

---

## **Part 1: Secondary Assessment (NCTE SPA Standards)**

---

### **INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE (IPFW) College of Education and Public Policy**



#### **Department of Educational Studies *Secondary English/Language Arts FINAL ST Evaluation***

As part of understanding what knowledge, skills, and dispositions our students possess, we are asking you to complete an end-of-clinical evaluation. This tool is comprised of three different parts. The first part is based on the National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE) standards for beginning teachers. The second part contains knowledge and skills as outlined by InTASC and CAEP, our accrediting body. The last part asks to you to consider the dispositions that are valued by the faculty at IPFW. In other words, these dispositions align with our Conceptual Framework. You will also be asked to provide a narrative summary of the Student Teacher's performance. Thank you in advance for the time you put into this evaluation -- it is very important to us and the Student Teacher.

---

The results of this evaluation will be collected by the Student Teaching office as well as forwarded to the e-mails listed below:

---

Results are also collected by IPFW Field Services Office.

---

### Evaluation Information:

---

|                                  |                      |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Date of Evaluation<br>mm/dd/yyyy | <input type="text"/> |
| Teacher Candidate<br>Name        | <input type="text"/> |
| Teacher Candidate<br>E-mail      | <input type="text"/> |
| School                           | <input type="text"/> |
| Grade Level                      | <input type="text"/> |
| University Supervisor<br>Name    | <input type="text"/> |
| University Supervisor<br>E-mail  | <input type="text"/> |
| Cooperating Teacher<br>Name      | <input type="text"/> |
| Cooperating Teacher<br>E-mail    | <input type="text"/> |

The person completing this form is:

---

- Cooperating Teacher
- University Supervisor

### Indicator 1: Democratic learning environment that accounts for and respects diverse learners

NCTE Standard 5.2

---

#### TARGET

Candidate uses data about students' individual differences, identities, and funds of knowledge to create inclusive ELA learning environments that contextualize curriculum.

Candidate creates opportunities for students to analyze how social context affects learning. Candidate monitors personal language use and behavior in terms of demonstrating respect for individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability.



#### ACCEPTABLE

Candidate creates and sustains ELA learning environments that promote respect for and support of individual differences, identities, and funds of knowledge. Candidate is respectful in behavior and language use in response to individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability.



#### UNACCEPTABLE

Candidate shows limited ability to create ELA learning environments that promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability.



## Indicator 2: Management of classroom learning environment

### NCTE Standard 5.2

#### TARGET

Candidate creates literate classroom communities by presenting varied structures and techniques for group interactions, by employing effective classroom management strategies, and by providing students with opportunities for feedback and reflection. Candidate provides rich opportunities for students to confront inaccurate preconceptions and participate actively in their own ELA learning.



#### ACCEPTABLE

Candidate creates classroom learning environments and experiences to promote whole-class, small-group, and individual work. Candidate uses grouping strategies to confront inaccurate preconceptions and facilitate active participation in ELA learning.



#### UNACCEPTABLE

Candidate demonstrates limited ability to create an inclusive learning environment that contributes to students' active learning, progress, and success in the ELA classroom.



## Indicator 3: Curricular/instructional planning

### NCTE Standard 5.1

#### TARGET

Candidate understands the purposes and characteristics of different kinds of curricula and relates them to curricular requirements and standards. Candidate selects teaching resources or creates instructional materials that are consistent with what is currently known about student learning in ELA.



#### ACCEPTABLE

Candidate examines and selects resources for instruction such as textbooks, other print materials, videos, films, records, and software, ensuring that they reflect curricular requirements and standards and that they are appropriate for supporting the teaching of ELA.



#### UNACCEPTABLE

Candidate shows limited skill in evaluating, and selecting appropriate resources for instruction, including print-based texts, videos, films, records, and software, based on state standards and in support of teaching ELA



**Indicator 4: Interdisciplinary teaching strategies/collaboration****NCTE Standard 3.6**

---

**TARGET**

Candidate works/collaborates with teachers in other content areas or through professional development opportunities in the English language arts to design opportunities for students to connect important ideas, concepts, and skills with similar ones in other disciplines.

**ACCEPTABLE**

Candidate collaborates with teachers of other content areas to integrate interdisciplinary teaching strategies and materials into the ELA classroom.

