UNIVERSITY *of* VIRGINIA | SCHOOL *of* EDUCATION *and* HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Teacher Education Internship Evaluation

....

The internship evaluation provides a framework for interns, mentor teachers, and clinical coaches to monitor and support interns' growth during the internship sequence. Developed in collaboration with P-12 stakeholders, the internship evaluation measures interns' development on competencies aligned to the Virginia Department of Education's Uniform Performance Standards for Teachers and the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers.

Table of Contents

ADMINISTRATION

At designated times throughout the clinical experience sequence, interns, mentors, and coaches complete the intern evaluation. All stakeholders complete the evaluation in the Anthology Portfolio system. The instrument includes space for evaluators to leave open-ended comments tagged to specific items and on the candidates' overall performance. After completing the evaluation on their own, candidates meet with their mentor teachers and clinical coaches to discuss the results and set professional development goals.

The internship evaluation is used in conjunction with additional formative feedback opportunities throughout the semester. Details about all formative and summative feedback opportunities are included in materials available on the clinical experience website.

Degree	Administration	Evaluators
Master of Teaching (1 year, full-time, on grounds)	Internship I - Fall • Final evaluation (formative) Internship II - Spring • Midterm evaluation (formative) • Final evaluation (summative)	Intern (self-evaluation) Mentor Teacher Clinical Coach
Master of Teaching (2-3 years. part-time, online)	Practicum • Final evaluation (formative) Internship • Midterm evaluation (formative) • Final evaluation (summative)	Intern (self-evaluation) Mentor Teacher Clinical Coach
Bachelor of Science in Education (2 years, full-time, on grounds)	Practicum - 3rd Year Spring • Final practicum evaluation (formative)[1] Internship I - 4th year Fall • Final evaluation (formative) Internship II - 4th year Spring • Midterm evaluation (formative) • Final evaluation (summative)	Intern (self-evaluation) Mentor Teacher Clinical Coach

[1] During the 3rd year practicum, candidates and their mentor teachers complete a **practicum evaluation**. This shortened version of the internship evaluation helps candidates identify specific areas of strength and opportunities for improvement as they move forward to the yearlong internship sequence, providing an additional scaffold for undergraduate students. A copy of the practicum evaluation is included in this guide.

USE OF DATA

Teacher candidates have access to their assessment results in the Anthology Portfolio system. After completing the evaluation on their own, candidates review their results in preparation for a conference with the mentor teacher and clinical coach. At the conference, stakeholders discuss the results and work together to help the candidate set professional development goals.

Teacher Education faculty and staff have access to candidates' assessment results in the Anthology Portfolio system. Clinical experience faculty review their candidates' results to monitor candidate progress and make instructional decisions. Intern evaluation data may be used to identify students in need of Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) to support their continued success in the program. Data from the intern evaluation may be used to craft the expectations and supports outlined in candidates' PIPs.

At the program level, the Teacher Education office aggregates data and shares these data with program faculty and clinical partners to support program revision and review.

SCORING PROCEDURE

During each evaluation period, the intern completes a self-evaluation, while the mentor and coach complete evaluations of the intern. After completing their evaluations, the intern, mentor teacher, and clinical coach meet to discuss areas of strength and next steps for growth.

Performance level descriptors are specific to each criterion and describe expected competency, skills, and performance at each level. There are four categories on the evaluation rating scale: exemplary, proficient, developing, and unacceptable.

- **Unacceptable** refers to consistent performance below the established standard or in a manner that is inconsistent with the school's mission and goals. If a candidate scores in the unacceptable range, the mentor, coach, and internship instructor (university faculty member) meet with the candidate to discuss strategies for improving performance. A performance improvement plan may be established, and the candidate's status in the program may be placed under review.
- **Developing** refers to inconsistent performance below the established standard expressed in the evaluation criteria. A developing teacher candidate's performance may require more support than is typically provided to a first-year teacher. UVA teacher candidates are developing throughout much of the program, and candidates should expect to see some developing ratings during early practicum experiences, Internship I, and a portion of Internship II.
- **Proficient** refers to performance that consistently demonstrates a particular competency or indicator expressed in the evaluation criteria. A proficient teacher candidate's performance requires only the support routinely provided to first year teachers. The program expectation is that candidates will be proficient in most or all areas by the end of the teacher education program, and this is the target rating.
- **Exemplary** refers to performance, accomplishments, and behaviors that consistently and considerably surpass the established standard and the expectations of a first-year teacher. Candidates may be exemplary in a few areas at the end of the program, but there is no expectation that teacher candidates are exemplary in all areas.

