EDR 626 Rubric: Case Study (updated 7/7/15)

by Grand Valley Education Administrator

Case Study

Standards

INTASC-2013.1 Learner Development. The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

INTASC-2013.2 Learning Differences. The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

INTASC-2013.3 Learning Environments. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

INTASC-2013.6 Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher’s and learner’s decision making.

INTASC-2013.8 Instructional Strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

INTASC-2013.9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.

IRA-2010.2.2 Candidates use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections.

IRA-2010.2.3 Candidates use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources.

IRA-2010.3.1 Candidates understand types of assessments and their
purposes, strengths, and limitations.

**IRA-2010.3.2** Candidates select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes.

**IRA-2010.3.3** Candidates use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.

**IRA-2010.3.4** Candidates communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences.

**IRA-2010.4.2** Candidates use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students’ knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity.

**IRA-2010.5.3** Candidates use routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another, discussions, and peer feedback).

**IRA-2010.6.2** Candidates display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.

**Directions to the Student**

The **Case Study** engages candidates in meaningful work with a learner that integrates knowledge of both assessment and instruction.

**Resources/Texts**

**Part 1: Assess Instructional Resources**

We begin with analysis of resources/texts to identify important ideas as well as the conceptual, linguistic, and graphic features that facilitate or constrain learners’ ability to make sense of texts that challenge their thinking. These features interact with learner’s knowledge and teacher’s instruction to affect how learner interacts and learns with text. This analysis is foundational to evaluating published literacy assessments, designing literacy assessments, preparing texts for instruction, and interpreting learners’ response to texts used for a variety of purposes. Thus, the practice of text analysis will be used throughout this course.

**Learner**

**Part 2: Assess a Struggling Reader**

Identify a student who is struggling in reading or writing or academic achievement. Obtain consent of student and parent to assess student’s literacy skills, defined broadly as. Study and select, as well as construct, appropriate literacy
assessment tools to understand student’s reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing and representing visually. Assessments may include, as appropriate, assessments of: interest/attitude; structured informal inventory; comprehension; word recognition, spelling, fluency; writing; language and vocabulary. Conduct assessments. Submit data for each assessment as the assessment is completed. Provide a rationale for each re: strengths, limits, purposes, and student needs.

**Part 3: Report Results of Assessment, Make Recommendations**

Record interpretations of each assessment and summarize data from multiple sources into a cohesive profile of learner strengths and needs and offers recommendations. This report will also serve as a tool for communication with stakeholders. It will be ‘built’ in segments over the semester as different portions of the assessment are conducted and discussed in class.

**Part 4: Plan Instructional Intervention**

Use assessment data to plan instruction for the focus student and (if applicable) other students. Develop instructional plan, to be used in your instruction that is consistent with an overall balance of high-utility components and aligns goals, findings from assessment, and research-based instructional practices with curriculum and progress monitoring measures. Also, confer with peer teachers to assist in developing a plan for instruction in a specific aspect of literacy.

**Activity/Context**

**Part 5: Implement Instructional Intervention**

Conduct instruction with focus student that is mindful and respectful of the diverse knowledge, skills, dispositions, experiences, and home and community influences that shape learners identities.

**Part 6: Monitor Progress**

Following assessment and planning for instruction, and close study of instructional approach, provide instruction for focus student. Keep a log and video-record in order to chronicle student progress and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. For log, supply information on lesson objectives, instructional approach, materials, and response to instruction with video or student artifacts. Consider how teacher’s instructional decisions regarding tasks and texts contributed to learner’s meeting, or not meeting, goals; self-evaluate use of gradual release to independent performance; support classroom teacher to do so.

**Part 7: Communicate with Stakeholders**
Meet with peer teachers small in cross-age groups to share semester’s work with students. Prepare a multi-media presentation that takes audience from initial concerns, through assessment, goal setting, instruction, and evaluation of that instruction re: student progress. The presentation should include examples of student work including brief video. The language, tone, structure and content emphasis of the presentation should be customized to the target audience of speaker’s choice (e.g., parent, student, administrator, or other stakeholder). Also, share insights gleaned through own research and the impact of those insights on instructional decisions. During the presentations of others, facilitate discussion by means of active listening, questioning, and offering insights and feedback on instructional decisions.

Rubric Instructions

For each row of the rubric, assess on a 0-3 scale by selecting a score from the right-side columns for the element on the left-side of the same row.

PLEASE NOTE: Percentages and Grades

PLEASE NOTE: Percentages and Grades within LiveText should be ignored. When a rubric is completed in LiveText, a percentage may appear within the rubric. This percentage will not be regarded by the College of Education and is no reflection of the Grand Valley student’s grade or performance within the course. It is a result of assigning numeric values to the columns of the rubric. This numbering generates numeric data for the College of Education to inform us of areas within our courses that we need to improve in the future. Likewise, LiveText provides instructors with a grading tool to grade assignments in LiveText. The College of Education asks faculty not to use this tool, as official grades are currently managed through Banner. Any grade shown in LiveText is non-official and should not be regarded by LiveText users.

