ECE Birth to Age 3 Practicum Evaluation - 5 level - Final F2021

Birth to Age 3 Practicum: Final Evaluation As part of understanding what knowledge, skills, and dispositions our students possess, we are asking you to complete an end-of-practicum evaluation. This tool is comprised of two different parts. The first part is based on the National Association for Education of Young Children (NAEYC) standards for beginning teachers. The second 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 practicum student's performance. Thank you in advance for the time you put into this evaluation -- it is very important to us and the student.
 This file updated Fall 2021.

Evaluation Information (results will be sent to the addresses entered):

○ Date of Evaluation mm/dd/yyyy _____

○ Teacher Candidate Name _____

○ Teacher Candidate E-mail _____

○ School _____

○ Grade Level of Placement _____

○ University Supervisor Name
_____

○ University Supervisor E-mail _____

○ Cooperating Teacher Name _____

○ Cooperating Teacher E-mail _____

This evaluation is being completed by:

○ Cooperating Teacher

○ University Supervisor

Part 1: ECE Standards (NAEYC)

For each of the following items in Part 1 (only):　　Use DEVELOPING if the candidate demonstrates performance described in both Acceptable and Unacceptable levels of performance.　Use APPROACHING TARGET if the candidate demonstrates performance described in both Target and Acceptable levels of performance.

NAEYC 1c: Understanding and using multiple influences on development and learning. EVIDENCE: What does the student teacher know about individual children, their families, their culture, the community, poverty & inequity impacts, the early childhood program and intervention resources? How do they use that knowledge for short or long-term outcomes for children?

○ **Target**: Candidate applies their understanding of multiple contextual influences (culture, linguistic contexts, relationships, SES, health-developmental status, media & technology) that positively and negatively impact children's development to their planning.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: The learning experiences demonstrate that candidate considered influences that positively and negatively impact children's development and was in search of more knowledge that could explain these influences.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate focuses on the negative aspects or impacts of family and community characteristics on children's learning and development.

NAEYC 1d: Using multidimensional knowledge (age, individual, and context) to make evidence-based decisions that support each child EVIDENCE: Does the teacher candidate use child development knowledge of individual children and understand the variations of development? Is the curriculum emergent, child-

centered, play-based, and investigative rather than teacher-centered and directed? Does the candidate regularly scaffold learning?

○ **Target**: Candidate designs challenging, risk-taking, and supportive curriculum that encourages each child's ability to learn through play, spontaneous activities, & guided investigations to understand and make meaning from experiences.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate plans curriculum that supports each child's individual developmental levels or abilities.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate plans for an age group or grade level, with minimal attention to individual developmental levels or abilities.

NAEYC 2a: Knowing about and understanding diverse family and community characteristics
EVIDENCE: What does the student teacher know about the community and the families? For instance, if there are holidays or birthdays, how does the candidate discuss potential family preferences about how to celebrate or not celebrate a holiday/birthday in class? If a family doesn't want their child to eat a particular food, how does the candidate treat this preference? Does the candidate look for ways to incorporate families' lives into the play? For instance, do they ask families to send in boxes or cleaned cans of food they eat to use in the house area? If the school/center is faith-based, how well does the candidate know the general tenets of that faith and why families may have chosen that school?

○ **Target**: Candidate intentionally uses knowledge of the community as well as families' assets, strengths, home languages and cultural values when planning and interacting with children.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate's uses understanding of family and community characteristics in learning experiences.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate's understanding of family and community characteristics is not observable in the learning experiences OR not aligned with family and community characteristics.

NAEYC 2b: Collaborate as partners with families to support young children's development and learning
EVIDENCE: Does the candidate look for opportunities to chat with families, use apps, home-

school journals, etc. for communicating with and hearing back from families? If there is a concern about a child's development or behavior, how does the candidate engage the family along with the cooperating teacher to observe for these concerns at home? Does the candidate attempt to learn from families, recognizing and drawing on their expertise about their child for insight into curriculum? How does the candidate incorporate families' preferences, values, childrearing practices and goals when making decisions?

○ **Target**: Candidate takes initiative in communicating and sustaining respectful relationships with families in informal conversations, teacher-family conferences, home visits, and reciprocal technology such as apps, texts, phone calls or emails. Information was shared in ways families could understand using their preferred communication methods and home language if possible.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate interacts with families when opportunities arose using positive communication methods such as informal conversations at pick-up/drop-off times, conferences or with technology. Shared information and children's work with families.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate puts responsibility of communication on families. Candidate usually used one approach as the basis for all communication. When methods to gain family involvement are not effective, candidate assumes they "are just not interested."

