 Evaluation Instrument for Field Experience

EDU 427 Teaching Elementary Students with Cross-Categorical Disabilities

Missouri Western State University—Department of Education

Student last name: First name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ G#: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Semester: Spring: \_\_\_\_ Fall: \_\_\_ Year: \_\_\_\_\_\_ Assigned School: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Cooperating Teacher: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Subject area(s): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Grade level: \_\_\_\_ Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Teacher candidates are evaluated on their knowledge, skills, and dispositions, aligned to national (INTASC) and Missouri education standards (MoSPE) and to the MWSU conceptual framework.

At this level of performance the teacher candidate is expected to perform at the **Consistent/Developing** level on all knowledge and skill standards on the Final evaluation.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Knowledge and Skills**

Directions: Mark the box that best describes the performance level of the teacher candidate for each of the twelve standards.

|  |
| --- |
| *Definition of Candidate Rating Descriptors (refer to the Rubric for Teacher Candidate for a detailed description)*  **Baseline – 0:** the teacher candidate possesses the necessary knowledge but cannot apply or demonstrate the performance  **Emerging – 1:** the teacher candidate possesses the necessary knowledge and **inconsistently** and somewhat effectively demonstrates the performance at the Emerging Level  **Emerging – 2:** the teacher candidate possesses the necessary knowledge and **consistently** and effectively demonstrates the performance at the Emerging Level  **Developing – 3:** the teacher candidate demonstrates consistently at the Emerging Level and is beginning to demonstrate at the Developing Level |

***Standard I—Content Knowledge:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** (0 points)  ▪ Lack of subject knowledge evident in lesson  ▪ No use of academic language  ▪ Few students engaged in learning activity  M/F | **Inconsistent** (1 point)  ▪ Frequent misconceptions of subject knowledge in lesson  ▪ Limited use of academic language while teaching  M/F  ▪ Many students engaged in learning activity | **Consistent** (2 points)  ▪ Demonstrates knowledge of subject in lesson  ▪ Consistently uses academic language while teaching  ▪ Majority of students engaged in learning activity  M/F | **Developing** (3 points)  ▪ Clear evidence of subject knowledge in every lesson  ▪ Confidently uses academic language while teaching  ▪ Students actively engaged in learning activity  M/F |
| Comments: | | | |

***Standard 2—Student Learning, Growth, and Development:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** (0 points)  ▪ Learning activities do not reflect social, cognitive, emotional, or physical developmental levels  ▪ no evidence of learning theory in teaching activities  ▪ No evidence in lessons of learning styles, multiple intelligences, and prior experience to enhance learning  M/F | **Inconsistent** (1 points)  ▪ Learning activities consider social, cognitive, emotional, and physical needs of students;  ▪ Uses learning theories to address child/adolescent development.  ▪ Little evidence of learning styles, multiple intelligences, and prior experience in the planning lessons  M/F | **Consistent** (2 points)  ▪ Learning activitiesaddress the social, cognitive, emotional, and physical developmental level of students  ▪ theory of learning used in daily teaching activities  ▪ Lesson design reflects knowledge of learning styles, multiple intelligences, and prior experience  M/F | **Developing** (3 points)  ▪ Activities and lessons designed at the social, cognitive, emotional, and physical developmental level of students  ▪ Well developed theory of learning in all lessons and activities  ▪ Lesson design includes learning styles, multiple intelligences, use of prior real world experiences to enhance instruction  M/F |
| Comments: | | | | |

***Standard 3—Curriculum Implementation:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** (0 points)  M/F  ▪ Individual student learning needs are not addressed  ▪ Lessons do not contain district, state, and national standards | **Inconsistent** (1 point)  M/F  ▪ Considers diverse student learning needs  ▪ Lessons contain district, state, and national standards | **Consistent** (2 points)  M/F  ▪ Consistent attention to diverse student learning need  ▪ Lessons include learning strategies from district, state, and national standards | **Developing** (3 points)  M/F  ▪ Recognizes needs of diverse learners and creates effective lessons  ▪ Lessons developed using differentiated strategies from district, state, and national standards |
| Comments: | | | |