**UNACCEPTABLE**

Candidate uses few interdisciplinary teaching strategies and materials; demonstrates no consistent collaboration with teachers of other content areas.

**Indicator 5: Student engagement with content**

---

**TARGET**

Candidate engages students in discovering their personal response to texts, materials, and performances, and/or ways to connect such responses to other larger meanings and critical stances in the English language arts.

**ACCEPTABLE**

Candidate engages students in making meaning of texts, materials, and performances through personal response.

**UNACCEPTABLE**

Candidate focuses on engaging students to make meaning of text, materials, and performances in isolation of a greater personal response.



## Indicator 6: Classroom discussion/critical thinking

## NCTE Standard 5.4

**TARGET**

Candidate uses a variety of instructional strategies and teaching resources to help students participate in dialogue and critical thinking within the community of learners.

Candidate makes explicit for all students the speech and related behaviors appropriate for conversing about ideas presented through oral, written, visual, or digital media to support what is known about student learning in ELA.

**ACCEPTABLE**

Candidate engages students often

in meaningful discussions for the purposes of interpreting, evaluating, and critiquing ideas presented through oral, written, visual, or digital media.

Candidate supports what is known about student learning in ELA.

**UNACCEPTABLE**

Candidate engages in teacherstudent talk, rather than facilitating student-student conversations, demonstrating limited understanding of how to engage students effectively in discussion for the purposes of student learning in ELA.



## Indicator 7: Effective language skills for composing

## NCTE Standard 4.1

**TARGET**

Candidate integrates throughout the English language arts curriculum standards-based learning opportunities in which students—individually and collaboratively—demonstrate their abilities to use language—including home and community languages—to generate a range of text types for a variety of purposes and audiences.

**ACCEPTABLE**

Candidate engages students in standards-based learning experiences that consistently emphasize varied uses and purposes for language, including home and community languages.

**UNACCEPTABLE**

Candidate frequently uses instructional practices that promote a singular use and purpose for language.



**Indicator 8: Assessment: Literature and reading**

## NCTE Standards 3.2

**TARGET**

Candidate demonstrates consistent use of a variety of appropriate reading- and literature-focused assessments—formal and informal, formative and summative—to gauge students' interpretive, critical, and evaluative abilities across the language arts (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and presenting). Candidate uses information gleaned from such assessments to inform future instruction.

**ACCEPTABLE**

Candidate demonstrates consistent use of appropriate reading- and literature-focused assessments to evaluate students' abilities in the English language arts. Assessments are designed in ways that stand to inform future instruction.

**UNACCEPTABLE**

Candidate fails to demonstrate consistent use of appropriate reading- and literature-focused assessments to evaluate student performance or assessments are not designed and/or interpreted in ways that inform future instruction.

**Indicator 9: Assessment: Language use and composition**

## NCTE Standards 4.2

**ACCEPTABLE****TARGET**

Candidate creates research-based assessments for writing that are varied—formal and informal, formative and summative—for her/his own use and for selfassessment by students. Data derived from the tools are used to individualize instruction, engage students' ideas, and scaffold student growth as writers over time.



Candidate demonstrates consistent use of a variety of writing-focused assessments—formal and informal, formative and summative—to enhance students' development as writers.

Assessments are appropriate to the writing task and consistent with current research.

Candidate uses information gleaned from such assessments to inform future instruction and encourage student growth as writers.

**UNACCEPTABLE**

Candidate inconsistently uses writing-focused assessments that contribute to students' development as writers or uses assessments that are not designed and/or interpreted in ways that inform future instruction and support student growth as writers.



## Indicator 10: Content knowledge mastery: Literature and multimedia texts

## NCTE Standard 1.1

| <b>TARGET</b>   | <b>ACCEPTABLE</b>   |  | <b>UNACCEPTABLE</b>  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Candidate demonstrates extensive, accurate, and integrated content knowledge as it relates to the study of various texts: fiction and nonfiction, print and non-print, classic and contemporary. Candidate uses knowledge to enhance instruction and to support students in making meaning of texts featured in a standards-based English language arts (ELA) curriculum.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">○</p> | <p>Candidate demonstrates adequate content knowledge as it relates to the study of various texts: fiction and nonfiction, print and nonprint, classic and contemporary.</p> | <p>Candidate uses knowledge to support students in making meaning of texts featured in a standards-based ELA curriculum.</p> | <p>Content knowledge limits the candidate's capacity to support students in making meaning of texts featured in a standardsbased ELA curriculum. Candidate is not open to corrections and instead tries to cover up deficiencies.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">○</p> |
| <p>Candidate handles mistakes with grace and communicates openness to learning.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">○</p>  |   |  |  |

