

Field-based Learning Observation Rubric for Evaluation: Student Teaching (FLORE: ST)

Overview and Rationale

This Field-based Learning Observation Rubric for Evaluation – Student Teaching (FLORE-ST) measures student teaching performance at the completion of the educator preparation program. The tool is intended to apply across all initial licensure programs at Purdue University Fort Wayne School of Education. The tool is motivated, in part, by recommendations from a 2024 Indiana Department of Education (IDOE)-mandated review of Science of Reading instruction at Purdue Fort Wayne. The external review recommended developing a single tool for observing student teachers across programs and throughout field placements prior to student teaching. (Note the FLORE-ST is only for student teaching; future versions will be adapted for use with pre-clinical field placements.)

A committee consisting of faculty and staff representing a cross-section of the School of Education developed the tool during the Spring 2025 semester. Roles represented included: Teacher Education Department Chair, Counseling and Graduate Education Department Chair, Student Teaching Coordinator, Transition to Teaching Director, Special Education Director, Early Childhood Education faculty, Elementary Education faculty, Secondary Education faculty, Science of Reading subject matter expert, and Assessment and Analytics Director. The committee drafted the rubric then made revisions based on feedback from the whole faculty, field-based university supervisors, and cooperating teachers.

The rubric is derived from the P-12 Indiana Development Standards (IDS).¹ These standards represent the general pedagogical skills and content knowledge that a candidate who is completing an educator preparation program (EPP) should possess when designing and delivering instruction, as well as what the EPP should prepare that candidate to do. The P-12 IDS address the needs of candidates and programs across the entire P-12 grade span. The rubric further aligns to other IDS sets for specific grade spans, which are very similar to the P-12 IDS. Beyond Indiana, the rubric aligns to InTASC standards and ISTE technology education standards. See tables 1 and 2 below for alignment. Faculty are encouraged to develop a brief addendum if they need to evaluate specific standards for a given program that are not met by the general rubric below.

The P-12 IDS have seven standard areas, each with multiple indicators. This rubric adopts the seven primary standards of P-12 IDS. The rubric condenses the indicators into two to six criteria per standard based on common constructs. In total, the rubric has 22 criteria. Each criterion has a general description of the skill or knowledge that a candidate should demonstrate. The language for each description mirrors the P-12 IDS as closely as possible, with an emphasis on performance rather than understanding. The rubric describes four levels of performance: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Approaches Expectations, and Does Not Approach Expectations. Additionally, evaluators may select “Not observed” if the criterion was not relevant for a given observation. Language for each performance level clearly differentiates the activities candidates should engage in, how consistently they perform the activities,

¹ Retrieved from <https://www.in.gov/doe/educators/educator-licensing/indiana-educator-standards/> on March 20, 2025.

and how well they implement the activities. Language for these performance levels was informed by published student teaching rubrics.²

Additional supplemental materials are available to accompany this rubric. In particular, the Look For documents should be helpful in identifying how users may interpret and apply the rubric across different grade spans or content areas. There is also a file with Definitions of common terms.

Descriptive tables

Items in the FLORE-ST are aligned to multiple sets of standards. The following tables summarize the number of criteria aligned to specific standards (Table 1) and indicate the correlation between individual criteria with standards (Table 2). Rubric criteria may align to multiple standards, and a small number of P-12 IDS indicators are excluded from the rubric to maintain a concise tool.

Table 1: Number of criteria aligned to specific standards sets

| IDS | | InTASC | | ISTE | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Standard | Criteria | Standard | Criteria | Standard | Criteria |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| 6 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| 7 | 3 | 7 | 2 | | |
| | | 8 | 3 | | |
| | | 9 | 2 | | |
| | | 10 | 1 | | |

