

**TEAM Summative Evaluation**

Teacher Candidate: Semester/Year: Grade: School: Evaluator:

Please use this rubric at the end of the placement to make your overall assessment of the teacher candidate’s performance.

Scoring Key: 1=Below Expectations 2=At Expectations 3=Above Expectations

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PLANNING** | | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Unacceptable (1) Below Expectations** | **Acceptable (2) At Expectations** | **Target (3) Above Expectations** | **Overall Rating** |
| **Instructional** | Candidate’s goals **rarely aligned** to | Candidate’s goals were aligned to | Candidate’s goals were **always** |  |
| **planning** | state content standards. Activities, materials, and assessments **unconnected** to student prior learning or background. Appropriate pacing was not addressed. Individual students’ needs **neglected**. | state content standards. Activities, materials, and assessments built on prior student learning and backgrounds. Many lesson components (student work periods, instruction times, closures, etc.) were given appropriate pacing times. Plans **included differentiation for learners with needs but**  **accommodations were not observed.** | **clearly** aligned to state content standards. **Creative** activities, materials, and **nontraditional** assessments built **deep** student knowledge. All lesson components (student work periods, instruction times, closures, etc.) were given appropriate pacing times. Plans provided **multiple opportunities**  for students to have their needs met. |
| **Student work** | Candidate’s assignments required | Candidate’s assignments required | Candidate’s assignments required |  |
| **products** | students **to reproduce** information. Assignments **rarely** had students draw conclusions **and/or** offer support for them. | students to interpret information rather than reproduce it.  Assignments had students draw conclusions. | students to interpret information at a **high level of thought**.  Assignments **nearly always**  required students to draw conclusions and support them orally or in writing. |
| **Quality of** | **Some** assessments had clear | **Most** assessments had clear | All assessments provided clear |  |
| **assessments** | measurement criteria. **Some** | measurement criteria. Formative | measurement criteria. Formative |
| **utilized** | formative assessments were used. Assessments **used single measures** of performance. | assessments were utilized **frequently.** Assessments measured performance in more than one way. | **and summative** assessments were used **frequently**.  Assessments measured performance in **varied and unique ways.** |
| **INSTRUCTION** | | | | |
| **Knowledge of** | **Some** objectives and standards were | **Most** objectives and standards | All objectives and standards were |  |
| **standards &** | communicated. Expectations for | were communicated. **Most** | **consistently** communicated. **All** |
| **objectives** | student performances were **unclear**. **Some** objectives are connected to what students have learned. | expectations for student performances were clear. **Most** objectives are connected to what students have learned. | expectations for student performances were **clearly communicated to students**. **All** objectives are connected to what students have learned. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Unacceptable (1) Below Expectations** | **Acceptable (2) At Expectations** | **Target (3) Above Expectations** | **Overall Rating** |
| **Skill at** | Content was meaningful to **some** | Content was made **meaningful** | Content was **consistently** |  |
| **motivating** | **students**. Candidate **did not** | **and relevant** to most students. | meaningful and relevant to |
| **students** | **consistently** reinforce and reward student efforts. Candidate **did not** develop learning experiences where inquiry, curiosity, and exploration were valued. | Candidate reinforced and rewarded efforts. Candidate developed learning experiences where inquiry, curiosity, and exploration were valued. | students. Candidate consistently reinforced and rewarded efforts. Candidate developed **ample** learning experiences where inquiry, curiosity, and exploration were valued. |
| **Competence in** | Candidate failed to use examples, | Candidate used examples, | Candidate used **meaningfu**l |  |
| **presenting** | illustrations and/or labels for new | illustrations, and/or labels for new | illustrations and labels for new |
| **instructional** | concepts or ideas on a regular basis. | concepts and ideas **most** of the | concepts or ideas. **Always** |
| **content** | **Didn’t always** model performance expectations. Sequencing across the lesson was lacking. Presentation **included confusing or nonessential information.** | time. Modeled performance expectations. Logical sequencing and segmenting across the lesson was apparent **most** of the time. | modeled performance expectations. Lessons were **always clearly** logically sequenced and segmented across the lessons. Information was relevant to the students’ **lives.** |
| **Competence in** | Lessons **did not always** start | Lessons started promptly **most** of | **All** lessons started promptly. The |  |
| **Lesson** | promptly. The lessons lacked | the time. The lessons contained a | lessons **clearly** contained a |
| **Structure and** | structure and **did not clearly** contain | beginning, middle and end. | beginning, middle and end. |
