Group Rubric Analysis

Program	Rubric	Dates
	TEAM Formal Evaluation (1012, 1013, 1018, 1019)	
Teacher Education	MEMPHIS-TE-1012	8/1/25-12/31/26

TEAMS Fall 2025   N=37

Total Students Being Assessed: **37**

CRITERIA LEVEL COUNTS						
Criteria	Above Expectations 3	At Expectations 2	Below Expectations 1	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Goals are aligned to state content standards 1	29	9	0	2.76	3	**0.43**
Plan provides opportunities to accommodate 2	29	9	0	2.76	3	**0.43**
Allows appropriate time intervals for student work, ... 3	25	13	0	2.66	3	**0.47**
Assignments engage students in higher level/critical... 4	21	17	0	2.55	3	**0.50**
All assessments have clear measurement criteria 5	20	17	1	2.50	3	**0.55**
Formative assessments and written tasks are included... 6	26	10	2	2.63	3	**0.58**
Assessments are aligned to State/Common Core standards 7	28	10	0	2.74	3	**0.44**
Objective(s) and standards as well as expectations 8	27	10	1	2.68	3	**0.52**
Teacher candidate relates objective(s) to prior know... 9	29	8	1	2.74	3	**0.50**
Content is personally meaningful and relevant to the... 10	27	11	0	2.71	3	**0.45**
Teacher candidate reinforces and rewards student eff... 11	27	11	0	2.71	3	**0.45**
Includes examples, illustrations, analogies 12	25	12	1	2.63	3	**0.53**
Logical sequencing and segmenting across the lesson 13	26	12	0	2.68	3	**0.46**
Feedback is high quality and focused and is done 14	29	9	0	2.76	3	**0.43**

Group Rubric Analysis

CRITERIA LEVEL COUNTS						
Teacher Candidate displays accurate content knowledge 15	32	6	0	2.84	3	**0.36**
Candidate circulates during instructional activities 16	29	9	0	2.76	3	**0.43**
Lesson starts promptly and has a coherent beginning,... 17	25	13	0	2.66	3	**0.47**
Pacing is appropriate and varied when needed 18	28	9	1	2.71	3	**0.51**
Materials are efficiently distributed 19	29	9	0	2.76	3	**0.43**
Support the lesson's objectives and sustain students... 20	32	6	0	2.84	3	**0.36**
Provide for student-to-student interaction 21	23	15	0	2.61	3	**0.49**
Provide students with authentic choices and encourage 22	21	17	0	2.55	3	**0.50**
Incorporates technology and resources outside 23	25	13	0	2.66	3	**0.47**
Activities and materials add to the lesson in meanin... 24	27	11	0	2.71	3	**0.45**
Group adequately enhances student understanding 25	21	15	2	2.50	3	**0.60**
Most students know their roles/responsibilities 26	21	16	1	2.53	3	**0.55**
Teacher candidate provides differentiated instructio... 27	21	16	1	2.53	3	**0.55**
Teacher candidate incorporates student interests 28	22	16	0	2.58	3	**0.49**
Teacher candidate engages students in 1 or more 29	25	13	0	2.66	3	**0.47**
Teacher candidate provides opportunities to generate 30	24	14	0	2.63	3	**0.48**
Questions are purposeful and coherent 31	20	17	1	2.50	3	**0.55**
Wait time is appropriate 32	19	19	0	2.50	2	**0.50**
The teacher candidate implements activities that tea... 33	24	13	1	2.61	3	**0.54**
Teacher candidate sets high expectations and creates... 34	30	8	0	2.79	3	**0.41**

Group Rubric Analysis

CRITERIA LEVEL COUNTS

Students complete work according to teacher candidat... 35	30	8	0	2.79	3	**0.41**
Teacher candidate implements effective management 36	25	13	0	2.66	3	**0.47**
Students are well-behaved and on task with minor lea... 37	27	11	0	2.71	3	**0.45**
Teacher candidate-student interactions are friendly 38	34	4	0	2.89	3	**0.31**
Teacher candidate is receptive to interests and opin... 39	34	4	0	2.89	3	**0.31**
Candidate incorporates all suggestions and critiques 40	31	7	0	2.82	3	**0.39**

CRITERIA LEVEL DISTRIBUTION CHARTS

Goals are aligned to state content standards 1	29 (76%)	9 (24%)	
Plan provides opportunities to accommodate 2	29 (76%)	9 (24%)	
Allows appropriate time intervals for student work, ... 3	25 (66%)	13 (34%)	
Assignments engage students in higher level/critical... 4	21 (55%)	17 (45%)	
All assessments have clear measurement criteria 5	20 (53%)	17 (45%)	1
Formative assessments and written tasks are included... 6	26 (68%)	10 (26%)	2 (5%)
Assessments are aligned to State/Common Core standards 7	28 (74%)	10 (26%)	
Objective(s) and standards as well as expectations 8	27 (71%)	10 (26%)	1
Teacher candidate relates objective(s) to prior know... 9	29 (76%)	8 (21%)	1
Content is personally meaningful and relevant to the... 10	27 (71%)	11 (29%)	
Teacher candidate reinforces and rewards student eff... 11	27 (71%)	11 (29%)	