Table 2: Correlation matrix of FLORE-ST to Standards

| Standard | Item | Criterion | IDS (P-12) | InTASC |
|--|------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Student Development and Diversity | 1a | Student Development | 1.1, 1.3 | 1 |
| | 1b | Student Diversity | 1.2, 1.4 | 2 |
| | 1c | Students with Exceptionalities | 1.5, 1.6 | 2 |
| 2. Learning Processes | 2a | Approaches to Learning | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 | 1, ISTE 2 |
| | 2b | Influences on Learning | 2.4, 2.5, 2.10 | 1, 2 |
| | 2c | Student Achievement | 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9 | 1 |
| 3. Instructional Planning and Delivery | 3a | Curriculum | 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 | 7 |
| | 3b | Instructional Approaches | 3.4, 3.5 | 5, 8 |
| | 3c | Differentiation | 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10 | 8 |
| | 3d | Content: Instruction | NA | 4 |
| | 3e | Content: Application | 3.11 | 5, 8 |
| | 3f | Resources | 3.12, 3.13, 3.14 | 7, ISTE 2 |
| 4. Assessment | 4a | Assessment Design | 4.1, 4.2 | 6 |
| | 4b | Monitoring Student Progress | 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 | 6 |
| | 5a | Environment and Culture | 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 | 3 |

² Kansas Student Teacher Assessment Rubric (STAR, Retrieved from <https://soehs.ku.edu/current-students/field-experience>); Ohio State Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST, private communication); Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS, Retrieved from <https://teachfortexas.org/Resources>)

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----|--|-------------------------|----|
| 5. Learning Environments | 5b | Classroom and Behavior Management | 5.5, 5.6 | 3 |
| 6. Professional Environment | 6a | Collaboration and Communication | 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 | 10 |
| | 6b | Professional Learning | 6.6, 6.7, 6.8 | 9 |
| | 6c | Ethics and Legal Considerations | 6.9, 6.10 | 9 |
| 7. Reading Instruction | 7a | Scientifically based Reading and Writing Instruction | 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7 | NA |
| | 7b | Literacy-rich Environment | 7.8 | NA |
| | 7c | Content area and Disciplinary Literacy | 7.2 | NA |

Validation

We used three separate approaches to help maximize the validity of the rubric: derivation from the IDS, guidance from published rubrics, and consultation with expert practitioners.

First, the rubric directly uses constructs and language from the P-12 IDS. Minor modifications are made for each standard and item within the rubric for clarity and grammatic consistency, but the emphasis of each derives from the standards themselves. This process ensures that the rubric remains firmly grounded in the IDS. We intentionally built the rubric from the standards, rather than applying standards to a pre-existing rubric.

Second, in writing the first draft of the rubric, we drew language for the performance levels from existing student teaching evaluation tools (see footnote 2 above). We then modified the performance descriptions to better match the IDS language and our context. In most cases, the language changed substantially, but the original idea are still embedded within the rubric. The use of established tools helps anchor the items in the collective knowledge of the education preparation field.

Third, SOE staff sent the rubric and a survey to field-based cooperating teachers (CTs) and university supervisors (USs) who serve as mentors for our student teachers to solicit feedback. The survey used Lawshe's method to determine content validity for each item. Respondents indicated whether each item was "essential to the role of teaching," "useful but not essential," or "not necessary to the role of a teacher." The survey was sent to 174 recipients (151 CTs, 23 USs) in 84 schools across 29 school districts and 7 childcare facilities. In total, 46 people responded (36 CTs, 10 USs) for a response rate of 25%, evenly split between elementary and secondary grade spans. For each item, a content validity ratio (CVR) was calculated based on the number of "essential" responses. Overall, 19 of 23 items met the CVR threshold for validity. Of the four items considered non-essential, we removed one item (in Standard 7), significantly revised one item (in Standard 3), and kept two items with minimal changes (in Standards 1 and 3) to meet evaluation expectations. For those two items, we have added clarifying explanations in the supplemental materials. The rubric's content validity index (that is, the average CVR) across the final 22 items was 0.594.

