

Part 1: Secondary WORLD LANG Assessment (ACTFL SPA Standards)

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
FORT WAYNE

School of Education

Secondary World Languages 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 American Council on the Teaching of a Foreign Languages (ACTFL) standards for beginning teachers. The second part contains knowledge and skills as outlined by InTASC and CAEP, our accrediting body. The last part asks to you to consider the dispositions that align with our Conceptual Framework at Purdue University Fort Wayne. 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 to the student teacher.

The results of this evaluation will be collected by Purdue University Fort Wayne and forwarded to the e-mails listed below:

Evaluation Information:

Date of Evaluation (mm/dd/yyyy)

Teacher Candidate (Student) Name

Teacher Candidate (Student) E-mail

Placement School

Grade Level Taught

University Supervisor Name

University Supervisor E-mail

Cooperating Teacher Name

Cooperating Teacher E-mail

The person completing this evaluation is:

- The Cooperating Teacher
 The University Supervisor

Number of students:



STANDARD 1. Language Proficiency: Interpersonal, Interpretive, and Presentational Speaking

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
Candidates deliver oral presentations on a wide variety of topics, including those of personal interest to the students. They speak in extended discourse and use specialized vocabulary. They use a variety of strategies to tailor the presentation to the needs of their audience.	Candidates deliver oral presentations extemporaneously, without reading notes verbatim. Presentations consist of familiar literary and cultural topics and those of personal interest to the students. They speak in connected discourse using a variety of time frames and vocabulary appropriate to the topic. They use extralinguistic support as needed to facilitate audience comprehension.	Candidates deliver oral presentation designed with some consideration of student interest, speaking with some reliance on notes. Vocabulary used is appropriate to the topic but somewhat limited. They are aware of and attentive to their audience's challenges with comprehension.	Candidates deliver oral pre-planned presentations dealing with familiar topics. They speak using notes, and the often read verbatim. They may speak in strings of sentences using basic vocabulary. They often focus more on the content of the presentation rather than considering the audience.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments for STANDARD 1:

STANDARD 2. Cultures, Linguistics, Literatures, and Concepts from Other Disciplines: Cultural Knowledge

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
<p>Candidates view and can explain the target culture as a system in which cultural perspectives are reflected through products and practices. They distinguish between general patterns and more limited contexts, between tradition and contemporary practice; they account for the dynamic nature of culture and hypothesize about cultural phenomena that are unclear. Candidates describe how various cultures are similar and different.</p>	<p>Candidates cite key perspectives of the target culture and connect them to cultural products and practices. Candidates use cultural frameworks and/or cross-cultural models that connect perspectives to the products and practices as a way to compare the target culture to their own or to compare a series of cultures.</p>	<p>Candidates cite examples of cultural practices, products, and perspectives from the target culture, drawing comparisons and contrasts with their own. While perspectives are sometimes connected to products or practices, they do not reflect clear cultural frameworks or cross-cultural models.</p>	<p>Candidates cite examples of cultural practices, products, and perspectives that reflect a developing knowledge base. Candidates chart or list similarities and differences between the target culture and their own. They tend to cite products or practices but are limited in connecting these with perspectives.</p>
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

STANDARD 2. Cultures and Concepts from Other Disciplines

Literary and Cultural Themes and Interdisciplinary Topics

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
<p>Candidates interpret materials on topics from a number of disciplines (e.g., ecology, health) as an informed layperson would in the target culture. They engage with major literary texts and cultural icons in the traditional and contemporary target culture. They acquire a wide range of language expressions from so doing and can use them to converse on similar topics.</p>	<p>Candidates derive general meaning and some details from materials with topics from a number of disciplines (e.g., ecology, health). They engage the literature and icons of the target culture. They comprehend more from materials on topics with which they have some familiarity and can determine the meaning of words from context.</p>	<p>Candidates consider topics from other disciplines, including literature or cultural icons of the target culture, demonstrating an openness to exploring new avenues for developing linguistic and cultural awareness</p>	<p>Candidates identify key ideas from materials on topics from other disciplines when they have studied these or when there is instructional explanation.</p>
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