NAEYC 3b: Use results of observation, documentation, and other appropriate assessment tools and approaches to make informed choices about instruction and planning.
EVIDENCE: Does the candidate regularly talk about and use a variety of formative, summative, qualitative and standardized assessments? Do they collect data in both spontaneous and playful settings as well as formal? Do they share their observations/data with the cooperating teacher? Do they use the results when planning curriculum?

○ **Target**: Candidate systematically collects for each child a variety of data in both formal and playful learning contexts.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate collects a variety of data in both formal and playful learning contexts.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate randomly collects data on children's development and learning, relied primarily on one data source, or used results to limit children's experiences.

NAEYC 3c: Embeds ethical assessment tools into curriculum that are appropriate for developmental level, ability, cultural, and linguistic background of each child.
 EVIDENCE: When assessing children and scoring assessments does the candidate take into consideration children who are learning English, have developmental delays, disabilities, etc.? Do they use knowledge gained to design new goals, curricular experiences and change own practice? How do they talk about and individual children's concerns and interests during team planning meetings or formal/informal conversations with colleagues in connection with learning activities? Do they figure out ways to include the child or do they exclude the child?

○ **Target**: Candidate modifies assessment tools to account for cultural and linguistic diversity and for children with developmental delays or disabilities. Candidate used the results to design learning and developmental goals and curriculum that reflect individual strengths and needs of each child.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate provides evidence of modifying select assessments OR accounting for diversity when analyzing or reflecting on the data for each child.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate applies each assessment and analyzes the data in the same way for each child, not accounting for diversity.

NAEYC 4a: Establishing positive relationships in work with young children
 EVIDENCE: How "real" is the engagement with each individual child? Consider the CLASS assessment tool.

○ **Target**: Candidate displays warm, nurturing interactions with each child, communicating genuine liking for and interest in young children's activities and characteristics.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate interacts respectfully with young children, responding to their individual characteristics, likes and dislikes.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate acts disingenuously, uses threats to control, makes promises but does not keep them, or engages with children in an emotionally distant manner.

NAEYC 4b: Applying effective, strategies that are responsive to young children's learning trajectories, including the incorporation of inquiry and play as core teaching practices
 EVIDENCE: This is specifically asking about how well the student teacher builds the planned

curriculum based on observational data of children's interest in a topic of study or supporting a learning need rather than relying on a published curriculum. For instance, they may start a project around construction because children noticed a building being erected across the street. How well does the candidate engage children to think critically? Play refers to children's self-directed or guided play that supports meaningful engagement with materials, ideas, and peers as they develop in all areas and learn content.

○ **Target**: Candidate is purposeful in planning an inquiry based differentiated learning environment for individual children's needs and interests. Scaffolded and extended children's learning across domains. Used multiple forms of play and children's choice of activities and materials as the primary method to develop content knowledge, symbolic and imaginative thinking, peer relationships, social skills, language, creative movement and problem-solving skills.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate creates a child-centered, theme- and play-based learning environment to support planned and spontaneous interactions with materials. Academic content areas are engaged with or supported separately in terms of space, conversations, and open-ended questions.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate uses teacher-directed, theme-based planning. During the learning experiences, candidate asked primarily close-ended questions, discouraged spontaneous play activities or children's ideas of how to use materials. May use a rotation of centers or use some other limit rather than children's free play and use of materials and activities.

NAEYC 4c (1 of 3): Using a broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate teaching/learning approaches that reflect principles of universal design for learning.
 EVIDENCE: Does the candidate privilege child-directed investigation, choice, and play over teacher directed or initiated learning experiences? Are all areas/centers and materials available & accessible for children to play in without adults rotating or limiting numbers? Does the candidate ask the children for their ideas about curricular topics or how to redesign problematic areas? Does candidate add materials to support investigations?