The internship evaluation is a developmental continuum, and **the expectation is that interns meet the proficient rating in most or all areas by the end of the teacher education program**. The program does not expect interns to be proficient in every area during early clinical experiences, nor are interns expected or required to earn exemplary ratings by the end of the program.

Directions for completing the internship evaluation in Anthology Portfolio are available on the clinical experience website and are shared via email during the evaluation periods.

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT AND REVISION

2011-2012: Initial Rubric Development

When the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) implemented a new standards framework in 2012, UVA Teacher Education faculty created a new intern evaluation to align with this framework. Developed in collaboration with P-12 stakeholders, including practicing teachers and school leaders, the internship evaluation measures interns' development on competencies aligned to VDOE's Uniform Performance Standards for Teachers (VUPS) and the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers. This guide includes a crosswalk between the VUPS, InTASC standards, and the internship evaluation.

2019-20: Rubric Revision and Pilot

In fall 2018, the Teacher Education faculty identified a need to review and revise the intern evaluation. Interns, mentor teachers, and clinical coaches provided feedback, primarily about the length of the assessment and redundancy of items. The Director of Teacher Education formed a subcommittee including three teacher education faculty, three P-12 school partners, the Teacher Education program's Director of Clinical Practice and Partnerships, and the School of Education and Human Development's (EHD) Director of Assessment. The team reviewed the instrument against the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments and determined several key areas to address. For example, the difference in performance levels for many items reflected a change in the frequency of behaviors rather than substantive changes in behaviors. As a result, the developmental continuum was unclear, and it was difficult for interns to understand how they could take actionable steps to improve their performance.

The Director of Assessment conducted an exploratory factor analysis to examine the relationships between items on the internship evaluation across scorers. Data included in the factor analysis were robust and included three years of scores at two timepoints per year (midterm and final) with three scorers at each time point. This resulted in approximately 1400 observations of interns across three years. Results indicated that teacher candidates' self-evaluations and clinical coaches' evaluations of teacher candidates correlated well, indicating a consensus regarding the perception of the items and candidates' performance. However, the factor analysis did indicate redundancy or vagueness in items, as indicated by differential factor load across scorers. Interestingly, mentor teachers' ratings of teacher candidates did not correlate highly with candidates' and coaches' ratings. This finding pointed to a potential discrepancy in perception of items and/or differences in the training that mentor teachers received in comparison to candidates and coaches. Ultimately, the EFA indicated three common factors which were then used as the impetus for discussion and revision through a stakeholder engagement process.

The subcommittee met to discuss the results of the factor analysis and other changes necessary to improve the quality of the data collected from the evaluation. In addition to reviewing the rubric against the CAEP evaluation framework, the subcommittee discussed practical considerations in using this type of holistic rubric. For example, interns, mentors, and coaches reported the instrument included too many items, which could lead to respondents moving too quickly through the instrument. Combining items could create too many double-barreled outcomes, while reducing items could lead to an instrument that doesn't capture all constructs the program

intends to evaluate. In addition, the committee focused on the language of each item, potential biases of the items, and ways to strategically incorporate cultural responsiveness across the instrument.