STANDARD 2. Cultures, Linguistics, Literatures, and Concepts from Other Disciplines

Language and Language Systems

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
<p>Candidates engage students in activities that develop understanding of the target language as a linguistic system, including pragmatics, semantics, syntax, morphology, phonology, and discourse. They explore its sociolinguistic features and contexts. They demonstrate that all living languages change over time by examining significant changes in the target language.</p>	<p>Candidates design activities in which students will have opportunities to explore several linguistic subsystems of the target language and consider sociolinguistic contexts. These activities include examples of changes in the target language.</p>	<p>Candidates plan activities that focus on at least one of the linguistic subsystems of the target language and note that social context influences linguistic expression. They acknowledge language change</p>	<p>Candidates engage the students in the study of language features and structures. These activities and meaningful contexts are those that occur in instructional materials.</p>
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments for STANDARDS 2:

STANDARD 3: Language Acquisition Theories and Knowledge of Students and Their Needs

Adapting Language Acquisition Theory in Planning Instruction

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
<p>Candidates consistently apply theory about how people acquire new languages when planning for and implementing language instruction. Instructional activities are tailored for the particular language development levels, linguistic backgrounds, and learning styles of the students.</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/></p>	<p>Candidates seek out information regarding their students' language levels, language backgrounds, and learning styles. They implement a variety of theory-based instructional models and techniques to address these student differences.</p> <p><input type="radio"/></p>	<p>Candidates use a variety of instructional strategies to address their students' different levels of development in the target language. Some of these are theory-based.</p> <p><input type="radio"/></p>	<p>Candidates recognize that their students have a wide range of language levels, language backgrounds, and learning styles. They attempt to address these differences by using a limited variety of instructional strategies.</p> <p><input type="radio"/></p>

STANDARD 3: Language Acquisition Theories and Knowledge of Students and Their Needs

Adapting Instruction to Meet Students' Developmental Needs

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
Candidates address their students' developmental needs, including cognitive, physical, linguistic, social, and emotional needs, by planning for differentiated alternative classroom activities. These activities reflect a strong understanding of adolescent development and nurture a supportive learning environment.	Candidates implement a variety of instructional models and techniques that address specific developmental needs of their students. Instruction demonstrates understanding of adolescent development and fosters a supportive learning environment.	Candidates plan some activities that address developmental needs of their students and provide the foundation for a supportive learning environment.	Candidates identify developmental needs of their students. They recognize that they may need to adapt instruction to meet these special needs.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments for STANDARD 3:

STANDARD 4: Integration of Standards in Planning and Instruction

Standards as the Basis of Instruction

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century (SFLL) or World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (W-RSLL) and state standards are the foundation of classroom practice.	Candidates adapt activities as necessary to address SFLL or W-RSLL and state standards.	Candidates identify the SFLL or W-RSLL and state standards addressed in their instruction.	Candidates conduct activities that address specific SFLL or W-RSLL and state standards to the extent that their instructional materials include a connection to standards.
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

STANDARD 4: Integration of Standards in Planning and Instruction

Integration of Three Modes of Communication

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
Candidates design and implement engaging activities for learners that integrate interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational modes of communication.	Candidates design opportunities for students to communicate by using the three modes of communication in an integrated manner.	Candidates plan learning activities that integrate at least two of the three modes of communication.	Candidates understand the connection among the three modes of communication and focus on one mode at a time in communicative activities.
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

STANDARD 4: Integration of Standards in Planning and Instruction

Integration of Cultural Products, Practices, and Perspectives

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
Candidates engage learners in cultural exploration and comparisons through exploration of cultural products, practices, and perspectives.	Candidates design opportunities for students to explore the target language culture by making cultural comparisons using at least 2 of the following: products, practices, and perspectives.	Candidates understand the anthropological view of cultures in terms of products, practices, and perspectives and refer to one or more of these areas in their classroom practice and comparisons of cultures.	Candidates provide opportunities to explore the target culture, but do not refer specifically to culture in terms of the products, practices, and perspectives.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

