

Part 1: Elementary Assessment (Indiana Developmental Standards)

Elementary Student Teaching FINAL Evaluation

As part of understanding what knowledge, skills, and dispositions our students possess, we are asking you to complete an end-of-clinical evaluation. This tool is comprised of three different parts. The first part is based on the Indiana Developmental Standards for teacher preparation programs. The second part contains knowledge and skills as outlined by InTASC and CAEP, our accreditating body. The last part asks to you to consider the dispositions that are valued by the faculty at Purdue University Fort Wayne. In other words, these dispositions align with our Conceptual Framework. You will also be asked to provide a narrative summary of the Student Teacher's performance. Thank you in advance for the time you put into this evaluation -- it is very important to us and the Student Teacher.

Evaluation Information: Date of Evaluation mm/dd/yyyy Teacher Candidate Name Teacher Candidate Email Placement School Grade Level Taught University Supervisor Name

| University Supervisor Email | |
|--|--|
| Cooperating Teacher Name | |
| Cooperating Teacher Email | |
| Person filling out the survey. I am the Cooperating Teacher University Supervisor | |
| Number of students: | |
| | |

For each of the following items in Part 1 (only):

- Use the DEVELOPING category if the candidate demonstrates performance described in both Acceptable and Unacceptable levels of performance.
- Use the TARGET category if the candidate demonstrates performance described in both Exceeds Target and Acceptable levels of performance.

REPA Develop. Standard 2.1 Learning Processes InTASC 1 Learner Develop.

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---------------------------|---------|--------------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| Drew on prior knowledge | | Drew on prior knowledge | | |
| of each child to plan | | to plan curricular | | Did not or is only |
| curricular experience(s) | | experience(s) that were | | beginning to |
| that challenged and | | achievable and | | demonstrate an ability |
| extended development | | meaningful for children. | | to plan curriculum that is |
| and learning. | | Select children were | | achievable and |
| Experiences motivated | | challenged to master | | challenging for children |
| each child, regardless of | | understanding of and | | at various |
| developmental levels, to | | make connections to the | | developmental levels. |
| demonstrate mastery of | | content. | | |
| understanding for and | | | | |
| make meaningful | | | | |
| connections to the | | | | |
| content. | \circ | \circ | \circ | 0 |
| | | | | |

REPA Develop. Standard 1.1 Student and Diversity InTASC 2

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---|--------|---|------------|---|
| Used developmental, family, and cultural knowledge to proactively create/support a safe, positive, encouraging and nurturing environment. Use that context to integrate varied opportunities for teaching and practicing social and emotional regulation skills. Supports positive behaviors through the use of intrinsic motivation techniques without relying on rewards or punishments; intervenes in negative | | Used knowledge of child development and/or family culture to model and support appropriate, positive behaviors in students. Explicitly taught social or emotional regulation skills. Intervened in negative student behaviors. | | Did not actively teach missing social or emotional regulation skills. Intervened in negative student behaviors but relied primarily on rewards or punishments to stop behavior. |
| student behaviors (e.g., name-calling, exclusion). | 0 | 0 | 0 | \circ |
| | | | | |

| Comments for previous items | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | |
| | | |

In this section, you *MUST* evaluate performance in <u>each</u> of the content areas below. Consider when you have obseved the area being taught independently or when one or more were integrated into a single curricular experience.

Curriculum

REPA Content Scientifically Based Reading (Standards 1 & 2) InTASC 4 Content Knowledge Standards

| TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---------|-------------------------|---|---|
| | Implemented strategies | | Unclear if or how |
| | based on Science of | | Science of Reading |
| | Reading strategies | | research impacted |
| | inconsistently. | | selection or |
| | | | implementation of |
| | Built on some students' | | teaching strategies. |
| | prior understandings of | | |
| | the five essential | | Taught according to |
| | components of reading. | | curriculum guide or used |
| | | | other strategies, ignoring |
| | | | scientifically based |
| | | | reading research areas. |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| \circ | 0 | \circ | \circ |
| | TARGET | Implemented strategies based on Science of Reading strategies inconsistently. Built on some students' prior understandings of the five essential | Implemented strategies based on Science of Reading strategies inconsistently. Built on some students' prior understandings of the five essential |

REPA Content English Language Arts (Standard 3): Writing InTASC 4 Content Knowledge Standards