Sample Discussion and Item Revision

The committee examined two items related to candidates' communication skills. Original items:

Item	Unacceptable	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Academic English	The candidate does not demonstrate consistent mastery of academic English, and frequent errors detract from effectiveness in either or both verbal and written communication.	The candidate demonstrates mastery of academic English in most communications, but some errors do occur that may detract from effectiveness.	The candidate demonstrates consistent mastery of academic English in all communication.	The candidate demonstrates mastery of academic English in both verbal and written communications with few or no errors. Writing style goes beyond basic mastery and enhances the candidate's ability to communicate within the field.
Communication	The candidate does not collaborate or communicate effectively within the school community.	The candidate collaborates and communicates somewhat effectively within the school community.	The candidate collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students' well-being and success.	The candidate goes above and beyond in collaborating and communicating effectively within the school community by engaging with various stakeholders (special education teachers, department and grade level colleagues, counselors, teaching assistants, administrators, etc.) in order to inform instruction and promote students' well-being and success.

Stakeholder discussion:
- The **Communication** item loaded onto different factors for clinical coaches and mentor teachers. They may have interpreted the item differently.
- The **Communication** item included **collaboration**, which is a related but different skill set. Collaboration is captured in another item.
- The program has a focus on **professional communication**, which is related to but not the same as academic English. Professional communication must consider the **audience and purpose for your communication**, which may vary across contexts.
- University faculty's language can be perceived by external stakeholders as "too academic."

- There is a difference between written and oral communication. The item should be comprehensive enough to include both.
- What might we observe to evaluate candidates on these items? The item should be written in such a way that candidates have sufficient opportunities to demonstrate the competencies listed.

Decision with stakeholders:
- Delete **Academic English** item.
- Change **Communication** to **Professional Communication** and revise the descriptors.
  - Move items related to **collaboration** to the **Collaboration** item.
  - Make **students' well-being and success** central to all ratings.

Revised item:

Item	Unacceptable	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Professional Communication: The candidate communicates professionally and effectively within the school community to promote students' well-being and success.	The candidate is unprofessional in communication within the school.	The candidate is professional in communication with the school, though communication may not be effective in promoting student success.	The candidate is professional in communication with the school and is focused on promoting student success in all communications.	The candidate is professional in communication within the school and seeks leadership or engagement opportunities to promote student well-being and success among faculty and staff.

In spring 2019, the Teacher Education program piloted the instruments with approximately 40 interns completing their student teaching placements. While the instrument was piloted, the Teacher Education faculty met in April 2019 to discuss the language of the instrument. After the completion of the pilot, the intern evaluation stakeholder subcommittee reconvened to review pilot data, faculty feedback, and the language of individual items. Through this conversation, the committee developed a final version of the intern evaluation.

Sample Discussion and Item Revision

Piloted item:

Item	Unacceptable	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Cultural Competence: The candidate demonstrates cultural competence and responsiveness to diverse student and family funds of knowledge.	The candidate demonstrates limited cultural competence and is unable to draw on student and family funds of knowledge when planning instruction.	The candidate attempts to draw on student and family funds of knowledge, though these efforts may be infrequent and/or superficial.	The candidate draws on student and family funds of knowledge to ensure content is relevant, to draw on learners' assets, and to help students make authentic, real-world connections.	The candidate draws on student and family funds of knowledge to ensure content is relevant, to draw on learners' assets, and to help students make authentic, real-world connections. The candidate makes consistent efforts to engage families and the community within and outside of the classroom.

Stakeholder discussion:
- We should set the expectation that all candidates **make consistent efforts to engage families and the community within and outside of the classroom**. This component should be moved to the **proficient** category, which is the target for program completers.
- For candidates to move beyond the program expectation and into the **exemplary** category, they should **independently take initiative** to engage with families and find ways to **differentiate** their engagement with partners.

Final item:

Item	Unacceptable	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Cultural Competence: The candidate demonstrates cultural competence and responsiveness to diverse student and family funds of knowledge.	The candidate demonstrates limited cultural competence and is unable to draw on student and family funds of knowledge when planning instruction.	The candidate attempts to draw on student and family funds of knowledge, though these efforts may be infrequent and/or superficial.	The candidate draws on student and family funds of knowledge to ensure content is relevant, to draw on learners' assets, and to help students make authentic, real-world connections. The candidate makes consistent efforts to engage families and the community within and outside of the classroom.	The candidate draws on student and family funds of knowledge to ensure content is relevant, to draw on learners' assets, and to help students make authentic, real-world connections. The candidate independently identifies and acts on opportunities to engage with and differentiate for families and to include families in the learning partnership.