Please also remember that an "assessment" is not an end goal, nor is it the same as a course grade. Rather, an assessment is a learning tool that demonstrates students’ ability to meet course expectations and allows the College of Education to look for ways to improve our programs. An assessment is also not a student satisfaction/opinion survey. Instead, it is a direct measure of student learning and development outcomes. Providing students with access to these assessments ensure all College of Education students have the ability to showcase their progress throughout their program(s) and beyond graduation.
## Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proficient (3) (3.000 pts)</th>
<th>Developing (2) (2.000 pts)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1) (1.000 pt)</th>
<th>Unacceptable (0) (0.000 pt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILA 2.2 InTASC 1</strong> (1.000, 10%) INTASC-2013.1 IRA-2010.2.2</td>
<td>Candidate chose a research-based instructional approach appropriate for student needs, or adopts recommended one, and provides literature in support of the approach; can paraphrase literature.</td>
<td>Candidate chose an instructional approach ill-suited to student needs or lacking support in literature or candidate did not understand the approach well enough to apply it.</td>
<td>Candidate did not meet standard for ‘developing.’</td>
<td>Candidate did not make an attempt to satisfy standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILA 2.3 InTASC 8</strong> (1.000, 10%) INTASC-2013.8 IRA-2010.2.3</td>
<td>Candidate identified examples of important understandings, relevant supporting details, conceptual demands, linguistic and graphic features; used practice to match reader, text, and task; cited literature that supports practice; provided evidence of collaboration with peer teachers; identified areas of growth, examples.</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrated limited understanding of text analysis; examples of features are not sufficiently explained or not relevant to important understandings; had difficulty using practice to match text to learner and instruction; written work lacked clarity, organization.</td>
<td>Candidate did not meet standard for ‘developing.’</td>
<td>Candidate did not make an attempt to satisfy standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILA 3.1 InTASC 6</strong> (1.000, 10%) INTASC-2013.6 IRA-2010.3.1</td>
<td>Description of assessment tools - purpose, strengths, limitations, and comparisons - showed evidence of close study of supporting literature and adequate rationale for use with student. Administration showed command of procedures, interpreted with few errors. Description was informal, organized, and accurate.</td>
<td>Description of assessment tools showed evidence of partial study or incomplete understanding of literature and little rationale in support of its use. Administration showed errors, incomplete command of procedures for using and interpreting assessment. Description was poorly organized or inaccurate.</td>
<td>Candidate did not meet standard for ‘developing.’</td>
<td>Candidate did not make an attempt to satisfy standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILA 3.2 InTASC 6</strong> (1.000, 10%) INTASC-2013.6 IRA-2010.3.2</td>
<td>Candidate provided accurate quantitative and qualitative interpretation of data from multiple sources (interviews, tests, observations);</td>
<td>Candidate provided description of events, scores, partially accurate quantitative and qualitative interpretation of data; sparse evidence in</td>
<td>Candidate did not meet standard for ‘developing.’</td>
<td>Candidate did not make an attempt to satisfy standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILA 3.3</td>
<td>InTASC 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.000, 10%)</td>
<td>(1.000, 10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTASC-2013.6</td>
<td>INTASC-2013.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA-2010.3.3</td>
<td>IRA-2010.3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Candidate set worthwhile goals re: learner knowledge, skills, dispositions, understandings; explicitly connected goals to learner strengths and needs re: assessment; articulated what progress toward goals looks like; established measures of progress that were appropriate for goals. Candidate’s support for peer in establishing goals, linking goals to assessment, and planning to measure progress exhibited above qualities for ‘proficient.’**

**Candidate’s report of student’s response to instruction lacked specificity, did not explicitly evaluate instructional effectiveness, or placed inordinate responsibility on student; did not provide useful description, video, artifacts for consultant. Candidate focused on factors other than student learning.**

**Candidate did not meet standard for ‘developing.’**

**Candidate did not make an attempt to satisfy standard.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prioritized, communicated in written, oral forms, purposes, procedures, results, implications of assessments accurately, with representative examples/evidence and a balance of strengths, needs.</td>
<td>had difficulty prioritizing, describing concerns, setting purposes clearly, summarizing procedures for lay audience, articulating results accurately, balancing strengths, needs, providing appropriate examples of student work, or communicating in written, oral forms.</td>
<td>did not meet standard for ‘developing.’</td>
<td>did not make an attempt to satisfy standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plan and analysis in instructional log described instruction, environment, and materials, to be sensitive to diverse knowledge, skills, dispositions, experiences, and home and community influences on learner. Candidate identified progress toward standard in peer teacher’s work.</td>
<td>Lesson plan or instructional log or verbal report suggested that teacher has limited knowledge of learner or limited ability to apply that knowledge to assure that instruction, environment, and materials were adequately sensitive to diversity of learners. Candidate was not in a position to support peers.</td>
<td>did not meet standard for ‘developing.’</td>
<td>did not make an attempt to satisfy standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log, video showed that candidate modeled target, strategic literate behaviors that were typical of reading and writing for real purposes; guided learner in steps toward those behaviors; cited professional literature to support conduct of instruction. Provided video, artifacts of student work, to demonstrate this practice for peer teachers.</td>
<td>Log showed that candidate ‘s model of literate behaviors was of dubious quality or not developmentally appropriate or did not show real reading and writing; steps toward literate behaviors were absent, inappropriate, or insufficient; failed to provide credible support from literature. Did not provide useful video or artifacts of student work to demonstrate practice for peer teachers.</td>
<td>did not meet standard for ‘developing.’</td>
<td>did not make an attempt to satisfy standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate made observations of literacy instructional events, objects, interactions; articulated thinking</td>
<td>Candidate’s observations of own instruction indicated difficulty in identifying instructional decisions and/or</td>
<td>did not meet standard for ‘developing.’</td>
<td>did not make an attempt to satisfy standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://www.livetext.com/doc/982532?print=1
| about the interactions of these and elicited thinking of other collaborators in discussion; reflection on own and others’ assessment and instructional practices included evidence base. |
| characterizing student responses, lacked insight into potential impact of own decisions on student’s response to instruction. |
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