STANDARD 4: Integration of Standards in Planning and Instruction

Authentic Materials and Technology

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
Candidates select and adapt, as necessary, authentic materials and technology to drive standards-based classroom practice. They integrate multiple resources, including a variety of authentic materials and media, to engage students actively in their learning and enable them to acquire new information.	Candidates identify and integrate authentic materials and technology to support standards-based classroom practice. They help students to acquire strategies for understanding and interpreting authentic texts available through various media.	Candidates supplement published instructional programs and ancillary resources with some authentic materials and media that they have identified.	Candidates primarily use materials and technology created for classroom use or available as an ancillary to the textbook program, whether or not they are authentic or appropriate for standards-based practice.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments for STANDARDS 4:

STANDARD 5. Assessment of Languages and Cultures – Impact on Student Learning

Authentic Assessments Designed to Meet Needs of Diverse Learners

TARGET

Candidates design authentic assessments that allow all students to maximize their performance of successful communication and cultural understandings. Assessments focus on what all students, including diverse students, can do.



ACCEPTABLE

Candidates assess what students know and are able to do by using and designing assessments that authentically capture successful communication and cultural understandings for all students.



DEVELOPING

Candidates use some authentic performance assessments to measure communicative and cultural competence, but the assessment system as a whole does not allow all students to show what they can do.



UNACCEPTABLE

Candidates cite the role of performance assessment in the classroom and attempt to measure performances. They rely on discrete-point or right-answer assessments.



STANDARD 5. Assessment of Languages and Cultures – Impact on Student Learning

Using Assessment to Adjust and Reflect on Instruction

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
<p>Candidates design assessments and use results to improve teaching and adjust instruction to promote individual student and whole-group learning. They use technology where appropriate to collect data and report results and to enhance or extend instruction. They reflect on the process to improve future instruction.</p>	<p>Candidates incorporate what they have learned from assessments and show how they have adjusted instruction to change or reinforce instruction for the whole group. Reflecting on this experience informs future planning.</p>	<p>Candidates use assessment results to plan immediately subsequent lessons for the whole class.</p>	<p>Candidates use assessments that can be scored quickly and mechanically, whether in person or with the use of technology. Assessment is viewed as an end in itself or used to conduct whole group remediation or review.</p>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

STANDARD 5. Assessment of Languages and Cultures – Impact on Student Learning

Reporting Results to Stakeholders

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
<p>Candidates create opportunities to share individual and whole-group assessment results in meaningful and strengths-oriented ways with relevant stakeholders, particularly the students themselves. Whether these occur at community events, parent-teacher conferences, or classroom mentoring sessions, they emphasize student ownership of their own learning.</p>	<p>Candidates create opportunities to share individual or whole-group assessment results with relevant stakeholders, particularly the students themselves. They emphasize building student ownership of their own learning.</p>	<p>Candidates take offered opportunities to share individual or whole-group assessment results with relevant stakeholders, who might be students, parents, or community members.</p>	<p>Candidates use for their own purposes or grading or planning, and do not share results with other stakeholders.</p>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments for Standard 5:

STANDARD 6. Professional Development, Advocacy, and Ethics

Seeking Professional Growth Opportunities

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
Candidates develop a plan for their induction to the profession and identify multiple pathways for pursuing professional growth and development.	Candidates seek counsel (e.g., from CT or US) regarding opportunities for professional growth and establish a plan to pursue them.	Candidates take advantage of professional growth opportunities available to faculty at their schools.	Candidates consider suggestions that mentors make regarding the candidate's own professional growth.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

STANDARD 6. Professional Development, Advocacy, and Ethics

Collaboration and Advocacy that Support P-12 Learning

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
Candidates initiate efforts to collaborate with students, colleagues and other stakeholders to advocate for increased P-12 student learning in languages and cultures.	Candidates participate in at least one professional and/or social network events designed to advocate for the increase of P-12 student learning in languages and cultures.	Candidates explore opportunities to collaborate on advocacy for the increase of P-12 student learning in languages and cultures.	Candidates understand the importance of professional and social networks and the role they play in advocacy efforts to increase P-12 student learning in languages and cultures.
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