| Standard 1: Student Development and Diversity Candidates have a comprehensive understanding of student development and diversity and demonstrate the ability to provide instruction that is responsive to student differences. | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Criterion | Description | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Approaches Expectations | Does not Approach Expectations |
| 1a) Student Development IDS 1.1, 1.3 InTASC 1 | Candidate provides instruction that is appropriate to student development. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently demonstrates understanding of each student's anticipated learning abilities and challenges. Plans and articulates specific strategies for instruction aligned to the developmental learning level of each student and groups of students. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly demonstrates understanding of students' anticipated learning abilities and challenges. Plans instruction that aligns to the developmental levels of most students. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes demonstrates understanding of students' anticipated learning abilities and challenges. Plans instruction that aligns to the developmental levels of some of the students. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely demonstrates understanding of students' anticipated learning abilities and challenges. Plans the same instruction for all students. |
| 1b) Student Diversity IDS 1.2, 1.4 InTASC 2 | Candidate provides instruction that is responsive to student diversity. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently demonstrates familiarity with each student's diverse interests, backgrounds, cultures, and needs. Consistently uses this information to inform instruction. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly demonstrates familiarity with students' diverse interests, backgrounds, cultures, and needs. Regularly uses this information to inform instruction. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes demonstrates familiarity with students' diverse interests, backgrounds, cultures, and needs. Inconsistently uses this information to inform instruction. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely demonstrates familiarity with students' diverse interests, backgrounds, cultures, and needs. Rarely uses this information to inform instruction. |
| 1c) Students with Exceptionalities and English learners IDS 1.5, 1.6 InTASC 2 | Candidate appropriately addresses students with exceptionalities, including high ability, twice exceptional, and/or English learner students. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently adapts plans and instruction to support students' individual learning needs to make learning accessible and challenging for all students in the classroom using a variety of methods. Collaborates with colleagues and families (as appropriate) to help students with exceptionalities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly adapts plans and instruction to support student learning needs, making learning accessible and challenging for students. Collaborates with colleagues and families (as appropriate) to help students with exceptionalities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes attempts to adapt plans and instruction to make lessons accessible and challenging based on students' learning needs. Communicates with colleagues and families about students with exceptionalities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely attempts to adapt plans and instruction to make lessons accessible and challenging based on students' learning needs. Does not communicate with colleagues and families about students with exceptionalities. |

Notes for Standard 1: Strengths and Focus for next time

| Standard 2: Learning Processes | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Candidates have a comprehensive understanding of learning processes and demonstrate the ability to facilitate student achievement. | | | | | |
| Criterion | Description | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Approaches Expectations | Does not Approach Expectations |
| 2a) Approaches to Learning IDS 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 InTASC 1 ISTE 2 | Candidate addresses multiple ways students learn. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently uses a variety of appropriate instructional strategies and technologies to engage and challenge students in multiple learning situations, allowing students to make choices in their own learning. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly uses appropriate instructional strategies and technologies to engage and challenge students in multiple learning situations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes uses appropriate instructional strategies and technologies but may not challenge students in multiple learning situations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely uses appropriate instructional strategies or technologies. |
| 2b) Influences on Learning IDS 2.4, 2.5, 2.10 InTASC 1, 2 | Candidate addresses various influences on student learning, such as relationships with students, instructional practices, and student factors. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently connects lessons to students' prior knowledge, experiences, and future learning goals. Consistently encourages students to apply their strengths, life experiences, knowledge, and skills to enhance their own learning. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly connects lessons to students' prior knowledge and experiences. Regularly addresses students' strengths and gaps in life experiences, knowledge, and skills. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes connects lessons to students' prior knowledge and experiences. Sometimes addresses students' strengths and gaps in life experiences, knowledge, and skills. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely connects lessons to students' prior knowledge and experiences. Rarely addresses students' strengths and gaps in life experiences, knowledge, and skills. |
| 2c) Student Achievement IDS 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9 InTASC 1 | Candidate helps students develop independent learning and higher-order thinking skills. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently engages learners in critical thinking that fosters problem solving, encourages conceptual connections, and challenges assumptions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly engages learners in critical thinking that fosters problem solving and encourages conceptual connections. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes introduces or models critical thinking that fosters problem solving and encourages conceptual connections. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely introduces or models critical thinking that fosters problem solving or encourages conceptual connections. |