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|--|---------|--------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Implemented strategies | | Implemented strategies | | Unclear if or how |
| based on scientifically- | | based on scientifically- | | scientifically based |
| based writing research | | based writing strategies | | writing research |
| with fidelity. | | inconsistently. | | impacted selection or |
| | | | | implementation of |
| Writing includes: | | Built on some students' | | teaching strategies. |
| Library also sufficients | | prior writing abilities. | | |
| Handwriting | | | | Taught according to |
| Genres | | | | curriculum guide, |
| • Research Process | | | | ignoring the scientifically-based |
| Conventions of Standard Language (i.e., grammar, | | | | research. |
| punctuation, etc.) | \circ | \circ | \circ | \circ |

REPA Content English Language Arts (Standard 3): Speaking/Listening InTASC 4 Content Knowledge Standards

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|--|--------|--------------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| Implemented strategies | | Implemented strategies | | Unclear if or how |
| based on speaking and | | based on research- | | scientifically-based |
| listening research with | | based speaking and | | reading research |
| fidelity. | | listening strategies | | impacted selection or |
| | | inconsistently. | | implementation of |
| Speaking/Listening | | | | teaching strategies. |
| include: | | Built on some students' | | |
| Active discussion | | prior speaking and listening skills. | | Taught according to curriculum guide, |
| Critical listening | | | | ignoring the research. |
| Collaboration | | | | |
| Presentation | 0 | \circ | 0 | 0 |

REPA Content English Language Arts (Standard 3): Media Literacy InTASC 4 Content Knowledge Standards

| TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|--------|-------------------------|---|---|
| | Implemented strategies | | Unclear if or how |
| | based on research- | | research-based media |
| | based based media | | literacy research |
| | literacy strategies | | impacted selection or |
| | inconsistently. | | implementation of |
| | | | teaching strategies. |
| | Built on some students' | | |
| | prior understanding of | | Taught according to |
| | media literacy. | | curriculum guide, |
| | | | ignoring the research |
| | | | areas. |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 0 | 0 | \circ | \circ |
| | TARGET | Implemented strategies based on research- based based media literacy strategies inconsistently. Built on some students' prior understanding of | Implemented strategies based on research- based based media literacy strategies inconsistently. Built on some students' prior understanding of |

REPA Content Reading & English Language Arts (Standards 1, 2, 3): Assessment InTASC 4 Content Knowledge Standards

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|-------------------------------------|---------|-------------------------|------------|-------------------------|
| Implemented | | Implemented some | | Unclear if or how |
| scientifcally-based | | scientifcally-based | | scientifically-based |
| assessment strategies | | assessment strategies | | reading research |
| for Reading and English | | for Reading and English | | impacted selection or |
| Language Arts. | | Language Arts. | | implementation of |
| | | | | assessment strategies. |
| Assessment practices | | | | |
| include: | | | | Assessment included |
| | | | | strategies that are NOT |
| Aligned with | | | | supported by scientific |
| Science of Reading | | | | research, such as |
| Assessment used | | | | Running |
| to inform | | | | Records, Developmental |
| instruction | | | | Reading Assessment |
| Formative and | | | | (DRA); Informal Reading |
| Summative | | | | Inventory (IRI), or |
| assessment | | | | Qualitative Reading |
| O | \circ | \circ | \circ | Inventory (QRI). |

InTASC 4 Content Knowledge Standards

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|-------------------------|---------|--------------------------|------------|---------------------------|
| Used open-ended | | Used inquiry processes | | Used direct instruction |
| inquiry processes for | | (e.g., structured or | | techniques to tell |
| children to investigate | | guided investigations) | | children about scientific |
| their own questions | | for children to | | concepts or principles. |
| related to scientific | | investigate important | | Children spent majority |
| concepts or principles. | | scientific concepts or | | of time listening and/or |
| | | principles. | | completing |
| Children were supported | | | | worksheet(s). |
| in considering the | | Focused lesson on | | |
| personal and social | | assisting children with | | Children were not |
| applications of their | | building understanding | | supported in considering |
| results. | | of personal and social | | the personal and/or |
| | | applications in science. | | social applications of |
| \circ | \circ | \circ | \circ | science. |

REPA Content Mathematics (Standard 4)
InTASC 4 Content Knowledge Standards

EXCEEDS TARGET TARGET ACCEPTABLE DEVELOPING UNACCEPTABLE

Demonstrated mathematical fluency by having a number of ways to present and engage students in thinking about math concepts.

Balanced and linked conceptual understanding and computational proficiency.

Facilitated students'
focus on and use of
problem solving
strategies for
mathematical learning.
Assisted students in
monitoring and
reflecting on the process
of mathematical
problem solving.

Supported students' investigations of mathematical conjectures, student proofs, and the selection and use of various types of reasoning and proof.