***Standard 4—Critical Thinking:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** (0 points)  M/F  ▪ Appropriate instructional strategies are not included in lessons  ▪ Instructional resources are not used to improve student learning | **Inconsistent** (1 point)  M/F  ▪ Lessons include some instructional strategies to enhance student engagement  ▪ Few instructional resources are used for student learning | **Consistent** (2 points)  M/F  ▪ Instructional strategies are used to improve student engagement for problem-solving  ▪ Uses instructional resources for student learning | **Developing** (3 points)  M/F  ▪ Instructional strategies are based on effective communication to improve student engagement in problem-solving  ▪ Uses appropriate instructional resources to enhance student learning |
| Comments: | | | |

***Standard 5—Positive Classroom Environment:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** (0 points)  M/F  ▪ No management techniques used to promote learning  ▪ No transitions used and inadequate time management of activities | **Inconsistent** (1 point)  M/F  ▪ Uses a classroom management technique to enhance learning in the classroom  ▪ Attempts to manage time, transitions, and activities | **Consistent** (2 points)  ▪ Explores individualized classroom management techniques to impact learning  M/F  ▪ Manages time, transitions, activities, and classroom space to promote student learning | **Developing** (3 points)  ▪ Implements combined classroom management techniques, a positive social environment, student engagement, and group & self-motivation  M/F  ▪ Maximized student learning through time management, space, & transitions |
| Comments: | | | |

***Standard 6—Effective Communication:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** (0 points)  ▪ Little insight into differences in culture, gender, and abilities when communicating with students  M/F  ▪ No variation of technology, media or communication tools used in the classroom | **Inconsistent** (1 point)  ▪ Some understanding of differences in culture, gender, and abilities when communicating with students  M/F  ▪ Tries to communicate in the classroom with different communication tools | **Consistent** (2 points)  ▪ Recognizes different cultural, gender, intellectual, & physical abilities to communicate with students  M/F  ▪ Communicates well in the classroom through technology, media, & other tools | **Developing** (3 points)  ▪ Sensitive to cultural, gender, intellectual, & physical ability differences in students to promote effective communication  M/F  ▪ Promotion of effective interactions in the classroom through technology, media, & communication tools |
| Comments: | | | |

***Standard 7—Student Assessment and Data Analysis:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** (0 points)  ▪ Few or no assessments used to monitor student progress  ▪ No data collected or analyzed for instructional purposes  M/F  ▪ Student learning is not monitored during instruction | **Inconsistent** (1 point)  ▪ Student progress monitored through informal assessments  M/F  ▪ Limited data collected to analyze for instructional purposes  ▪ Minimal feedback used to modify instruction for learning | **Consistent** (2 points)  ▪ Formative and summative assessments used to monitor student progress  M/F  ▪ Assessment data collected for instruction  ▪ System used to monitor student learning through instruction | **Developing** (3 points)  ▪ Effective use of formative and summative assessments to monitor student progress  M/F  ▪ Assessment data used to improve student learning  ▪ Effective instruction monitored for student learning |
| Comments: | | | |

***Standard 8—Professionalism:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** (0 points)  M/F  ▪ Does not attempt self-assessment or reflect on lessons that have been taught  ▪ Does not attend or discuss professional development | **Inconsistent (**1 point)  M/F  ▪ Incomplete written or verbal reflections after lessons are completed  ▪ Attends few professional development opportunities | **Consistent (**2 points)  M/F  ▪ Uses self-assessment and reflection to make improvements  ▪ Takes advantage when offered professional development opportunity | **Developing** (3 points)  ▪ Continually makes instructional improvements through reflection and self-assessment  M/F  ▪ Actively seeks professional development opportunities |
| Comments: | | | |

***Standard 9—Professional Collaboration:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** (0 points)  M/F  ▪ Minimal effort to work with peers in order to meet student needs  ▪ No effort given to work with others to support student learning | **Inconsistent** (1 point)  M/F  ▪ Does some collegial activities to meet student needs  ▪ Will listen to peers in an attempt to support student learning | **Consistent** (2 points)  M/F  ▪ Collaborates with partners to meet student needs  ▪ Attempts to form partnerships to support student learning | **Developing** (3 points)  M/F  ▪ Actively collaborate with colleagues to meet student needs  ▪Purposefully seeks cooperative partnerships to support student learning |
| Comments: | | | |

Points earned for the INTASC/MoSPE Standards (**27 possible total points**) **A=21-27 B=15-20 C=9-14 Failing=0-8**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Cooperating Teacher Signature Date Cooperating Teacher Signature Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

MWSU Supervisor Signature Date MWSU Supervisor Signature Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Teacher Candidate Signature Date Teacher Candidate Signature Date