| **Pacing** | a beginning, middle and end. Pacing was **non-existent** or **did not** provide for different learning rates. Routines and/or transitions were **unorganized and inefficient**. | Pacing was **adequate** and provided some opportunities for different learning rates. Routines and/or transitions were **mostly** organized and efficient. | Pacing was **clearly** present and provided **multiple opportunities** for different learning rates. **All** routines and/or transitions were organized and efficient with minor interruptions. |
| **Qualities of** | Materials and activities **did not** | Materials and activities supported | All materials and activities |  |
| **activities and** | **always** support lessons’ objectives. | lesson objectives and sustained | **clearly** supported lesson |
| **materials** | Student interaction was limited. Technology **was not** used but was available. **No outside** resources were included. Tasks that were included in activities and materials lacked complexity and text. | **most** students’ attention. Student to student interaction and choices were part of most lessons.  Incorporated technology when available. Lessons relied mainly on adopted textbook. **Most** activities and materials included tasks that were rich with complexity and text. | objectives and **consistently** sustained student attention throughout all lessons. Students had **multiple opportunities,** interaction, and choices. Creative use of technology, when available. Multiple resources were used. **All** activities and materials included tasks that were rich with complexity and text. |
| **Use of a** | Candidate’s questions were primarily | Candidate’s questions were | Candidate’s questions were |  |
| **variety of** | of **one type or are without** purpose | **varied and balanced**. Required | varied, **creative**, and high quality |
| **questioning** | or sense. Questions were primarily | active responses (e.g. whole-class | providing a balanced mix of |
| **types** | asked of **individuals.** Wait time was **not evident**. Candidate **did not spread the questioning across all students.** | signaling, choral responses, or group and individual answers) Wait time was appropriate most of the time. Called on volunteers and non-volunteers. | question types that are purposeful and coherent. Require active responses as well as **student-to- student interaction.** Wait time was **consistently** used appropriately. **Consistently** calls on volunteers and non-volunteers. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Unacceptable (1) Below Expectations** | **Acceptable (2) At Expectations** | **Target (3) Above Expectations** | **Overall Rating** |
| **Use and** | Candidate **rarely offered** | Candidate’s academic feedback | Candidate’s academic feedback |  |
| **quality of** | **academic feedback.** Candidate | **was** focused and frequent. **Most** | was **authentic and frequently** |
| **academic** | **did not do enough** to support | **of the time the candidate** | given. Candidate **consistently** |
| **feedback** | student engagement and monitor their work. | **circulated** during instructional activities to support engagement and monitored student work. | circulated offering **genuine** support **and documentation** for student engagement and monitoring of student work. |
| **Using and** | Candidate rarely grouped students | Candidate’s group activities | Candidate’s group activities |  |
| **managing the** | for clear instructional purposes. | adequately enhanced student | clearly enhanced student |
| **grouping of** |  | understanding and learning. Most | understanding and learning |
| **students** |  | students knew their roles and | effectively. All students knew |
| (whole, small, |  | responsibilities. Individuals were | their roles & responsibilities. |
| pairs, or |  | held accountable for individual | Individuals were **consistently** |
| individually) |  | and/or group work. Instructional group composition was not varied consistently (e.g. race, gender, ability, and age). | **held** accountable for individual and/or group work. Instructional group composition varied (e.g. race, gender, ability, and age). |
| **Teacher** | Candidate **did not display** | Candidate displayed accurate | Candidate displayed accurate |  |
| **candidate** | **accurate content knowledge** | content knowledge of what was | content knowledge of what he/she |
| **knowledge of** | **across lessons taught.** | taught. **Usually implemented** | taught **and researched to add to** |
| **content** |  | subject-specific content strategies to enhance student content knowledge. | **the content being taught when needed. Consistently** implemented subject-specific content strategies to enhance student content knowledge. |
| **Teacher** | Candidate was indifferent to | Candidate displayed | Candidate clearly anticipated |  |
| **candidate** | students’ learning needs and | understandings of students’ | students’ needs and differentiated |
| **knowledge of** | difficulties. Differentiation was | anticipated learning difficulties. | seamlessly so all students could |
| **students** | rarely evident. | Sometimes the candidate incorporated student interests and cultural heritage. Provided limited differentiated instructional methods and content to ensure students had the opportunity to master what was being taught. | master the concepts. Incorporated student interests and cultural heritage in respectful and meaningful ways. |
| **Promoting** | Candidate **did not** teach any | **Candidate thoroughly taught** | Candidate **thoroughly taught one** |  |
| **thinking** | (Analytical Thinking, Practical | **one type (**Analytical Thinking, | **or more types (**Analytical |