Provide an environment, that needs minimal teacher prompting, in which students automatically are able to:

- use mathematical language to organize and communicate mathematical thinking orally and in writing.
- make connections within mathematics and to real-life contexts.
- use appropriate technological tools, such as calculator, spreadsheets, geometry and/or presentation

Demonstrated mathematical fluency by having a number of ways to present math concepts to students.

Favored one aspect more than another (e.g., conceptual understanding vs computational proficiency), but not to the detriment of the other.

Posed problems for children to solve that link to their life experiences.

Taught children self-monitoring techniques for problem-solving process.

Created space in learning environment for students to:

- organize and communicate
 mathematical thinking in writing.
- talk in pairs, small groups, or as a large group about answers to problems with the goal of highlighting reasoning and proof.
 - make connections within mathematics.
 - use math or technology tools appropriately to build understanding.

Used one method to present or think about mathematical concepts. Relied on that strategy to the exclusion of others that would benefit some students.

Favored computational proficiency to the detriment of children's conceptual learning.

Viewed mathematical learning as skill-anddrill, not as interesting problems to solve.

Created space in learning environment for students to:

- communicate answers to others with the goal of coming to consensus.
- uses calculators in a way that that focuses just on the answers and not a deeper understanding.

REPA Content Social Studies (Standard 6) InTASC 4 Content Knowledge Standards

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---------------------------|---------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------------|
| Used knowledge of | | Used knowledge of | | Focused on isolated |
| social studies to provide | | social studies to help | | facts. May have |
| students integrated | | students learn concepts | | provided misinformation |
| learning experience from | | from one academic field | | to or supported |
| more than one of the | | within social studies. | | misconceptions of |
| academic fields of | | | | students. |
| social studies. | | Encouraged students to | | |
| | | build knowledge through | | Encouraged students to |
| Engaged students in | | researching specific | | memorize information |
| research using a variety | | sources, examining data, | | provided rather than |
| of sources, analyzing | | and formulating oral | | engage in inquiry. |
| different points of view, | | and/or written | | |
| and applying their | | arguments. | | |
| thinking (individually | | | | |
| and collaboratively) to | | | | |
| real world situations. | | | | |
| Encouraged the | | | | |
| acquisition of | | | | |
| knowledge, skills and | | | | |
| dispositions necessary | | | | |
| to be informed, caring | | | | |
| and responsible citizens. | \circ | 0 | \circ | \circ |

REPA Content Fine Arts (Standard 7) InTASC 4

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|-----------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Worked alone or with | | Planned visual art or | | Visual art or music |
| visual arts/ music | | music learning | | experience focused on |
| specialists to integrate | | experience that | | one concept in isolation. |
| art/music with other | | integrated concepts | | |
| content areas in learning | | within that one | | Supported students in |
| experiences. | | discipline. | | using paper-pencil methods for |
| Used visual arts/music | | Supported students' use | | communicating what |
| as the primary media for | | of traditional tools for | | they learned, rather than |
| students to | | communication in visual | | using visual arts/music |
| communicate what they | | arts/ music. | | as a communication |
| learned in other | | | | tool. |
| disciplines. | | Acquainted students | | |
| | | with exemplary arts from | | Introduce a variety of art |
| Provided exemplary | | a variety of cultures and | | forms representing an |
| works of arts from a | | historical periods. | | array of quality. |
| variety of cultural and | | | | |
| historical periods to | | Encouraged students in | | Encouraged students to |
| make connections | | study of, participation in, | | participate in using |
| between the arts and | | and appreciation of | | traditional tools |
| other disciplines. | | traditional tools | | associated with visual |
| | | associated with visual | | arts/music. |
| Encouraged students in | | arts/music. | | |
| study of, participation in, | | | | |
| and appreciation of | | | | |
| traditional and | | | | |
| technology-based tools | | | | |
| associated with visual | | | | |
| arts/music. | \bigcirc | | \bigcirc | |

REPA Content Health, Wellness, and Physical Education (Standard 8): Health and Wellness InTASC 4 Content Knowledge Standards

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|----------------------------|---------|---------------------------|------------|--------------------------|
| Used inquiry to foster | | Used structured or | | Relied on direct |
| students' understanding | | guided investigations to | | instruction for sharing |
| of the benefits of a | | teach students the | | information on the major |
| healthy lifestyle, as well | | major health issues | | health issues affecting |
| as the dangers of | | affecting children and | | children. May have |
| diseases and activities | | imparted information on | | imparted misinformation |
| that may contribute to | | these issues sensitively. | | or reacted insensitively |
| disease. | | | | to student concerns. |
| | | Provided problems to | | |
| Addressed health- | | solve to clarify | | Encouraged students to |
| related issues in ways | | misconceptions for | | memorize information |
| that helped children | | children and helped | | provided rather than |
| recognize potentially | | them recognize | | engage in inquiry. |
| dangerous situations, | | potentially dangerous | | |
| clarify misconceptions, | | situations. | | |
| and find reliable sources | | | | |
| of information. | \circ | \circ | \circ | 0 |