## Indicator 11: Content knowledge mastery: Language use and composition

NCTE Standards 2.1, 2.2

**TARGET**

Candidate demonstrates extensive, accurate, and integrated content knowledge as it relates to language use and composition. Candidate uses such knowledge to enhance instruction and to support students as they engage in the recursive process of writing formal and informal texts for various audiences, purposes, and rhetorical situations, using contemporary technologies as appropriate.

**ACCEPTABLE**

Candidate demonstrates adequate content knowledge as it relates to language use and composition. Candidate uses knowledge to support students in writing formal and informal texts for various audiences, purposes, and rhetorical situations, using contemporary technologies as appropriate. Candidate handles mistakes with grace and communicates openness to learning.

**UNACCEPTABLE**

Candidate demonstrates weaknesses in content knowledge as it relates to language use and composition. Candidate does not recognize writing as a recursive process and/or is not open to corrections but instead tries to cover up deficiencies.



Comments on the NCTE Standards.

**\*\* You have now completed Part 1. Please verify your answers before hitting the button to continue to Parts 2 and 3. \*\***

**Part 2 - Unit-wide Assessment (CAEP/InTASC Stnds)**


---



## Learners & Learning

The candidate regularly assesses development and learning of each student and uses that information to scaffold to next levels.

InTASC #1

CAEP 1.1

### Target

Candidate regularly assesses learning (e.g., performance, abilities, and skills) of individuals and the group. Data are used to design responsive curriculum and instruction to scaffold the next level of learning.



### Acceptable

Candidate assesses, albeit inconsistently, learning (e.g., performance, abilities, and skills) of individuals and the group. Data are used to design responsive curriculum and instruction to meet learners' needs.



### Unacceptable

Candidate infrequently assesses learning for individuals and group. Curriculum and instruction are selected without reference to learning characteristics.



## Content Knowledge

Candidate uses interactive technology efficiently and effectively to achieve content-specific learning goals.

InTASC #5

CAEP 1.5

### Target

Candidate engages students in use of and critical analysis of different media and communication technologies in their content area to achieve specific learning goals. The media are used in such a way that students are helped to reflect on the content of their learning.



### Acceptable

Candidate engages students in use and critical analysis of different media and communication technologies that are applicable and connected to the specific learning goals for the content area.



### Unacceptable

Candidate uses different media and communication technologies that are generic in nature (i.e., not connected directly to the specific content area) or have limited utility for enriching learning in the content area. Students are not encouraged to respond critically to the technology selected.



## Content Knowledge

Candidate engages students in making meaning of the content by examining it through diverse perspectives and personal responses.

InTASC #4

CAEP 1.1

---

### Target

Candidate engages students in discovering meaning of the content by questioning and analyzing ideas from diverse perspectives in content texts, materials, performances, and/or labs. Students are challenged to connect their personal responses to other larger meanings and critical stances in the content area.



### Acceptable

Candidate engages students in making meaning of content texts, materials, performances, or labs by providing diverse materials and opportunities for personal response.



### Unacceptable

Candidate provides content text, materials, performances, and/or labs from limited perspectives, thus restricting the students' ability to engage in making meaning. Or, candidates might over-emphasize students' personal responses to the content.



## Instructional Practice

Candidate uses both formative and summative assessment to document learning.

InTASC #6

CAEP 1.1

---

### Target

Candidate balances the use of formative and summative assessments, as appropriate, to support, verify, and document learning.



### Acceptable

Candidate uses both formative and summative assessments to document learning.



### Unacceptable

Candidate relies significantly on one assessment method over the other. Data are used to demonstrate what students do not know or are unable to do.



### Instructional Practice

The candidate selects learning experiences that reflect curriculum goals and content standards while being relevant to learners.