○ **Target**: Candidate purposefully set up the environment, schedule and routines focusing on children's individual characteristics, needs, and learning interests. Key features include:
    Consistent schedules and predictable routines   Promoted time, space, & materials to encourage child-initiated play, choice, risk taking, and big body play both inside & outside

Materials & space available and accessible for all children Engage children as co-constructors of the curriculum & environment

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate set up the environment, schedule and routines to use time feasibly, and generally focused on children's individual or group characteristics, needs, and interests.   Generally followed schedule and routines   Provided accessible materials and space for play inside and outside

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Learning experiences lack evidence of the use of a continuum of teaching strategies, and effective use of the environment.   Schedule and routines do not consider children's unique and group characteristics, needs, and interests.   Limits children's use of space and/or materials

----

NAEYC 4c (2 of 3): Using a broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate teaching/ learning approaches that advance academic knowledge.
 EVIDENCE: Does the candidate plan interesting and engaging group discussions, centers and investigations based on conversations with or observations of children's interests or developmental needs? How well does the student teacher use a variety of activities and experiences based on different content areas, schemas, S/E or learning dispositions?

○ **Target**: Candidate includes a broad repertoire of inquiry-based, developmentally appropriate teaching/learning approaches to seamlessly integrate academic content. Key features include: Observations inform decisions about teaching strategies and curriculum implementation   Child initiated & directed play   Integrates curriculum content into projects, play and other learning activities reflecting children's interests.   Genuine reciprocal conversations with and among children in groups and individually that stimulate thinking, understanding, theory-building & meaning   Literacy experiences in both English and children's home languages

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Learning experiences demonstrate that candidate generally used a continuum of teaching strategies. Learning experiences included an appropriate but not well-balanced variety of developmentally appropriate teaching/learning approaches.   Topics or themes are evident in both in formal activities and informal play experiences

Asks open-ended questions   Engages in conversations in groups and with individual children.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Learning experiences lack a variety of developmentally appropriate teaching/learning approaches.   Focus is on direct instruction Questions tend to be closed-ended

---

NAEYC 4c (3 of 3): Using a broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate teaching/ learning approaches that provides inclusive S/E support and guidance
 EVIDENCE: How often and how well does the student teacher use a variety of conflict resolution, negotiation, and peace-based strategies rather than punishment/reward strategies? How often does the candidate build positive classroom culture dispositions in group conversations or individually? How well does the candidate integrate these strategies into daily formal learning experiences and during play?

○ **Target**: Candidate intentionally fosters critical developmental skills such as empathy, sociability, cooperation, friendship, self-concept, and self-esteem, responsibility, reasoning, planning and organization by embedding them in curriculum and teaching/learning process.   Addresses children's challenging behaviors using positive guidance strategies   Incorporates children's home language and culture using anti-bias strategies.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate fosters some critical developmental skills such as empathy, sociability, cooperation, friendship, self-concept, and self-esteem, responsibility, reasoning, planning and organization by directly addressing them (appropriately contextualized) during teaching/learning process.   Addresses children's challenging behavior and biases when occasion occurred

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate often misses opportunities to focus on critical developmental skills such as empathy, sociability, cooperation, friendship, self-concept, and self-esteem, responsibility, reasoning, planning and organization.   Either ignores challenging behavior or uses negative strategies (e.g., punishment, singling child out of group)

NAEYC 5a: Knowing and using the central concepts, inquiry tools, and structures of content areas or academic disciplines (math, science, social studies, literacy, language arts, art, music, drama, movement, health, nutrition).

○ **Target**: Candidate demonstrates an in-depth knowledge base of content when creating appropriate learning environments that support learning in each content area for each child. Designs integrated meaningful learning experiences that cover all content areas (math, science, social studies, literacy, language arts, art, music, drama, movement, health, nutrition) and developmental domains.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate demonstrates understanding of content knowledge when designing learning experiences.   Designs integrated meaningful learning experiences that cover most content areas and developmental domains.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate planned learning experiences that demonstrated own misunderstanding or misapplication of content knowledge

NAEYC 5c: Using own content & pedagogical knowledge, appropriate early learning standards, and other resources to design, implement, and evaluate developmentally meaningful and challenging curriculum for each child.
EVIDENCE: During team planning meetings, informal conversations or with parents, how often does the student teacher explain curricular decisions based on research, IN Early Learning Foundations (Gold, COR, etc.), knowledge of approaches in ECE such as Montessori, High/Scope, the Reggio-Emilia approach, project approach, etc.? Do they consider children's ability levels, cultural and linguistic diversity? Do they keep to the initial plan rather than adapt to a situation to better engage students if it's clear it's above their ability and later explain why they made that adaptation?