REPA Content Health, Wellness, and Physical Education (Standard 8): Physical Education InTASC Standard 4 Content Knowledge Standards

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|--------------------------|---------|--------------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| Created experiences to | | Communicated using a | | Used direct instruction to |
| help children understand | | variety of methods the | | tell children the benefits |
| the intrinsic value and | | intrinsic value and | | of physical activity. |
| benefits associated with | | benefits associated with | | |
| physical activity. | | physical activity. | | Children remained |
| | | | | inactive during most of |
| Responded to signs of | | Demonstrated | | the learning experience. |
| students' need for | | understanding that | | . |
| physical movement with | | physical inactivity is a | | |
| meaningful movement | | major health risk factor | | |
| experience. | | by providing regular | | |
| · | | opportunities for | | |
| | | physical movement | | |
| | | (beyond PE class or | | |
| 0 | \circ | recess). | \circ | \circ |

Comments for previous items:

Instructional Planning and Delivery

REPA Develop. Standard 3.4 Instructional Planning and Delivery InTASC Standard 8 Instructional Strategies

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|----------------------------|---------|---------------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| Used a variety of | | Planned for active | | Did not actively engage |
| instructional | | involvement so that | | students in learning the |
| approaches, including | | students are engaged in | | subject matter content. |
| the effective use of | | learning the subject | | |
| technology, to foster | | matter content. | | Missed opportunities to |
| students' appreciation | | | | link relevant resources or |
| and engagement in | | Instruction reflected | | resources were not used |
| subject matter content. | | appropriate subject | | in a way that benefitted |
| | | matter content and/or | | the students. |
| Built effective learning | | and curriculum goals. | | |
| experiences that were | | | | Did not create learning |
| engaging and | | Helped students realize | | experiences that |
| meaningful for students. | | how knowledge, skills, | | encouraged the |
| | | and ideas relate to their | | application of |
| Assisted students in | | lives and to other real | | knowledge, skills, tools, |
| applying the knowledge, | | world situations. | | and ideas across fields |
| skills, and ideas to their | | | | of knowledge or to real |
| lives and to other real | | Utilized resources (e.g., | | world situations. |
| world situations. | | print and electronic) | | |
| | | within the classroom or | | |
| Utilized informational | | school to benefit | | |
| resources (e.g., print | | students. | | |
| and electronic) beyond | | | | |
| the classroom to ensure | | | | |
| that students are | | | | |
| competent and | | | | |
| confident users of | | | | |
| technology and other | | | | |
| resources. | \circ | \circ | \circ | \circ |

REPA Develop. Standard 3.6 Instructional Planning and Delivery InTASC Standard 7 Planning for Instruction

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|--|---------|---|------------|--|
| Differentiated instruction to individual students' characteristics (e.g., developmental characteristics, interests, learning styles, and modalities) and community's characteristics (e.g., cultures, income levels) with subject matter content and curriculum goals. Anticipated student misunderstandings and pre-emptively | | Created instruction that was responsive to individual children's characteristics (e.g., developmental levels, interests, learning styles, and modalities) as well as the community's characteristics. Sought guidance from teacher or specialists, before or during experience, on how to address students' exceptional learning | | Ignored the students' characteristics (e.g., development levels, interests, learning styles, or modalities) and/or the community's characteristics. Recognized students whose development or learning is atypical. May or may not have responded to the needs with a successful adaptation or followed IEP's for individual |
| addressed them. | | needs. | | students. |
| Planned, implemented, and assessed instruction tasks and activities appropriate to the needs of students who are culturally diverse or have | | Planned instruction and assessed learning so that the diverse developmental and learning characteristics of children were | | Approached teaching in a way that was not sensitive to children's needs. Created learning |
| exceptional needs using best practices and current research. | | accommodated. Planned learning experiences that | | experiences that reflected the dominant culture of the classroom, school, or the |
| Applied knowledge of the richness of contributions from diverse cultures to the content studied in the elementary classroom. Used culturally-relevant resources in the learning experiences from the community (e.g., invited family members to share artifacts, | | integrated knowledge of contributions from diverse cultures into the content. | | perspective of the teacher. |
| experiences). | \circ | \circ | \bigcirc | \circ |