In fall 2020, the final intern evaluation was implemented across all programs. For the first time, candidates were evaluated on the same instrument at three points during the program: the end of Internship I, the midpoint of Internship II, and the end of Internship II.

2022-23: Upcoming Rubric Revision

In 2021, VDOE added a new performance standard for teachers:
> **Performance Standard 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices.** The teacher demonstrates a commitment to equity and provides instruction and classroom strategies that result in culturally inclusive and responsive learning environments and academic achievement for all students.

The UVA intern evaluation includes items aligned with the new performance standard, but the faculty will conduct a more thorough review with stakeholders during the 2022-23 academic year. Faculty and school partners will collaborate to ensure this performance standard is explicitly and comprehensively addressed throughout the evaluation. Stakeholders will also review data from 2020-2022 and discuss additional revisions needed to improve the instrument.

ESTABLISHING EVIDENCE OF CONTENT VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Through the revision and pilot process, EHD has established evidence of validity for the internship evaluation instrument and the results and conclusions generated by this assessment. Consistent with EHD's process for EPP-developed assessments, the instrument is aligned to VUPS and InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and was designed based on the CAEP framework for assessments. Content area experts participated in the redesign of the instrument and provided feedback on revisions, including feedback on item content and application of the instrument in the clinical experience. The following sections outline the process EHD undertook to establish evidence of content validity using Lawshe's method. This process satisfies technical quality guidelines required by the CAEP assessment review process.

Guidelines

The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, developed by the American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association and the National Council on Measurement in Education, define validity as "…the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of test scores for proposed uses of tests."[2] There are several different types of validity evidence; this document focuses on content validity, as this is a common source of evidence for rubrics used in the evaluation of pre-service candidates during teacher preparation. Additionally, documenting evidence of content validity for EPP-designed rubrics is an acceptable method for satisfying CAEP assessment standard and accreditation requirements.

Establishing evidence of alignment between assessment content and candidate learning standards and constructs which the assessment is designed to measure ensures results of the assessment can be interpreted to draw valid conclusions about a candidate's competency related to effective teaching. Such evidence can be established by soliciting judgements from subject-matter experts regarding the relative representativeness of the assessment items in measuring the overarching construct, as well as the importance and clarity of those items.[3] Such a process should be documented, described, and justified with respect to the intended use of the validity evidence, the assessment, and the population for which the assessment is intended. Additionally, the constructs purportedly measured by the assessment should be clearly defined, as well as the criteria for determining representativeness, importance, and clarity of the assessment items.[4]

---

[2] American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing.* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association, 11.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid; Davis, L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from your panel of experts. *Applied Nursing Research, 5*, 194-197; Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A qualitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology, 28*, 563-575.

Content Validity Process Overview

Expert Judgment Panel: To establish evidence of content validity for internship and self-assessment rubrics created by the Teacher Education program, the Director of Assessment and Director of Teacher Education identified an expert panel of faculty and P-12 school division personnel to rate assessment items for representativeness, importance, and clarity using a standardized protocol. This panel provided objective information about the assessments and the validity of interpretations that are drawn from assessment results regarding competencies related to the identified constructs to which the assessment is aligned.[5] Panel members included at least two clinical coaches, at least two mentor teachers, and at least one faculty member (total panel members: five).

Rating Protocol and Response Forms: The Internship Evaluation rubric was provided alongside a unique rating form, which expert panel members used to rate rubric item representativeness, importance, and clarity, and to provide overall feedback on each item. The form asked panel members to rate the items as follows:
- Representativeness in measuring the aligned overarching construct on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the most representative;
- Importance of the item in measuring the aligned overarching construct, on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the most essential; and
- Clarity on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the clearest.
- Space was provided for experts to provide feedback for each item.