Notes for Standard 2: Strengths and Focus for next time

| Standard 3: Instructional Planning and Delivery Candidates have a comprehensive understanding of instructional planning and delivery and demonstrate the abilities to plan and deliver instruction that engages students, to use contemporary tools and technologies, and to help all students learn. | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Criterion | Description | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Approaches Expectations | Does not Approach Expectations |
| 3a) Curriculum IDS 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 InTASC 7 | Candidate plans lessons that meet the curricular standards. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates clearly measurable objectives, lesson content, and learning tasks that align with the depth and rigor of the appropriate P-12 state learning standards. Consistently aligns Instructional plans with developmental stages and learner needs; anticipates and adapts to individual differences with depth and precision. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selects measurable objectives, lesson content, and learning tasks that align with the depth and rigor of the appropriate P-12 state learning standards Generally aligns instructional plans with developmental stages and learner needs; demonstrate sound understanding of typical progressions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selects objectives, lesson content, and learning tasks that sometimes align to the appropriate P-12 state learning standards. Partially aligns instructional plans to developmental stages; limited differentiation or awareness of individual needs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely selects objectives, lesson content, and learning tasks that align to the appropriate P-12 state learning standards. Does not align instructional plans to reflect developmental appropriateness. |
| 3b) Instructional Approaches IDS 3.4, 3.5 InTASC 5, 8 | Candidate uses a variety of instructional approaches to make content accessible and motivate students. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently varies instructional approaches and resources to support the aims of the lesson. Actively engages students in learning through strategies that promote inquiry, curiosity, ownership of learning, and sustain motivation (e.g. play-based, project-based, problem-based). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Varies instructional approaches and resources to support the aims of the lesson. Engages students in learning through strategies that promote inquiry, supports motivation and invite active participation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistently uses appropriate instructional approaches and resources to support the aims of the lesson. Attempts to engage students but strategies are inconsistent or are moderately effective in fostering motivation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses instructional approaches and/or resources that are irrelevant to the aims of the lesson or inappropriate for students. Rarely engages students; instruction lacks strategies to support motivation, resulting in passive or disengaged learners. |
| 3c) Differentiation IDS 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10 InTASC 8 | Candidate considers student characteristics and implements developmentally appropriate instruction. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differentiates instruction through evidence-based practices (e.g., Universal Design for Learning and/or Response to Intervention) to meet the needs of individual learners. Consistently monitors the quality of student participation and performance; redirects individual students as needed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differentiates instruction to ensure students have the opportunity to meet the needs of individual learners. Monitors quality of student participation and performance; attempts to redirect individual students as needed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes differentiates instruction to meet the needs of individual learners Inconsistently monitors quality of student participation and performance; attempts to redirect groups of students as needed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides one-size-fits-all lessons. without meaningful differentiation. Rarely monitors quality of student participation and performance; ignores the need to redirect students. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 3d) Content: Instruction IDS – InTASC 4 | The candidate accurately and effectively communicates knowledge in the discipline and uses vocabulary and academic language that is clear, correct, and appropriate for learners. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conveys a depth of content knowledge that allows for multiple explanations. • Anticipates possible student misunderstandings and proactively develops teaching strategies to address them. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conveys accurate content knowledge with clarity. • Identifies and seeks to address student misunderstandings. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conveys content knowledge. • Sometimes identifies and may or may not address student misunderstandings. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conveys inaccurate content knowledge. • Does not identify student misunderstandings. |
| 3e) Content: Application IDS 3.11 InTASC 5, 8 | Candidate effectively uses group activities to explore content from integrated and varied perspectives. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designs and implements structured small group activities that promote active collaboration to explore content from integrated and varied perspectives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans small group activities and provides guidance to explore content from integrated and varied perspectives | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes group activities but offers minimal guidance to explore content. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not incorporate meaningful group activities. |
| 3f) Resources IDS 3.12, 3.13, 3.14 InTASC 7 ISTE 2 | Candidate selects developmentally appropriate, varied materials and resources, including digital tools and media, to promote differentiated student learning. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selects and integrates a wide range of high-quality, appropriate resources, including digital tools, that are purposely used to differentiate instruction. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selects appropriate and varied resources, including digital tools, to support differentiated learning. Resources generally demonstrate an understanding of how to adapt materials for diverse learners. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selects some appropriate resources but demonstrates limited variety or inconsistent alignment for student needs. Use of digital tools and differentiation strategies is emerging but not consistently applied. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not demonstrate the ability to select or use appropriate resources, using digital tools to support differentiated learning. |
| Notes for Standard 3: Strengths and Focus for next time | | | | | |