REPA Standard 3.11 Develop. Instructional Planning and Delivery InTASC Standard 8 Instructional Strategies

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|----------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|
| Evaluated the | | Used a variety of | | Focused instruction on |
| effectiveness of the | | instructional materials, | | providing information |
| instructional materials, | | technological resources, | | that did not require |
| technology, and | | and multiple teaching | | children to use critical |
| teaching strategies for | | and learning strategies | | thinking or problem |
| promoting critical | | to enhance students' | | solving skills. |
| thinking and problem | | development of critical | | |
| solving, <u>during</u> the | | thinking, problem solving, | | Used primarily close- |
| learning activity. Made | | and performance skills. | | ended, evaluative |
| necessary modifications | | | | questions during |
| to improve the students' | | Used mostly open- | | learning experience, |
| critical thinking and | | ended questions, | | and/or ineffective wait |
| problem solving skills. | | although they may be of | | time, thus not facilitating |
| | | a limited scope and/or | | the development of |
| Developed critical | | variety, to facilitate K-6 | | critical thinking and |
| thinking and problem | | students' critical thinking | | problem solving. |
| solving skills by using an | | and problem solving. | | |
| effective combination of | | Wait time was | | |
| wait time and a variety | | appropriate for | | |
| of open-ended | | promoting critical | | |
| questions (e.g., theory- | | thinking and problem | | |
| building, comparative, | | solving. | | |
| and challenging). | | | | |
| Responded effectively to | | | | |
| students when they | | | | |
| posed their own open- | | | | |
| ended questions. | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \circ | \circ |

REPA Develop. Standard 5.5 Learning Environments InTASC Standard 3 Learning Environments

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---------------------------|------------|----------------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| Used a variety of | | Demonstrated | | Practiced ineffective or |
| effective classroom | | knowledge and | | theoretically outdated |
| management strategies | | understanding of the | | classroom management |
| to keep students | | principles of effective | | strategies. |
| engaged in purposeful | | classroom | | |
| learning activities and | | management. | | Encouraged students to |
| create classroom | | | | be dependent on the |
| procedures. | | Encouraged students to | | teacher by being overly |
| | | assume | | controlling of behaviors |
| Taught routines, | | responsibility for | | OR failed to set or |
| transitions, and | | themselves and one | | enforce reasonable |
| procedures and then | | another, participate in | | expectations for student |
| expected students to | | decision making, work | | behavior or procedures |
| monitor their own | | collaboratively and | | for routines. |
| learning, motivation, and | | independently, and | | |
| interactions with peers | | engage in purposeful | | May have created a |
| during those times. | | learning activities create | | climate of competition |
| | | an effective learning | | or exclusion, |
| Fostered students' | | environment. | | marginalizing some |
| responsibility for | | | | students based on their |
| themselves and one | | | | personal characteristics |
| another, participating in | | | | or skills (e.g., emotional |
| decision-making, | | | | regulation). |
| working collaboratively | | | | |
| and independently, while | | | | |
| engaged in learning | | | | |
| activities. | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | \bigcirc |

REPA Develop. Standard 3.15 Instructional Planning and Delivery InTASC Standard 8 Instructional Strategies

| Used knowledge of language development, cultural and gender effects on communication, and the role of verbal and nonverbal language to communicate effectively | | Used knowledge of language development, cultural and gender effects on | | Demonstrated a lack of ability to effectively modify communication |
|--|------------|--|---|--|
| cultural and gender effects on communication, and the role of verbal and nonverbal language to communicate effectively | | cultural and gender effects on | | , |
| effects on communication, and the role of verbal and nonverbal language to communicate effectively | | effects on | | modify communication |
| communication, and the role of verbal and nonverbal language to communicate effectively | | | | Thoulty Continuation |
| role of verbal and nonverbal language to communicate effectively | | and the second s | | strategies to benefit the |
| nonverbal language to communicate effectively | | communication, or the | | learner. |
| communicate effectively | | role of verbal and | | |
| • | | nonverbal language to | | Occasionally modeled |
| and the second second second second | | communicate effectively | | communication |
| with all students. | | in some situations. | | strategies that helped |
| | | | | students participate in |
| Consistently used active | | Presented curriculum | | and learn active inquiry |
| inquiry strategies in the | | and modeled | | strategies. |
| classroom to engage | | communication | | |
| students in extensive, | | strategies to help | | Ineffectively used oral |
| integrated learning | | students learn active | | and/or written discourse |
| opportunities. | | inquiry strategies. | | between her/himself |
| | | . , | | and students to support |
| Facilitated students' oral | | Modeled appropriate | | learning OR modeled |
| and written discourse | | oral and written | | inappropriate strategies. |
| a6d proficiency in | | discourse between | | |
| classroom collaboration | | her/himself and | | |
| and supportive | | students as well as | | |
| interactions with each | | encouraged the | | |
| other to support | | students' use of | | |
| learning. | | discourse among | | |
| 3 | | themselves to extend | | |
| | | lear n ing. | | |
| O | O | 133 (4.19) | O | O |
| | | | | |
| Comments for previo | ous items: | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Assessment