InTASC #7

CAEP 1.1

---

#### Target

Candidate creates learning experiences that are meaningful to learners due to students' contextual variables and prior knowledge. The experiences also align to curriculum and content standards



#### Acceptable

Candidate selects learning experiences based on students' prior knowledge. The experiences also reflect curriculum and content standards, yet sometimes not directly.



#### Unacceptable

Candidate follows curriculum guides or sequence with minimal consideration to how meaningful experiences are for learners or for addressing content standards.



### Instructional Practice

Candidates use technology to support student learning through gathering, interpreting, evaluating, and applying information.

InTASC #8

CAEP 1.1

---

#### Target

Technology tools are used to access, interpret, evaluate, and apply information. Candidate uses the technology to engage the students in higher order thinking skills. In addition, technology is age appropriate, and builds student creativity, communication, and/or collaboration skills.



#### Acceptable

Technology is used to access, interpret, evaluate, and apply information. In addition, it is age appropriate and supports student learning.



#### Unacceptable

Technology use focuses on accessing information or repeating information, rather than supporting student learning. The approach may also lack engagement or be age inappropriate.



## Professional Responsibility

The candidate uses a variety of self-assessment strategies to analyze and reflect on his/her practice.

InTASC #9

CAEP 3.6

### Target

Candidate creates a plan for reflecting on practices during and after instruction. The data gathered via the strategies are analyzed and used to make a variety of adaptations/adjustments (e.g., organizational, instructional, materials, etc.) that benefit the students.



### Acceptable

Candidate creates a plan for reflecting on practice after instruction occurs. The data gathered via the strategies are analyzed and used to make improvements to future instructional plans.



### Unacceptable

Candidate reflects on practice in an unplanned, unsystematic way or only when prompted by someone to do so. Experiences are reflected on in a holistic manner without reference to specific data. In addition, the candidate may lack links between changes made and data collected.



## Professional Responsibility

The candidate understands laws related to learners' rights and teacher responsibilities.

InTASC #9

CAEP 3.6

### Target

Candidate understands and appropriately applies educational laws, especially confidentiality, requirements for reporting child abuse and neglect and discrimination/harassment/bullying.



### Acceptable

Candidate demonstrates a firm understanding of educational laws, especially confidentiality, requirements for reporting child abuse and neglect and discrimination/harassment/bullying.



### Unacceptable

Candidate demonstrates misunderstandings or gaps in knowledge concerning educational laws, especially confidentiality, requirements for reporting child abuse and neglect and/or discrimination/harassment/bullying.



## Professional Responsibility

The candidate demonstrates professional ethics and respect for others in the use of technology (e.g., learning management system, social media).

InTASC #9

CAEP 1.5

---

| <b>Target</b>   | <b>Acceptable</b>  | <b>Unacceptable</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Candidate explicitly teaches and supports students' application of digital citizenship characteristics. When necessary, family members are notified in advance of classroom activities.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></p> | <p>Candidate follows characteristics of digital citizenship when developing lesson plans that incorporate technology. Reminders or prompts for students are outlined. When necessary, family members are notified in advance of classroom activities.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></p> | <p>Candidate does not acknowledge, support, or follow components of digital citizenship for self or students. Family members are not notified in advance of classroom activities when it was necessary.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></p> |

**\*\* You have now completed Parts 1 and 2; please verify your answers before hitting the button to continue on to Part 3.**

---

### Part 3: Unit-wide Disposition Assessment (CAEP/InTASC Stnds)

College of Education and Public Policy

Disposition Assessment

---

Indicator 1: DEMOCRACY & COMMUNITY: Builds a community based on belief that each **child/adolescent (c/a)** can learn to high levels.

InTASC #2

CAEP 3.3

### Target

Communicates through words and actions that each c/a can learn to high levels. Communicates faith in values, strengths, and competencies of each c/a and family. Communicates high expectations through design and delivery of challenging curriculum and assessments that foster high-level skills for each c/a.



### ACCEPTABLE

Communicates through words and actions that each c/a can learn to high levels. Communicates positive perspectives about c/a and families. Supplements prescribed curriculum with enrichment experiences that reflect some c/a's lives outside of school.



### UNACCEPTABLE

Communicates through words and actions that some (not all) c/a can learn to high levels. Communicates negative perspectives about a c/a or families. Sets minimal expectations for c/a performance. Seeks minimal information about c/a's lives outside of school, usually in response to a problem.



