 **TEAM Summative Evaluation – Residency I**



**I**

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

Please use this rubric at the end of the residency 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** | Candidate’s goals were | Candidate’s goals were **always** |  |
| **planning** | **aligned** to state content standards. Activities, materials and assessments **unconnected** to student prior learning or background. Appropriate pacing was not addressed.  Individual students’ needs  **neglected**. | aligned to 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** | Candidate’s assignments | Candidate’s assignments | Candidate’s assignments |  |
| **work** | required students **to** | required students to interpret | required students to interpret |
| **products** | **reproduce** information. Assignments **rarely** had students draw conclusions **and/or** offer support for them. | information rather than reproduce it. Assignments had students draw conclusions. | 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. | measurement criteria. |
| **utilized** | formative assessments were used. Assessments **used single measures** of performance. | Formative assessments were utilized **frequently.**  Assessments measured performance in more than one way. | Formative **and summative** assessments were used **frequently**. Assessments measured performance in  **varied and unique ways.** |
| **INSTRUCTION** | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | **Some** objectives and standards | **Most** objectives and standards | All objectives and standards |  |
| **of standards** | were communicated. | were communicated. **Most** | were **consistently** |
| **& objectives** | Expectations for 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. | communicated. **All** 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 | Content was made **meaningful** | Content was **consistently** |  |
| **motivating** | **some students**. Candidate **did** | **and relevant** to most students. | meaningful and relevant to |
| **students** | **not 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 presenting instructional content** | Candidate failed to use examples, illustrations and/or labels for new concepts or ideas on a regular basis.  **Didn’t always** model performance expectations. Sequencing across the lesson was lacking. Presentation  **included confusing or nonessential information.** | Candidate used examples, illustrations and/or labels for new concepts and ideas **most** of the time. Modeled performance expectations.  Logical sequencing and segmenting across the lesson was apparent **most** of the time. | Candidate used **meaningfu**l illustrations and labels for new concepts or ideas. **Always** modeled performance expectations. Lessons were **always clearly** logically sequenced and segmented across the lessons. Information was relevant to the students’  **lives.** |  |
| **Competence** | Lessons **did not always** start | Lessons started promptly **most** | **All** lessons started promptly. |  |
| **in Lesson** | promptly. The lessons lacked | of the time. The lessons | The lessons **clearly** contained |
| **Structure** | structure and **did not clearly** | contained a beginning, middle | a beginning, middle and end. |
| **and Pacing** | contain 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**. | and end. 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** | Materials and activities | All materials and activities |  |
| **activities** | **not always** support lessons’ | supported lesson objectives | **clearly** supported lesson |
| **and** | objectives. Student interaction | and sustained **most** students’ | objectives and **consistently** |
| **materials** | 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. | 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. | 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 | Candidate’s questions were | Candidate’s questions were |  |
| **variety of** | primarily of **one type or are** | **varied and balanced**. | varied, **creative** and high |
| **questioning** | **without** purpose or sense. | Required active responses (e.g. | quality providing a balanced |
| **types** | Questions were primarily asked of **individuals.** Wait time was **not evident**.  Candidate **did not spread the questioning across all students.** | whole-class signaling, choral responses, or group and individual answers)  Wait time was appropriate most of the time. Called on volunteers and non-volunteers. | mix of 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 | Candidate’s academic |  |
| **quality of** | **academic feedback.** | feedback **was** focused and | feedback was **authentic and** |
| **academic** | Candidate **did not do enough** | frequent. **Most of the time the** | **frequently** given. Candidate |
| **feedback** | to support student engagement and monitor their work. | **candidate circulated** during instructional activities to support engagement and monitor student work. | **consistently** circulated offering **genuine** support **and documentation** for student engagement and monitoring of  student work. |
| **Using and** | Candidate rarely grouped | Candidate’s group activities | Candidate’s group activities |  |