| **skills** | Thinking, Creative Thinking, or Research-Based Thinking) thinking skills. Candidate provided **minimal** opportunities to generate ideas and alternatives. Candidate provided **minimal** opportunities to analyze problems from perspectives and viewpoints. | Practical Thinking, Creative Thinking, or Research-Based Thinking) thinking skill.  Candidate provided **some** opportunities to generate ideas and alternatives. Candidate provided **some** opportunities to analyze problems from different perspectives and viewpoints. | Thinking, Practical Thinking, Creative Thinking, or Research- Based Thinking). Candidate provided **numerous** opportunities to generate a variety of ideas and alternatives. Candidate provided **ample** opportunities to analyze problems from multiple perspectives and viewpoints. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | | **Unacceptable (1) Below Expectations** | **Acceptable (2) At Expectations** | **Target (3) Above Expectations** | **Overall Rating** |
|  | **Promoting** | Candidate **rarely** provided | Candidate implements activities | Candidate teaches **by modeling** |  |
|  | **problem** | opportunities for student problem | that teach **at least one** of the | **problem solving and actively** |
|  | **solving** | solving or provided opportunities that are **artificial and inauthentic.** | following problem-solving types (abstraction, categorization, drawing conclusions or justifying solution, predicting outcomes, observing and experimenting, improving solutions, identifying relevant/irrelevant information, generating ideas, and creating and designing). | **encouraged** students to **practice** problem solving through **two or more** of the following problem- solving types (abstraction, categorization, drawing conclusions or justification, predicting, observing and experimenting, improving solutions, identifying relevant/irrelevant information, generating ideas, and creating and designing). Candidate modeled and **consistently** provided opportunities for students to generate a variety of ideas and  alternatives. |
|  | **ENVIRONMENT** | | | | |
|  | **Setting clear** | Candidate **did not** set high | Candidate set **high expectations**. | Candidate **consistently** set high |  |
|  | **and high** | expectations for students. | Encouraged students to learn from | expectations **for all** students. |
|  | **expectations** | Students were not encouraged to learn from mistakes. Learning experiences did not promote student success. | mistakes. Most of the time learning opportunities allowed **most students to experience success**. Students completed work according to candidate’s expectations. | Candidate created learning experiences where mistakes were helpful and where success is built in. **All students met or exceeded candidate’s expectations.** |
|  | **Managing** | Students were **not well behaved.** | Students were **well-behaved and** | Students were always well |  |
|  | **student** | Candidate **did not** handle minor | **on task** with minor learning | behaved and on task. Candidate |
|  | **behavior** | learning disruptions easily during Residency Semester. Candidate **did not** follow PIM’s classroom rules and procedures. **Candidate treated all behavior issues as major issues or all as trivial; does not distinguish between them**. | disruptions.  Candidate followed PIM’s classroom rules. Candidate overlooked **some minor behavior issues**, but other times he/she addresses it, pausing the lesson. | **consistently** handled minor learning disruptions easily. Candidate **always** followed PIM’s classroom rules and procedures. Disruptions were handled **appropriately and professionally.** |
|  | **Collaboration** | Candidate **does not incorporate** | Candidate incorporates **some of** | Candidate **incorporates all** |  |
|  | **With MT** | suggestions and critiques made in | **the suggestions and critiques** | **suggestions** and critiques made in |
|  | **and** | collaboration with their MT or | made in collaboration with the | collaboration with their MT and |
|  | **Clinical** | Clinical Supervisor. | MT and Clinical Supervisor | Clinical Supervisor regarding |
|  | **Supervisor** |  | regarding planning, teaching, and assessing children. | planning, teaching, and assessing children. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Collaboration with Professionals, Parents, and Others** | Candidate **fails to communicate and/or collaborate** with professionals, parents, and others in a meaningful way to meet the needs of all children in the classroom. | Candidate collaborates & communicates with professionals, others and with parents under the guidance of their PIM to meet the specific needs of all children in the classroom. | Candidate **communicates and collaborates** with professionals & parents in meaningful ways in concert with their PIM. Candidates seek **additional** ideas and suggestions in collaboration with fellow candidates, University faculty and others to improve their instruction and to assist students in their learning. |  |
| **Promoting a** | Candidate-student **interactions** | Most candidate-student | Candidate-student interactions |  |
| **Respectful** | **were stiff**. Candidate-student | **interactions were friendly and** | were **consistently** professional, |
| **culture** | and student-student rapport was **disrespectfu**l. Candidate expressed **no interest in** students’ interests or opinions. | **caring**. Candidate-student and student-student rapport was respectful. Candidate was receptive to interests and opinions of students. | friendly, and caring. Candidate- student and student-student rapport was **always** respectful. Candidate was consistently receptive to interests and opinions of students. |

# Comments on areas of strengths (strongest performance elements):

**Comments of areas of continued growth (lowest performance elements):**