CSDS 258/268 Final Student Teacher/Intern Evaluation Form

Please complete this evaluation form for each candidate you are mentoring.

Date: _____ **School Site:** _____

Candidate's First Name: _____ **Candidate's Last Name:** _____

Univ. Supervisor: _____ **Mentor Teacher:** _____

Grade/Content Area: _____ **Teacher's Email:** _____

Criterion	Performance Rating				
	Does Not Meet Expectations ◯ 1	**Meets Expectations** ◯ 2	**Meets Expectations at a High Level** ◯ 3	**Exceeds Expectations** ◯ 4	**Score**
Maintaining Effective Environments – TPEs 2.1, 2.3, 2.6, 7.14	Expectations for, and responses to, behavior are limited to inappropriate for maintaining control of the class. Routines are unclear or ineffective. Did not use assistive technology in the classroom.	Expectations for, and responses to, behavior are designed to maintain control of the class. Routines focus primarily on management. Utilizes limited assistive technology in the classroom.	Expectations for, and responses to, behavior are designed to maintain control of the class and promote positive, fair and respectful treatment of students. Routines are designed to facilitate learning, not just management. Utilizes assistive technology appropriately.	Expectations for, and responses to, behavior are designed to promote individual responsibility, multiple perspectives, and an inclusive environment for all students. Routines are designed to facilitate independent learning and regular student-to-student interactions. Utilizes assistive technology effectively.	
	Does Not Meet Expectations ◯ 1	**Meets Expectations** ◯ 2	**Meets Expectations at a High Level** ◯ 3	**Exceeds Expectations** ◯ 4	**Score**
Monitoring Student Learning and Making Adjustments using ELA or ELA standards during Lessons – TPEs 1.8, 3.2, 7.11	No or limited monitoring of students and adjustment to the lesson. Focus is on external factors (e.g., time, schedule) rather than using ELA or ELD standards to meet student learning needs or student behavior.	Monitoring of students and adjustment to the lesson are focused primarily on behavior or lesson structure rather than using ELA or ELD standards to meet student learning needs.	Monitoring of students and adjustment to the lesson using ELA or ELD standards are focused on student learning and engagement.	Monitoring students and adjusting the lesson using ELA or ELD standards are focused on providing access to the content for specific students and encouraging active engagement by all students.	

	Does Not Meet Expectations ◯ **1**	**Meets Expectations** ◯ **2**	**Meets Expectations at a High Level** ◯ **3**	**Exceeds Expectations** ◯ **4**	**Score**
Subject-Specific Pedagogy – TPEs 1.3, 1.5, 3.1, 3.3, 4.4, 4.7, 7.8, 7.9	Lesson objectives and instruction are not clearly related to content knowledge or literacy development. Instruction is: (a) ineffective or inconsistent with current subject-specific pedagogy, (b) includes a limited variety in instructional and engagement strategies.	Lesson objectives and instruction primarily address either content knowledge or literacy development, focusing primarily on lower levels of learning. Instruction is: (a) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy, (b) includes a variety of instructional and engagement strategies.	Lesson objectives and instruction clearly address both content knowledge and literacy development, including a focus on higher level learning. Instruction is: (a) consistent with current subject- specific pedagogy, (b) includes a variety of instructional and engagement strategies, (c) provides opportunities for critical and creative thinking.	Lesson objectives and instruction seamlessly integrate content knowledge and literacy development, focusing on higher level learning and real world connections. Instruction is: (a) consistent with current subject specific pedagogy, (b) includes a variety of instructional and engagement strategies, (c) provides opportunities for critical and creative thinking, (d) utilizes a range of communication or activity modes.	
	Does Not Meet Expectations ◯ **1**	**Meets Expectations** ◯ **2**	**Meets Expectations at a High Level** ◯ **3**	**Exceeds Expectations** ◯ **4**	**Score**
Addressing Needs of All Students – TPEs 1.6, 4.1, 5.8, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.10, 7.12	Instructional approaches are limited or inappropriate for at least two of the following groups: (a) different levels of English proficiency, students with identified special needs, including dyslexia, (c) students with different instructional needs, (d) did not develop students' foundational skills or probe students based on their prior knowledge, and (e) does not collaborate with multidisciplinary teams when determining eligibility for special education services, interpreting assessment results, and planning necessary adaptations	Instructional approaches are generally appropriate for at least two of the following groups: (a) different levels of English proficiency, (b) students with identified special needs, including dyslexia, (c) students with different instructional needs, (d) develop foundational skills and limit probing students based on their prior knowledge, and (e) collaborate appropriately with multidisciplinary teams when determining eligibility for special education services, interpreting assessment results,	Instructional approaches are specifically aligned with the needs of at least two of the following groups: (a) different levels of English proficiency, (b) students with identified special needs, including dyslexia, students with different instructional needs, (d) develop students' foundational skills and probing students based on their prior knowledge, and (e) collaborate with multidisciplinary teams when determining eligibility for special education services, interpreting assessment results, and planning necessary adaptations (accommodations and modifications) for deaf students who may have a secondary disability, such as dyslexia or another disability that impacts	Instructional approaches are specifically aligned with the needs of all the following groups: (a) different levels of English proficiency, (b) students with identified special needs, including dyslexia, students with different instructional needs, (d) develop students' foundational skills and probing students based on their prior knowledge, and (e) collaborate effectively with multidisciplinary teams when determining eligibility for special education services, interpreting assessment results, and planning necessary adaptations (accommodations and modifications) for deaf students who may have a secondary disability,	

