with Learning Goal(s)	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
<b>DATA ANALYSIS:</b> Evidence of Impact on Student Learning	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	
<b>PROFESSIONAL REFLECTION:</b> Interpretation of Student Learning	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	

Professional Teacher Grade Level	School District	Years of Experience
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	Warsaw Community Schools	1
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	Warsaw Community Schools	1
Fifth Grade	Warsaw Community Schools	3
Fifth Grade	Warsaw Community Schools	1
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies	Warsaw Community Schools	1
10 <sup>th</sup> -12 Grade Business	Burriss Laboratory School	2

Professional Teacher Work Sample									
Fall 2024									
N = 6									
Average of Scores from College Faculty and Professional Teachers									
Criterion	Performance Rating of Frequency (percentage)								
	Exemplary		Target		Emerging		Unacceptable		
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	
<b>CONTEXTUAL FACTORS:</b> Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select a Variety of Instruction, Strategies, Learning Tasks, and Resources	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
<b>RESEARCH:</b> Variety of Instruction, Strategies, Learning Tasks, and Resources Linked to Research	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	
<b>DATA ALIGNMENT &amp; LEARNING GOAL(S):</b> Data Alignment with Learning Goal(s)	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	
<b>DATA ANALYSIS:</b> Evidence of Impact on Student Learning	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	
<b>PROFESSIONAL REFLECTION:</b> Interpretation of Student Learning	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	

Professional Teacher Grade Level	School District	Years of Experience
Third Grade	Warsaw Community Schools	1
Fifth Grade	Warsaw Community Schools	2
H.S. Business	Burris Laboratory School, Muncie	3
M.S. Social Studies	Warsaw Community Schools	2
SPED – 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	Williamson County Schools	2

**Professional Teacher Work Sample**  
 Spring 2026  
 N = 5  
 Average of Scores from College Faculty and Professional Teachers

Criterion	Performance Rating of Frequency (percentage)							
	Exemplary		Target		Emerging		Unacceptable	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
<b>CONTEXTUAL FACTORS:</b> Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select a Variety of Instruction, Strategies, Learning Tasks, and Resources	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>RESEARCH:</b> Variety of Instruction, Strategies, Learning Tasks, and Resources Linked to Research	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>DATA ALIGNMENT &amp; LEARNING GOAL(S):</b> Data Alignment with Learning Goal(s)	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>DATA ANALYSIS:</b> Evidence of Impact on Student Learning	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>PROFESSIONAL REFLECTION:</b> Interpretation of Student Learning	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%