○ **Target**: Candidate designs and evaluates curricular decisions for: Appropriate use of resources (knowledge of approaches, websites, published curriculum, etc.);   Alignment with appropriate early learning standards;   Degree of meaningfulness and challenge for the age group and each individual child; <u>AND</u>   Ability to foster children's ability to solve problems and think deeply, at their differing ability levels.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate designs and reflects on curricular decisions for: Variety of resources used;   Planned and spontaneous learning experiences that account for the

diverse backgrounds, abilities and interests of every child; <u>AND</u>   Alignment with appropriate early learning standards.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate designs and implement curriculum such that: Are not adapted to better engage children;   Relies on published curriculum to demonstrate alignment with early learning standards; <u>AND</u>   Places emphasis on telling and following directions.

NAEYC 6a: Engaging in informed advocacy for young children
 EVIDENCE: Does the candidate initiate conversations or offer suggestions for change or help such as in the daily schedule, resources, connecting families to social agencies, website information, or organizations?

○ **Target**: Candidate discusses and advocates for current issues and trends, rights and needs of children in their daily work as well as for families so that change or resources are made available equitably.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate discusses issues and trends, rights and needs of children and families when brought up and works within established systems so that change or resources are made available equitably.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate does not discuss issues and trends, or raise concerns about equity and resources for children or families, even when children and families need a voice.

NAEYC 6c: Professionally communicates with families and colleagues
 EVIDENCE: When working with the teaching team or other professionals, does the Candidate offer their own data collected to deepen the discussion? Do they treat family members,

education professionals, community members and others with respect, actively listening to their point of view?

○ **Target**: Candidate demonstrates the ability to respectfully learn from and negotiate with colleagues (other teachers, director) as well as engage in interdisciplinary collaboration with special educators and specialists working with children.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate displays a willingness to negotiate and learn from colleagues and explores their roles/contributions when working with special educators and specialists working with children.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate displays hesitancy or resentment toward constructive criticism or opportunities to collaborate.

NAEYC 6d: Engaging in continuous, collaborative learning to inform practice
 EVIDENCE: How often does the student teacher initiate reflective conversations about their own practice? Do they research current methods to try in the classroom? Do they talk about what they did or noticed in children and suggest a way to do it differently next time? Do they set goals and meet them?

○ **Target**: As a reflective, self-motivated practitioner, candidate independently seeks ways to improve their practice through classroom-based research, collegial feedback, analysis of own work, other sources, and identifying areas for improvement.

○ **Approaching Target**

○ **Acceptable**: Candidate engages in addressing challenges when encouraged by colleagues.

○ **Developing**

○ **Unacceptable**: Candidate displays a content or defensive attitude towards learning more about teaching or changing their practice.

Comments:

_____

_____

Part 2: **School of Education** 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 CAEP 3.3

○ **Target** Communicates through words and actions that each c/a can learn to high levels. Communicates faith in values, strengths, and competencies of each c/a and family. Communicates high expectations through design and delivery 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 levels. Communicates positive perspectives about c/a and families. Supplements prescribed curriculum with enrichment experiences that reflect some c/a's lives outside of school.

○ **UNACCEPTABLE** Communicates through words and actions that some (not all) c/a can learn to high levels. Communicates negative perspectives about a c/a or families. Sets minimal expectations for c/a performance. Seeks minimal information 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 an inclusive classroom. InTASC # 2 CAEP 3.3

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

○ **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** Independently reflects on effectiveness of 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.

○ **ACCEPTABLE** Makes changes to practices in response to feedback. Participates in professional development opportunities, including professional learning communities, scholarly endeavors, and/or teacher research.

○ **UNACCEPTABLE** Overly dependent on feedback from 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 CAEP 3.3

○ **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 or tests.

○ **UNACCEPTABLE** Engages in behaviors that result in intellectual dependency of c/a, for example, show, tell, and demonstrate. Teaches one way to solve a problem and 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 # 9, CAEP 3.3

○ **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 CAEP 3.3

○ **TARGET** Advocates for the profession by speaking or acting publically on issues facing schools, teachers, families, students, or communities.

○ **ACCEPTABLE** Projects positive view of profession when communicating with others about children, adolescents, families, colleagues, or the profession.

○ **UNACCEPTABLE** 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. 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's abilities and readiness to be a first-year teacher. The summary should include your recommendation of the student'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.

_____

_____

_____