	(accommodations and modifications) for deaf students who may have a secondary disability, such as dyslexia or another disability that impacts literacy development.	and planning necessary adaptations (accommodations and modifications) for deaf students who may have a secondary disability, such as dyslexia or another disability that impacts literacy development.	literacy development.	such as dyslexia or another disability that impacts literacy development.	
	Does Not Meet Expectations ○ **1**	**Meets Expectations** ○ **2**	**Meets Expectations at a High Level** ○ **3**	**Exceeds Expectations** ○ **4**	**Score**
Assessment – TPEs 4.3, 5.2, 7.3	(a) lack congruence with learning outcomes and level of learning (e.g., DOK level), (b) include little or no attention to the assessment of content knowledge or literacy instruction, (c) reflect a "one size fits all" method of assessment.	(a) are congruent with learning objectives in either content or level of learning (e.g., DOK level), (b) primarily assess either content knowledge or literacy instruction, (c) reflect some variety of methods for students to demonstrate learning, (d) primarily assess lower level learning.	(a) are congruent with learning objectives in content and level of learning (e.g., DOK level), include assessment of both content knowledge and literacy instruction, (c) reflect a variety of methods for students to demonstrate learning, (d) includes assessment of higher level thinking (e.g., complex task).	are congruent with learning objectives in content and level of learning (e.g., DOK level), include assessment of both content knowledge and literacy instruction, (c) reflect a variety of methods for students to demonstrate learning, (d) includes assessment of higher level thinking (e.g., complex task), e) include student choice or ways to demonstrate learning.	

Rubric Score:

Rubric Mean:

Professional Competencies:	**Yes**	**No**
Takes initiative.	☐	☐
Handles information about children, peers, families, colleagues, and supervisors ethically.	☐	☐
	☐	☐
	☐	☐

Accepts criticism and suggestions from the Mentor Teacher and/or University Supervisor.

Is punctual (arrives on time, submits assignments in a timely manner, etc.)

Respects the attitudes and opinions of others.

Has attended a professional conference, in-service, IEP, or Parent-Teacher meetings.

University Supervisor Comments (Candidate's strengths, areas for growth, other comments):

Mentor Teacher Comments (Candidate's strengths, areas for growth, other comments):

Teacher Candidate Comments:

University Supv's Signature:

Teacher Candidate's Signature:

Mentor Teacher's Signature:

School ADM's Signature (optional):

Enter date University Supv verified the Time Log:

University Supv's Recommendation:

Yes, I recommend the Candidate to continue in the program. ☐

No, I do not recommend the Candidate to complete the program (please submit a Statement of Concern form). ☐