Group Rubric Analysis

CRITERIA LEVEL DISTRIBUTION CHARTS			
Includes examples, illustrations, analogies 12	25 (66%)	12 (32%)	1
Logical sequencing and segmenting across the lesson 13	26 (68%)	12 (32%)	
Feedback is high quality and focused and is done 14	29 (76%)	9 (24%)	
Teacher Candidate displays accurate content knowledge 15	32 (84%)	6 (16%)	
Candidate circulates during instructional activities 16	29 (76%)	9 (24%)	
Lesson starts promptly and has a coherent beginning,... 17	25 (66%)	13 (34%)	
Pacing is appropriate and varied when needed 18	28 (74%)	9 (24%)	1
Materials are efficiently distributed 19	29 (76%)	9 (24%)	
Support the lesson's objectives and sustain students... 20	32 (84%)	6 (16%)	
Provide for student-to-student interaction 21	23 (61%)	15 (39%)	
Provide students with authentic choices and encourage 22	21 (55%)	17 (45%)	
Incorporates technology and resources outside 23	25 (66%)	13 (34%)	
Activities and materials add to the lesson in meanin... 24	27 (71%)	11 (29%)	
Group adequately enhances student understanding 25	21 (55%)	15 (39%)	2 (5%)
Most students know their roles/responsibilities 26	21 (55%)	16 (42%)	1
Teacher candidate provides differentiated instructio... 27	21 (55%)	16 (42%)	1
Teacher candidate incorporates student interests 28	22 (58%)	16 (42%)	

Group Rubric Analysis

CRITERIA LEVEL DISTRIBUTION CHARTS			
Teacher candidate engages students in 1 or more 29	25 (66%)	13 (34%)	
Teacher candidate provides opportunities to generate 30	24 (63%)	14 (37%)	
Questions are purposeful and coherent 31	20 (53%)	17 (45%)	1
Wait time is appropriate 32	19 (50%)	19 (50%)	
The teacher candidate implements activities that tea... 33	24 (63%)	13 (34%)	1
Teacher candidate sets high expectations and creates... 34	30 (79%)	8 (21%)	
Students complete work according to teacher candidat... 35	30 (79%)	8 (21%)	
Teacher candidate implements effective management 36	25 (66%)	13 (34%)	
Students are well-behaved and on task with minor lea... 37	27 (71%)	11 (29%)	
Teacher candidate-student interactions are friendly 38	34 (89%)	4 (11%)	
Teacher candidate is receptive to interests and opin... 39	34 (89%)	4 (11%)	
Candidate incorporates all suggestions and critiques 40	31 (82%)	7 (18%)	

Interpretation of the Data:

Overall results from the TEAM rubric analysis indicate that the majority of teacher candidates are performing **at or above expectations across the evaluated criteria**, suggesting strong preparation in instructional planning, classroom implementation, and professional practice. Across the rubric indicators, most candidates were rated **Above Expectations or At Expectations**, with mean scores across indicators ranging approximately **from 2.50 to 2.89 on a 3-point scale**, indicating performance that aligns closely with or exceeds expected teaching standards.

Several areas demonstrated particularly strong performance among completers. For example, **84% of candidates were rated above expectations in displaying accurate content knowledge and supporting lesson objectives**, reflecting strong subject matter preparation and the ability to align instruction with learning goals. Additionally, **89% of candidates were rated above expectations in maintaining positive teacher–student interactions and being receptive to student interests and opinions**, indicating the development of supportive classroom environments that promote student engagement and participation.

Group Rubric Analysis

The data also highlights strengths in instructional planning and classroom management. Most candidates demonstrated the ability to align goals with state standards, incorporate meaningful instructional materials, and implement effective classroom management strategies. For example, **76% of candidates exceeded expectations in aligning lesson goals with state standards**, while **79% exceeded expectations in setting high expectations for students and ensuring students complete assigned work**.

While most indicators showed strong performance, the data also identify areas for continued program improvement. Indicators related to **student choice, differentiation, and questioning strategies** showed slightly lower percentages of candidates performing above expectations, suggesting opportunities for the EPP to further strengthen candidate preparation in these areas through coursework and clinical practice experiences.

The EPP reviews TEAM evaluation data annually as part of its continuous improvement process. Faculty analyze these results alongside other completer impact measures, including TVAAS data, to identify trends and inform program adjustments. Insights from the analysis have supported ongoing conversations regarding strengthening instructional strategies, differentiation, and student-centered learning opportunities within methods coursework and clinical practice experiences.

Overall, the TEAM evaluation results provide additional evidence that the EPP's completers demonstrate the instructional knowledge, professional dispositions, and classroom practices necessary to support effective teaching and learning in P–12 settings.