REPA Develop. Standard 4.3 Assessment InTASC Standard 6 Assessment

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---|---------|---|------------|--|
| Carefully selected formal and informal | | Selected assessment tools that | | Used assessment tools exactly as designed. |
| assessment tools to reflect the diversity of students or modified them for learners with | | accommodated the diverse characteristics of students. | | Data gathered provided evidence of diverse learning needs, but |
| special needs or English as a new language. | | Administered assessments (i.e., formal and informal) to inform | | instruction was not modified for individual learners. |
| Used assessment data of student development and learning to design and implement | | and to make decisions about objectives, materials, and the effectiveness of | | Failed to utilize assessment data gathered to determine: |
| instruction that met individual student needs and interests. | | teaching strategies. Gathered assessment data to: | | what was taught, materials used, or instructional strategies; monitor student |
| Gathered assessment data during and after instruction to: | | monitor learning for groups of students, such as the need for re- | | learning; and/or • effectiveness of teaching strategies. |
| monitor and promote learning for each student, such as the need for re-teaching or adaptations to | | teaching or adaptations to strengthen instruction; and • monitor her/his own teaching strategies. | | |
| adaptations to strengthen instruction for each student; and monitor her/his own teaching strategies and behavior in terms of | | tederiing strategies. | | |
| improving student success. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Comments for Asse | ssment: | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Professionalism

InTASC Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|---------------------------|---------|--------------------------|------------|---------------------------|
| Conducted professional | | Used classroom | | Provided inconsistent |
| inquiry into personal | | observation, information | | evidence of reflecting on |
| practice to evaluate the | | about students, and | | practice in light of |
| effects of her/his | | research as sources for | | research on teaching |
| decisions and actions on | | evaluating the outcomes | | and resources available |
| students, parents, and | | of teaching and learning | | for professional learning |
| other professionals. | | and as a basis for | | OR did not follow |
| | | developing an | | through with strategies |
| Experimented with, | | improvement plan | | for improving practice. |
| analyzed, and revised | | based on the results. | | |
| practice based on | | | | Demonstrated a lack of |
| results of inquiry (e.g., | | Demonstrated | | understanding of the |
| current research). | | understanding of the | | professional code of |
| | | professional codes of | | ethical conduct. |
| Demonstrated a | | ethical conduct. | | |
| commitment to applying | | | | |
| the professional codes | | | | |
| of ethical conduct. | \circ | \circ | \circ | \circ |

REPA Develop. Standard 6.1 The Professional Environment InTASC Standard 10 Leadership & Collaboration

| EXCEEDS TARGET | TARGET | ACCEPTABLE | DEVELOPING | UNACCEPTABLE |
|--|------------------|--|------------|--|
| Provided evidence of how she/he established and maintained a positive, collaborative relationship with families to continuously promote the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical growth of their children. Provided evidence of how she/he developed collaborative | | Explained strategies used to build relationships with families in order to encourage intellectual, social, emotional, and physical growth of their children. Identified the appropriate colleagues and specialists within the school to support | | Did not convey the importance of involving families as partners in supporting the school both inside and outside the classroom. Provided evidence of one-way communication strategies (e.g., newsletters) to communicate with |
| relationships with colleagues and, when appropriate, community specialists to support students' learning and well-being. | | students' learning and wellbeing. | | families in order to support the students' development. Worked in isolation in an attempt to solve problems, rather than collaborating with |
| Comments for previ | o ious items: | | | others. |
| | | | | |

** You have completed Part 1. Please verify your responses before hitting the button below to continue to Parts 2 and 3.**

Part 2 - Unit-wide Assessment (CAEP/InTASC Stnds)

The candidate regularly assesses development and learning of each student and uses that information to scaffold to next levels.

InTASC #1

Target Acceptable Unacceptable

Candidate regularly assesses learning Candidate assesses, albeit inconsistently, Candidate infrequently assesses learning (e.g., performance, abilities, and skills) of learning (e.g., performance, abilities, and for individuals and group. Curriculum and individuals and the group. Data are used skills) of individuals and the group. Data instruction are selected without reference to design responsive curriculum and are used to design responsive curriculum to learning characteristics. instruction to scaffold the next level of and instruction to meet learners' needs. learning.