STANDARD 6. Professional Development, Advocacy, and Ethics

Professional Responsibility and Ethics

TARGET	ACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	UNACCEPTABLE
Candidates actively engage in inquiry into the responsibilities of being a professional language educator and demonstrate a commitment to equitable and ethical interactions with everyone they encounter in this role.	Candidates discuss the responsibilities of being a professional language educator and demonstrate commitment to ethical interactions with everyone they encounter in this role.	Candidates consider the responsibilities of being a professional language educator and interact ethically with students and colleagues.	Candidates are aware of professional responsibilities and the importance of equitable and ethical relationships.
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments for STANDARDS 6

**** Please Note: You are now done with Part 1. Please continue to complete Parts 2 and 3. ****

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

Learners & Learning

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

InTASC #1

CAEP 1.1

Target

Candidate regularly assesses learning (e.g., performance, abilities, and skills) of individuals and the group. Data are used to design responsive curriculum and instruction to scaffold the next level of learning.



Acceptable

Candidate assesses, albeit inconsistently, learning (e.g., performance, abilities, and skills) of individuals and the group. Data are used to design responsive curriculum and instruction to meet learners' needs.



Unacceptable

Candidate infrequently assesses learning for individuals and group. Curriculum and instruction are selected without reference to learning characteristics.



Content Knowledge

Candidate uses technology effectively to achieve content-specific learning goals.

InTASC #5

CAEP 1.5

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 technologies that are connected to the specific learning goals for the content area(s).



Unacceptable

Candidate emphasizes technologies that 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

CAEP 1.1

Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
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.	Candidate engages students in making meaning of content texts, materials, performances, or labs by providing diverse materials and opportunities for personal response.	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 over-emphasize students' personal responses to the content.
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructional Practice

Candidate uses both formative and summative assessment to document learning.

InTASC #6

CAEP 1.1

Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Candidate balances the use of formative and summative assessments, as appropriate, to support, verify, and document learning.	Candidate uses both formative and summative assessments to document learning.	Candidate relies significantly on one assessment method over the other. Data are used to demonstrate what students do not know or are unable to do.
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instructional Practice

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

InTASC #7

CAEP 1.1

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

Candidates use technology to ensure accessibility and relevance for all learners.

InTASC #8

CAEP 1.1

Target

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



Acceptable

Technology selected is age-appropriate, matching ability levels, interests, and needs.



Unacceptable

Technology selected is appropriate for a subset of students.



Professional Responsibility

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

InTASC #9

CAEP 3

Target

Candidate creates a plan for reflecting on practices during and after instruction. 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.



Acceptable

Candidate creates a plan for reflecting on practice after instruction occurs. The data gathered via the strategies are analyzed and used to make improvements to future instructional plans.



Unacceptable

Candidate reflects on practice in an unplanned, unsystematic way or only 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 collected.



Professional Responsibility

The candidate understands laws related to learners' rights and teacher responsibilities.

InTASC #9

CAEP 3.6

Target

Candidate understands and appropriately applies educational laws, especially confidentiality, requirements for reporting child abuse and neglect and discrimination/harassment/bullying.



Acceptable

Candidate demonstrates a firm understanding of educational laws, especially confidentiality, requirements for reporting child abuse and neglect and discrimination/harassment/bullying.



Unacceptable

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 #9

CAEP 1

Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
<p>Candidate explicitly teaches and supports students' application of digital citizenship characteristics. When necessary, family members are notified in advance of classroom activities.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></p>	<p>Candidate follows characteristics of digital citizenship when developing lesson plans that incorporate technology. Reminders or prompts for students are outlined. When necessary, family members are notified in advance of classroom activities.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></p>	<p>Candidate does not acknowledge, support, or follow components of digital citizenship for self or students. Family members are not notified in advance of classroom activities when it was necessary.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></p>

**** You have now completed Parts 1 and 2 of the survey. 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 Education and Public Policy

[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 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 - This is the most important part of the FINAL student teacher evaluation. 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

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

Powered by Qualtrics