Assessment Review Email: Each expert panel member received an Assessment Review Email, which included the following:
- A letter explaining:
  - The purpose of the panel;
  - The reason the expert was selected;
  - A description of the assessment and how it is used;
  - A description of the population for which the assessment is intended; and
  - An explanation of the response form and how resultant data will be used.
- A copy of the assessment rubric, including the instructions provided to candidates and supervisors regarding use of the rubrics; and
- The unique response form aligned to the assessment, including instructions for completing and submitting the rating form.

---

[5] Davis, L. (1992); Lawshe, C. H. (1975).

Calculation and Use of Results: The Director of Assessment generated a Content Validity Ratio (CVR) for each item based on recommendations by Davis, Lynn, and Rubio and colleagues:[6]

The number of experts who rated the item as 3 or 4 – ½ the total number of experts

_____

½ the number of total experts

Using the mean of the CVRs for each item, the Director of Assessment calculated a Content Validity Index (CVI). A CVI score of .80 or higher is considered acceptable. The Director of Assessment documented the results and saved this documentation in the Teacher Education Box site. Once evidence of content validity is established, rubric items must remain in their final form and may not be modified without repeating the content validity expert panel judgment process.

Assessment data gleaned from the use of these rubrics will be used to inform the 2021 Program Self-Study Report and On-Site Program Review visit as part of the CAEP Accreditation Review Cycle for the School of Education and Human Development. Additionally, these data may be used to inform program evaluation and improvement processes.

Results:

Content Understanding: 1	Differentiation: 1	Behavior Management: .6
Curriculum Standards: .6	Instructional Technology: .5[7]	Cultural Competence: 1
Learning Targets: .6	Assessment Strategies and Tools: 1	Professional Communication: 1
Lesson Plan Details: 1	Checking for Understanding: 1	Collaboration and Collegiality: 1
Planning with Data: 1	Quality of Feedback: 1	Legal and Ethical Guidelines: 1
Preparation: .6	Student Metacognition: 1	Goal Setting: 1
Instructional Dialogue: 1	Teacher Affect: .6	Personal Reflection: 1
Higher Order Thinking for All Students: 1	Expectations for Student Behavior: .6	**Total Instrument CVI = .87**

Reliability

Cronbach's alpha was calculated to provide evidence of reliability. Three observations were conducted for each of the approximately 40 candidates in the pilot year (2019). Cronbach's alpha = 0.97 for this measure, which can be interpreted as **Excellent**.

---

[6] Davis, L. (1992); Lynn, M. (1986). Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nursing Research, 35*, 382-385; Rubio, D.M., Berg-Weger, M., Tebb, S. S., Lee, E. S., & Rauch, S. (2003). Objectifying content validity: Conducting a content validity study in social work research. *Social Work Research, 27(2)*, 94-104.

[7] One scorer did not rate this item.

CAEP CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF EPP-CREATED ASSESSMENTS

Administration and Purpose	
Sufficiency Criteria	**EPP Response**
The time/point at which the assessment is administered during the preparation program are explicit.	UVA's EHD has developed clinical handbooks which explicitly address the progression of clinical experiences, including time points at which candidates are assessed.
The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions on progression are specified and appropriate.	UVA's EHD has developed clinical handbooks which explicitly address the purpose of each assessment as well as its use in evaluation of candidates and their progression through the program. These assessments are appropriately timed, and results contribute to valid conclusions regarding candidate progress.
Instructions provided to candidates about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous.	UVA EHD has developed clinical handbooks which explicitly address expectations of candidates in their clinical experiences, including the assessment of clinical competencies. Candidates are provided support throughout the clinical experience, including completion of assessment requirements. Information about the internship evaluation is provided on the clinical experience website and is sent to all evaluators during the evaluation periods.
The basis for judgment is made explicit to candidates.	UVA EHD has developed clinical handbooks which explicitly address expectations of candidates in their clinical experiences, including the assessment of clinical competencies. The basis for judgment of candidates based on clinical assessments is clear and is shared with candidates through these documents as well as through coaching and coursework.
Evaluation categories or assessment tasks are aligned with CAEP, InTASC, national/professional, and state standards.	UVA's EHD has developed an assessment map which articulates the alignment among key assessments and CAEP, InTASC, and state standards (VUPS).
Content of Assessment	
Sufficiency Criteria	**EPP Response**
Indicators assess explicitly identified aspects of CAEP and InTASC standards, in addition to national, professional, or state standards.	UVA's EHD has developed a standards crosswalk, which articulates the alignment among key assessments and CAEP, InTASC, and state standards (VUPS). All clinical assessments are aligned and tagged to relevant InTASC, CAEP, and state standards.
Indicators reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards.	Rubric criteria are aligned to InTASC, CAEP, and state standards and appropriately reflect the level of analysis, skill, and mastery articulated in the standards.