| Standard 4: Assessment Candidates have a comprehensive understanding of assessment principles and practices and demonstrate the ability to use assessment to monitor student progress and to use data to guide instructional decision making. | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Criterion | Description | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Approaches Expectations | Does not Approach Expectations |
| 4a) Assessment design IDS 4.1, 4.2 InTASC 6 | Candidate uses assessments that are aligned to learning goals and are appropriate for all students. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designs and selects various assessments aligned with student needs, academic standards, and measurable learning goals. • Clearly states the assessment's purpose, its connection to instruction, and its role in the overall unit. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selects assessments aligned with student needs, academic standards, and measurable learning goals. • States the assessment's purpose and its connection to instruction and learning goals. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selects assessments partially aligned with student needs, academic standards, and/or learning goals. • Provides limited rationale for the assessment's use or its connection to learning goals. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selects assessments that are not aligned with student needs, academic standards, and/or learning goals. • Provides inadequate rationale for the assessment's use or its connection to learning goals. |
| 4b) Monitoring Student Progress IDS 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 InTASC 6 | Candidate uses multiple formats of assessment to monitor student learning and inform instruction. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistently analyzes formative and summative assessment data to monitor progress of individual students. • Consistently uses student data (assessment and other data) to inform and adjust specific instructional strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners. • Provides specific and timely feedback to students, families, and other school personnel in relation to classroom goals to support learning. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regularly analyzes formative and summative assessment data to monitor progress of student groups and some individuals. • Regularly uses assessment data to inform instructional strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners. • Regularly provides timely feedback to students and families to support learning. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sometimes analyzes assessment (formative or summative) data to monitor whole class student progress. • Sometimes uses assessment data to inform instruction for the whole class. • Sometimes provides timely feedback to students to support learning. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rarely analyzes assessment data to monitor student progress. • Rarely uses assessment data to inform instruction. • Rarely provides feedback to students to support learning. |

Notes for Standard 4: Strengths and Focus for next time

| Standard 5: Learning Environments Candidates have a comprehensive understanding of student learning environments and demonstrate the ability to establish positive, productive, and safe learning environments for all students. | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Criterion | Description | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Approaches Expectations | Does not Approach Expectations |
| 5a) Environment and Culture IDS 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 InTASC 3 | Candidate creates safe, inclusive, developmentally appropriate learning environments with a classroom culture that emphasizes high academic expectations for all students. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently designs and adapts a safe, inclusive, and developmentally appropriate learning environment. Actively cultivates a classroom culture that promotes mutual respect, belonging, and shared responsibility for learning, informed by student voice. Clearly communicates and reinforces high academic expectations through rigorous tasks, differentiated supports, and student engagement. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly designs a safe, inclusive, and developmentally appropriate learning environment. Fosters a positive, respectful, and engaging classroom culture by building strong rapport with students. Communicates academic expectations that challenge students to do their personal best. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempts to create a safe, inclusive, and developmentally appropriate learning environment. Creates a classroom culture that is largely teacher-directed, with emerging efforts to build rapport. Communicates challenging academic expectations but may lack consistency or lower expectations for student groups. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to provide a safe, inclusive, and developmentally appropriate learning environment. Gives minimal attention to classroom culture, with limited student engagement, support, and awareness of diverse needs. Communicates academic expectations that are unclear, inconsistent, and/or fail to appropriately challenge students. |
| 5b) Classroom and Behavior Management IDS 5.5, 5.6 InTASC 3 | Candidate establishes and implements clear expectations for classroom behavior to meet student learning needs. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently fosters a positive classroom climate through clear, co-constructed, and reinforced routines and procedures. Transitions are seamless, intentional, and maximize instructional time. Proactively fosters positive behavior through strong relationships, clear expectations, and student-centered interventions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly communicates and reinforces routines and procedures that contribute to a positive classroom climate. Transitions are smooth and allow for efficient use of instructional time. Consistently identifies behavior issues and applies appropriate interventions when needed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistently reinforces routines and procedures, resulting in an unpredictable classroom climate. Transitions are inconsistent and contribute to some loss of instructional time. Inconsistently identifies behavior issues. May react with basic strategies that have limited effectiveness. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely reinforces routines and procedures, leading to a disorganized and unpredictable classroom climate. Transitions are inefficient and contribute to a substantial loss of instructional time. Frequently misses behavior issues, resulting in disruptions and safety, social, and/or emotional concerns. |
| <u>Notes for Standard 5: Strengths and Focus for next time</u> | | | | | |