| **managing the** | students for clear | adequately enhanced student | clearly enhanced student |
| **grouping of** | instructional purposes. | understanding and learning. | understanding and learning |
| **students** |  | Most students knew their roles | effectively. All students knew |
| (whole, small, |  | and responsibilities. | their roles & responsibilities. |
| pairs, or |  | Individuals were held | Individuals were **consistently** |
| individually) |  | accountable for individual 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 | content knowledge of what |
| **knowledge of** | **across lessons taught.** | was taught. **Usually** | he/she taught **and researched** |
| **content** |  | **implemented** subject-specific content strategies to enhance student content knowledge. | **to add to 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 |
| **knowledge of** | difficulties. Differentiation | anticipated learning | differentiated seamlessly so all |
| **students** | was rarely evident. | difficulties. 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. | students could 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** |  |
| **thinking** | (Analytical Thinking, | **one type (**Analytical Thinking, | **one or more types (**Analytical |
| **skills** | Practical 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 | Candidate teaches **by** |  |
|  | **problem** | opportunities for student | activities that teach **at least** | **modeling problem solving** |
|  | **solving** | problem solving or provided opportunities that are **artificial and inauthentic.** | **one** of the 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). | **and actively 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** | Candidate **consistently** set |  |
|  | **and high** | expectations for students. | **expectations**. Encouraged | high expectations **for all** |
|  | **expectations** | Students were not encouraged to learn from mistakes.  Learning experiences did not promote student success. | students to learn from mistakes. Most of the time learning opportunities allowed **most students to experience success**. Students completed  work according to candidate’s expectations. | students. 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** | Students were **well-behaved** | Students were always well |  |
|  | **student** | **behaved.** Candidate **did not** | **and on task** with minor | behaved and on task. |
|  | **behavior** | handle minor learning disruptions easily during Residency Semester.  Candidate **did not** follow MT’s classroom rules and procedures. **Candidate treated all behavior issues as major issues or all as**  **trivial; does not distinguish between them**. | learning disruptions. Candidate followed MT’s classroom rules. Candidate overlooked **some minor behavior issues**, but other times he/she addresses it, pausing the lesson. | Candidate **consistently** handled minor learning disruptions easily. Candidate **always** followed MT’s classroom rules and procedures. Disruptions were handled **appropriately and professionally.** |
|  | **Collaboration** | Candidate **does not** | Candidate incorporates **some** | Candidate **incorporates all** |  |
|  | **With MT and** | **incorporate** suggestions and | **of the suggestions and** | **suggestions** and critiques |
|  | **Residency** | critiques made in | **critiques** made in | made in collaboration with |
|  | **Supervisor** | collaboration with their MT or Residency Supervisor. | collaboration with the MT and Residency Supervisor regarding planning, teaching and assessing children. | their MT and Residency Supervisor regarding planning, teaching and assessing children. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Unacceptable (1) Below Expectations** | **Acceptable (2) At Expectations** | **Target (3)**  **Above Expectations** | **Overall Rating** |
| **Collaboration** | Candidate **fails to** | Candidate collaborates & | Candidate **communicates and** |  |
| **with** | **communicate and/or** | communicates with | **collaborates** with |
| **Professionals,** | **collaborate** with | professionals, others and with | professionals & parents in |
| **Parents and** | professionals, parents and | parents under the guidance of | meaningful ways in concert |
| **Others** | others in a meaningful way to meet the needs of all children in the classroom. | their MT to meet the specific needs of all children in the classroom. | with their MT. 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 | Most candidate-student | Candidate-student interactions |  |
| **Respectful** | **interactions were stiff**. | **interactions were friendly** | were **consistently** |
| **culture** | Candidate-student and student-student rapport was **disrespectfu**l. Candidate expressed **no interest in** students’ interests or opinions. | **and caring**. Candidate-student and student-student rapport was respectful. Candidate was receptive to interests and opinions of students. | professional, 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 reinforcement (strongest performance elements):**

**Comments of areas of refinement (lowest performance elements):**