Content Knowledge

Candidate uses technology effectively to achieve content-specific learning goals. InTASC #5; ISTE 2.6

Target

Candidate engages and involves students with different technologies to achieve specific learning goals in the content area(s). The technology tools or apps are used in such a way that students deepen their understanding of the content.

Acceptable

Candidate engages students in specific learning goals for the content area(s).

Unacceptable

Candidate emphasizes technologies that technologies that are connected to the have limited utility for enriching learning in the content area(s).

Content Knowledge

Candidate engages students in making meaning of the content by examining it through diverse perspectives and personal responses.

InTASC #4

Target

Candidate engages students in discovering meaning of the content by questioning and analyzing ideas from diverse perspectives in content texts, materials, performances, and/or labs. Students are challenged to connect their personal responses to other larger meanings and critical stances in the content area.

Acceptable

Candidate engages students in making meaning of content texts, materials, performances, or labs by providing diverse materials and opportunities for personal response.

Unacceptable

Candidate provides content text, materials, performances, and/or labs from limited perspectives, thus restricting the students' ability to engage in making meaning. Or, candidates might overemphasize students' personal responses to the content.

Instructional Practice

Candidate uses both formative and summative assessment to document learning. InTASC #6

Target

Candidate balances the use of formative and summative assessments, as appropriate, to support, verify, and document learning.

Acceptable

Candidate uses both formative and learning.

Unacceptable

Candidate relies significantly on one summative assessments to document assessment method over the other. Data are used to demonstrate what students do not know or are unable to do.

Instructional Practice

The candidate selects learning experiences that reflect curriculum goals and content standards while being relevant to learners.

InTASC #7

Target

Candidate creates learning experiences that are meaningful to learners due to students' contextual variables and prior knowledge. The experiences also align to curriculum and content standards

Acceptable

Candidate selects learning experiences based on students' prior knowledge. The experiences also reflect curriculum and content standards, yet sometimes not directly.

Unacceptable

Candidate follows curriculum guides or sequence with minimal consideration to how meaningful experiences are for learners or for addressing content standards.

Instructional Practice

Candidate uses technology to ensure accessibility and relevance for all learners. InTASC #8; ISTE 2.5

Technology enhances the teaching and Technology selected is age-appropriate, Technology selected is appropriate for a learning process in a way that is not achievable without it. Also, it is ageappropriate, matching ability levels,

Target

interests, and needs.

Acceptable

matching ability levels, interests, and needs.

Unacceptable

subset of students.

Professional Responsibility

The candidate uses a variety of self-assessment strategies to analyze and reflect on his/her practice.

InTASC #9

| Target | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
|--|---|---|
| Candidate creates a plan for reflecting on practices during and after instruction. | Candidate creates a plan for reflecting on practice after instruction occurs. The | Candidate reflects on practice in an unplanned, unsystematic way or only |
| The data gathered via the strategies are analyzed and used to make a variety of adaptations/ adjustments (e.g., organizational, instructional, materials, etc.) that benefit the students. | data gathered via the strategies are analyzed and used to make improvements to future instructional plans. | when prompted by someone to do so. Experiences are reflected on in a holistic manner without reference to specific data. In addition, the candidate may lack links between changes made and data |
| O | 0 | collected. |
| Professional Responsibility The candidate understands lo InTASC #9 | nws related to learners' rights ar | nd teacher responsibilities. |
| Target | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
| Candidate understands and appropriately applies educational laws, especially confidentiality, requirements for reporting child abuse and neglect and discrimination/ harassment/bullying. | Candidate demonstrates a firm understanding of educational laws, especially confidentiality, requirements for reporting child abuse and neglect and discrimination/harassment/bullying. | Candidate demonstrates misunderstandings or gaps in knowledge concerning educational laws, especially confidentiality, requirements for reporting child abuse and neglect and/or |
| | | discrimination/ harassment/bullying. |

Professional Responsibility

The candidate demonstrates professional ethics and respect for others in the use of technology (e.g., learning management system, social media).

InTASC #3; ISTE 2.3

Target Unacceptable **Acceptable** Candidate explicitly teaches and Candidate follows characteristics of Candidate does not acknowledge, supports students' application of digital digital citizenship when developing lesson support, or follow components of digital citizenship characteristics.When plans that incorporate technology. citizenship for self or students. Family necessary, family members are notified Reminders or prompts for students are members are not notified in advance of in advance of classroom activities. outlined. When necessary, family classroom activities when it was members are notified in advance of necessary. classroom activities.