Indicator 2: DEMOCRACY & COMMUNITY: Values diversity and uses it to create inclusive classroom.

InTASC # 2

CAEP 3.3

### TARGET

Value in culturally responsive practices is evident in delivery of instruction, such as cooperative learning, storytelling, and acceptance of code-switching in oral and written discourse. In conjunction with c/a, identifies biases in curricular materials, pedagogical practices, and assessments, and makes appropriate adjustments.



### ACCEPTABLE

Supplements prescribed curriculum through integration of multicultural literature and content. Engages c/a in dialogue to find out their perceptions and understandings about the world and their place in it. Builds multiple perspectives into classroom activities and assignments.



### UNACCEPTABLE

Displays a negative attitude towards diversity OR displays a superficial understanding of it. Perspective of dominant group dictates classroom materials, activities, and assignments.



**Indicator 3: HABITS OF MIND:** Relentless in belief about the importance of teachers using critical thinking, reflection, and professional development to grow as a teacher.

InTASC # 9

---

**TARGET**

Independently reflects on effectiveness of teaching by asking critical questions. Approaches professional growth from a critical thinking, inquiry perspective. Seeks out opportunities within learning environment to grow as a professional.



**ACCEPTABLE**

Makes changes to practices in response to feedback. Participates in professional development opportunities, including professional learning communities, scholarly endeavors, and/or teacher research.



**UNACCEPTABLE**

Overly dependent on feedback from others OR disregards feedback provided. Actively avoids engaging intellectually in professional development opportunities



**Indicator 4: HABITS OF MIND:** Committed to designing meaningful, intellectually engaging curriculum.

InTASC # 7

CAEP 3.3

---

**TARGET**

Makes c/a's habits of mind visible through inquiries or investigations (critiquing, questioning, analyzing, evaluating). Ties together multiple concepts so that similarities and differences are understood by c/a.



**ACCEPTABLE**

Creates a context that is supportive in developing c/a's habits of mind. Encourages multiple pathways for solving problems. Judiciously utilizes worksheets or tests.



**UNACCEPTABLE**

Engages in behaviors that result in intellectual dependency of c/a, for example, show, tell, and demonstrate. Teaches one way to solve a problem and accepts only that method. Follows teaching manual, curriculum guides, or colleagues without evaluating potential engagement levels by c/a's.



## Indicator 5: ADVOCACY:

Willingness to engage ethical responsibilities to help each child learn.

InTASC # 9

CAEP 3.3

| <b>TARGET</b>   | <b>ACCEPTABLE</b>  | <b>UNACCEPTABLE</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| Creates innovative solutions to issues of classroom complexity and learning environments. Collaborates with multiple stakeholders before developing a plan for success for a c/a. Consistently uses ethical guidelines to inform decision making. | Generates standard, technical, or traditional solutions to issues. Coordinates actions with colleagues to meet students' learning needs. Uses ethical guidelines, albeit inconsistently, in decision making. | Relies on others to identify issues and/or solutions. Important educational decisions are made independently without communicating with families or colleagues. Violates ethical guidelines such as confidentiality when making decisions. |
| <input type="radio"/>   | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  |

## Indicator 6: ADVOCACY: Persistent in advocating for and promoting the profession.

InTASC # 10

CAEP 3.3

| <b>TARGET</b>  | <b>ACCEPTABLE</b>  | <b>UNACCEPTABLE</b>   |
|--|--|---|
| Advocates for the mission of the school through involvement in events that extend beyond the school day. OR Engages in public pedagogy on educational issues or the teaching profession. | Projects positive view of profession to others. When appropriate, reframes negative comments about c/a, families, colleagues, or the profession. | Initiates or adds to negativity about c/a, families, colleagues, or profession, projecting a negative view of the profession to others. |
| <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/>   |

**COMMENTS - This is the most important part of the student teacher FINAL evaluation.** This narrative summary should be reasonably detailed, complete, and accurate, including reference to specific examples of the student teacher's skills. It should address the student teacher's abilities and readiness to be a first-year teacher. The summary should include your recommendation of the student teacher's potential as a member of the profession. Please remember that many times candidates are required to include this as part of their job application packet.



## Final Recommendation

---

- Recommend for licensing
- Recommend for licensing with reservations
- I do not recommend for licensing

Powered by Qualtrics