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

Criteria	Unacceptable (1) Below Expectations	Acceptable (2) At Expectations	Target (3) Above Expectations	Overall Rating
PLANNING				
Instructional planning	Candidate's goals **rarely 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**.	Candidate's goals were 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.**	Candidate's goals were **always 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 products	Candidate's assignments required students **to reproduce** information. Assignments **rarely** had students draw conclusions **and/or** offer support for them.	Candidate's assignments required students to interpret information rather than reproduce it. Assignments had students draw conclusions.	Candidate's assignments required 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 assessments utilized	**Some** assessments had clear measurement criteria. **Some** formative assessments were used. Assessments **used single measures** of performance.	**Most** assessments had clear measurement criteria. Formative assessments were utilized **frequently.** Assessments measured performance in more than one way.	All assessments provided clear measurement criteria. Formative **and summative** assessments were used **frequently**. Assessments measured performance in **varied and unique ways.**	
INSTRUCTION				
Knowledge of standards & objectives	**Some** objectives and standards were communicated. Expectations for student performances were **unclear**. **Some** objectives are connected to what students have learned.	**Most** objectives and standards were communicated. **Most** expectations for student performances were clear. **Most** objectives are connected to what students have learned.	All objectives and standards were **consistently** 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 motivating students	Content was meaningful to **some students**. Candidate **did not consistently** reinforce and reward student efforts. Candidate **did not** develop learning experiences where inquiry, curiosity, and exploration were valued.	Content was made **meaningful and relevant** to most students. Candidate reinforced and rewarded efforts. Candidate developed learning experiences where inquiry, curiosity, and exploration were valued.	Content was **consistently** meaningful and relevant to 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 **meaningful** 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 in Lesson Structure and Pacing	Lessons **did not always** start promptly. The lessons lacked structure and **did not clearly** 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**.	Lessons started promptly **most** of the time. The lessons contained a beginning, middle and end. Pacing was **adequate** and provided some opportunities for different learning rates. Routines and/or transitions were **mostly** organized and efficient.	**All** lessons started promptly. The lessons **clearly** contained a beginning, middle and end. 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 activities and materials	Materials and activities **did not always** support lessons' objectives. 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.	Materials and activities supported lesson objectives and sustained **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.	All materials and activities **clearly** supported lesson 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 variety of questioning types	Candidate's questions were primarily of **one type or are without** purpose or sense. Questions were primarily asked of **individuals.** Wait time was **not evident**. Candidate **did not spread the questioning across all students.**	Candidate's questions were **varied and balanced**. Required active responses (e.g. whole-class signaling, choral responses, or group and individual answers) Wait time was appropriate most of the time. Called on volunteers and non-volunteers.	Candidate's questions were varied, **creative**, and high quality providing a balanced 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 quality of academic feedback	Candidate **rarely offered academic feedback.** Candidate **did not do enough** to support student engagement and monitor their work.	Candidate's academic feedback **was** focused and frequent. **Most of the time the candidate circulated** during instructional activities to support engagement and monitored student work.	Candidate's academic feedback was **authentic and frequently** given. Candidate **consistently** circulated offering **genuine** support **and documentation** for student engagement and monitoring of student work.	
Using and managing the grouping of students (whole, small, pairs, or individually)	Candidate rarely grouped students for clear instructional purposes.	Candidate's group activities adequately enhanced student understanding and learning. Most students knew their roles and responsibilities. Individuals were held accountable for individual and/or group work. Instructional group composition was not varied consistently (e.g. race, gender, ability, and age).	Candidate's group activities clearly enhanced student understanding and learning effectively. All students knew their roles & responsibilities. Individuals were **consistently held** accountable for individual and/or group work. Instructional group composition varied (e.g. race, gender, ability, and age).	
Teacher candidate knowledge of content	Candidate **did not display accurate content knowledge across lessons taught.**	Candidate displayed accurate content knowledge of what was taught. **Usually implemented** subject-specific content strategies to enhance student content knowledge.	Candidate displayed accurate content knowledge of what he/she taught **and researched to add to the content being taught when needed. Consistently** implemented subject-specific content strategies to enhance student content knowledge.	
Teacher candidate knowledge of students	Candidate was indifferent to students' learning needs and difficulties. Differentiation was rarely evident.	Candidate displayed understandings of students' anticipated learning 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.	Candidate clearly anticipated students' needs and differentiated seamlessly so all students could master the concepts. Incorporated student interests and cultural heritage in respectful and meaningful ways.	
Promoting thinking skills	Candidate **did not** teach any (Analytical Thinking, 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.	**Candidate thoroughly taught one type (**Analytical Thinking, 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.	Candidate **thoroughly taught one or more types (**Analytical 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 problem solving	Candidate **rarely** provided opportunities for student problem solving or provided opportunities that are **artificial and inauthentic.**	Candidate implements activities that teach **at least 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).	Candidate teaches **by modeling problem solving 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 and high expectations	Candidate **did not** set high expectations for students. Students were not encouraged to learn from mistakes. Learning experiences did not promote student success.	Candidate set **high expectations**. Encouraged 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.	Candidate **consistently** set high expectations **for all** students. Candidate created learning experiences where mistakes were helpful and where success is built in. **All students met or exceeded candidate's expectations.**	
Managing student behavior	Students were **not well behaved.** Candidate **did not** handle minor 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**.	Students were **well-behaved and on task** with minor learning disruptions. Candidate followed PIM's classroom rules. Candidate overlooked **some minor behavior issues**, but other times he/she addresses it, pausing the lesson.	Students were always well behaved and on task. Candidate **consistently** handled minor learning disruptions easily. Candidate **always** followed PIM's classroom rules and procedures. Disruptions were handled **appropriately and professionally.**	
Collaboration With MT and Clinical Supervisor	Candidate **does not incorporate** suggestions and critiques made in collaboration with their MT or Clinical Supervisor.	Candidate incorporates **some of the suggestions and critiques** made in collaboration with the MT and Clinical Supervisor regarding planning, teaching, and assessing children.	Candidate **incorporates all suggestions** and critiques made in collaboration with their MT and Clinical Supervisor regarding 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 Respectful culture	Candidate-student **interactions were stiff**. Candidate-student and student-student rapport was **disrespectful**. Candidate expressed **no interest in** students' interests or opinions.	Most candidate-student **interactions were friendly and caring**. Candidate-student and student-student rapport was respectful. Candidate was receptive to interests and opinions of students.	Candidate-student interactions were **consistently** 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):