** You have now completed Parts 1 and 2. Please verify your answers before hitting the button below to continue to Part 3.**

Part 3: Unit-wide Disposition Assessment (CAEP/InTASC Stnds)

College of Professional Studies

Disposition Assessment

Indicator 1: DEMOCRACY & COMMUNITY: Builds a community based on belief that each child/adolescent (c/a) can learn to high levels. InTASC #2

Target

Communicates through words and levels. Communicates faith in values, strengths, and competencies of each c/a and family. Communicates high of challenging curriculum and assessments that foster high-level skills for each c/a.

ACCEPTABLE

Communicates through words and actions that each c/a can learn to high actions that each c/a can learn to high actions that some (not all) c/a can learn levels. Communicates positive perspectives about c/a and families. Supplements prescribed curriculum with expectations through design and delivery enrichment experiences that reflect some performance. Seeks minimal information c/a's lives outside of school.

UNACCEPTABLE

Communicates through words and to high levels. Communicates negative perspectives about a c/a or families. Sets minimal expectations for c/a about c/a's lives outside of school, usually in response to a problem.

Indicator 2: DEMOCRACY & COMMUNITY: Values diversity and uses it to create inclusive classroom.

InTASC # 2

TARGET

Culturally responsive practices are evident in delivery of instruction. Works with children/adolescents to address injustices in curriculum, society, or own liyes.

ACCEPTABLE

Creates a curriculum that demonstrates valuing diverse groups through classroom materials, activities, and assignments.

UNACCEPTABLE

A single perspective dominates classroom materials, activities, and assignments.

Indicator 3: HABITS OF MIND: Relentless in belief about the importance of teachers using critical thinking, reflection, and professional development to grow as a teacher. InTASC # 9

> **TARGET ACCEPTABLE UNACCEPTABLE**

Independently reflects on effectiveness of Makes changes to practices in response teaching by asking critical questions. Approaches professional growth from a critical thinking, inquiry perspective. Seeks out opportunities within learning environment to grow as a professional.

development opportunities, including professional learning communities, scholarly endeavors, and/or teacher research.

Overly dependent on feedback from to feedback. Participates in professional others OR disregards feedback provided. Actively avoids engaging intellectually in professional development opportunities

Indicator 4: HABITS OF MIND: Committed to designing meaningful, intellectually engaging curriculum.

InTASC #7

TARGET

Makes c/a's habits of mind visible through inquiries or investigations (critiquing, questioning, analyzing, evaluating). Ties together multiple concepts so that similarities and differences are understood by c/a.

ACCEPTABLE

Creates a context that is supportive in developing c/a's habits of mind. Encourages multiple pathways for solving problems. Judiciously utilizes worksheets Teaches one way to solve a problem and or tests.

UNACCEPTABLE

Engages in behaviors that result in intellectual dependency of c/a, for example, show, tell, and demonstrate. accepts only that method. Follows teaching manual, curriculum guides, or colleagues without evaluating potential engagement/levels by c/a's.

Indicator 5: ADVOCACY:

Willingness to collaborate to help each child learn.

InTASC #3

TARGET

Collaborates with family members and other teachers to create innovative solutions that support each child's/ adolescent's success.

ACCEPTABLE

Coordinates actions with colleagues to meet students' learning needs.

UNACCEPTABLE

Important educational decisions are made independently without communicating with family members or colleagues.

Indicator 6: ADVOCACY: Persistent in advocating for and promoting the profession. InTASC # 10

TARGET ACCEPTABLE UNACCEPTABLE

or acting publically on issues facing schools, teachers, families, students, or communities.

communicating with others about children, adolescents, families, colleagues, or the profession.

Advocates for the profession by speaking Projects positive view of profession when Initiates or adds to negativity about c/a, families, colleagues, or profession, projecting a negative view of the profession to others.

COMMENTS - FOR FINAL EVALUATION ONLY:

This is the most important part of the rating of the student teacher. This narrative summary should be reasonably detailed, complete, and accurate, including reference to specific examples of the student teacher's skills. It should address the student teacher's abilities and readiness to be a first-year teacher. The summary should include your recommendation of the student teacher's potential as a member of the profession. Please remember that many times candidates are required to include this as part of their job application packet.

Final Recommendation

| () | D = = = := = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = | : : |
|-----|--|--------------|
| \ / | Recommend for | ar iicaneina |
| | | |

- Recommend for licensing with reservations
- O I do not recommend for licensing

Powered by Qualtrics