| Standard 6: The Professional Environment Candidates have a comprehensive understanding of professional expectations and demonstrate the ability to collaborate with others to improve student learning, to engage in professional growth, and to adhere to legal and ethical requirements. | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Criterion | Description | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Approaches Expectations | Does not Approach Expectations |
| 6a) Collaboration and Communication IDS 6.1 – 6.5 InTASC 10 | Candidate demonstrates leadership with students, colleagues, and the community through effective communication and outreach. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently contacts parents/ guardians regarding students' academic and social/ emotional growth through various methods. Consistently collaborates with colleagues and parents to enhance student learning and welfare. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly contacts parents/ guardians regarding students' academic and social/ emotional growth. Regularly collaborates with colleagues to plan instruction and address student needs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes contacts parents/guardians (e.g., introductions, parent-teacher conferences, communication via email or online). Sometimes collaborates with colleagues to plan instruction and address student needs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely communicates with parents or legal guardians. Rarely collaborates with colleagues to plan instruction and address student needs. |
| 6b) Professional Learning IDS 6.6, 6.7, 6.8 InTASC 9 | Candidate engages in goal-oriented self-reflection to improve instructional practice and advocates for their professional learning needs. Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently sets, modifies, and meets professional goals based on reflection and feedback to improve practice and student performance. Consistently advocates for their own professional learning needs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly sets and meets goals based on reflection and feedback to improve practice. Regularly advocates for their own professional learning needs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes sets and meets goals to improve practice. Sometimes advocates for their own professional learning needs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely sets and meets goals to improve practice. Rarely advocates for their own professional learning needs. |
| 6c) Ethics and Legal Considerations IDS 6.9, 6.10 InTASC 9 | Candidate meets legal and ethical responsibilities (e.g., confidentiality) and expectations for professional standards (e.g., attendance, professional appearance, and behaviors). Not Observed () | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behaves in accordance with legal and ethical standards. Consistently and independently models professionalism. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behaves in accordance with legal and ethical standards. Regularly demonstrates professionalism. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behaves in accordance with legal and ethical standards. Sometimes needs reminders about professional behavior. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to meet or violates legal and ethical standards. Rarely demonstrates professionalism. |
| <u>Notes for Standard 6: Strengths and Focus for next time</u> | | | | | |

| Standard 7: Reading Instruction Candidates have a comprehensive understanding of reading development and content-area literacy skills, and demonstrate the ability to plan and deliver appropriate, scientifically based reading instruction that responds to student strengths and needs. | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| Criterion | Description | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Approaches Expectations | Does not Approach Expectations |
| 7a) Scientifically Based Reading and Writing Instruction IDS 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7 | Candidate instructional practice is informed by the Science of Reading research to develop students' reading and writing skills in relevant content areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directly, explicitly, and systematically implements appropriate instructional practices informed by the Science of Reading. • Builds on individual students' prior understanding of reading, writing, listening, speaking, and other forms of communication. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implements appropriate instructional practices informed by the Science of Reading. • Builds on most students' prior understanding of reading and writing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistently implements instructional practices informed by the Science of Reading. • Builds on some students' prior understanding of reading and writing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not implement instructional practices informed by the Science of Reading. • Does not build on students' prior understanding of reading and writing. |
| 7b) Literacy-rich Environment IDS 7.8 | Candidate creates a literacy-rich environment that supports literacy and language development for diverse learners. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intentionally selects varied texts and/or literacy resources, designs the space to promote student interaction with language, and integrates speaking, reading, and writing to meet diverse learner needs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides appropriate texts and/or literacy resources, supports language use through classroom design, and includes regular opportunities for speaking, reading, and writing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers limited texts and/or literacy resources; classroom design and instruction provide inconsistent opportunities for language use. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks appropriate texts and/or literacy resources; classroom design and instruction do not support meaningful language or literacy development. |
| 7c) Content-area and Disciplinary Literacy IDS 7.2 | Candidate integrates content-area and/or disciplinary literacy strategies to support student learning. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistently embeds content-area and/or disciplinary literacy strategies that deepen understanding. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regularly embeds content-area and/or disciplinary literacy strategies that deepen understanding. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts to use content-area or disciplinary literacy strategies; strategies may not match the content, discipline, or task. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rarely or ineffectively uses literacy strategies. |
| <u>Notes for Standard 7: Strengths and Focus for next time</u> | | | | | |