Content of Assessment	
Sufficiency Criteria	**EPP Response**
Indicators unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated.	UVA EHD has engaged stakeholder groups consisting of content area experts and practitioners to ensure that clinical assessment criteria are clear, relevant, and aligned to standards and competencies required for the position.
When the standards being informed address higher level functioning, the indicators require higher levels of intellectual behavior (e.g., create, evaluate, analyze, and apply). For example, when a standard specifies that candidates' students "demonstrate" problem solving, then the indicator is specific to candidates' application of knowledge to solve problems.	UVA EHD has engaged stakeholder groups consisting of content area experts and practitioners to ensure that clinical assessment criteria are clear, relevant, and aligned to standards and competencies required for the position. Performance levels reflect appropriately increasing levels of analysis, competency, and skill.
Most indicators require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards.	UVA EHD has engaged stakeholder groups consisting of school division- and university-based content area experts and practitioners to ensure that clinical assessment criteria are clear, relevant, and aligned to standards and competencies required for the position. Rubric criteria align to appropriate InTASC, CAEP, and state standards. As such, evaluators assess candidates relevant to consequential attributes for the profession.
Scoring	
Sufficiency Criteria	**EPP Response**
The basis for judging candidate performance is well defined.	UVA EHD has developed clinical handbooks which explicitly address expectations of candidates in their clinical experiences, including the assessment of clinical competencies. The basis for scoring is well-defined and made clear to candidates as well as scorers. The instrument development process outlined above provides further detail about how items were revised for clarity.
Each proficiency level descriptor (PLD) is qualitatively defined by specific criteria aligned with indicators.	UVA EHD has developed clear and explicit PLDs which qualitatively define performance and competency expectations at each level of performance. The instrument development process outlined above provides further detail about how items were revised for clarity.
PLDs represent a developmental sequence from level to level (providing raters with explicit guidelines to evaluate candidate performance and giving candidates explicit feedback on their performance).	UVA EHD has developed clear and explicit PLDs which qualitatively define performance and competency expectations at each level of performance. PLDs articulate a clear progression in expectations regarding skill and competency across criteria, and purposefully incorporate increasing levels of performance to reflect expectations of candidates. The instrument development process outlined above provides further detail about how items were revised for clarity.

Scoring	
Sufficiency Criteria	**EPP Response**
Feedback provided to candidates is actionable – it is directly related to the preparation program and can be used for program improvement as well as for feedback to the candidate.	As UVA EHD has clear and explicit PLDs which qualitatively define performance and competency expectations at each level of performance, feedback to candidates is specific and actionable and results in data relevant to both candidate and program improvement.
Proficiency level attributes are defined in actionable, performance-based, or observable behavior terms. [NOTE: If a less actionable term is used such as "engaged," criteria are provided to define the use of the term in the context of the category or indicator.]	UVA EHD has developed clear and explicit PLDs which qualitatively define performance and competency expectations at each level of performance. PLDs articulate a clear progression in expectations regarding skill and competency across criteria, and purposefully incorporate increasing levels of performance to reflect expectations of candidates.

Data Reliability	
Sufficiency Criteria	**EPP Response**
A description or plan is provided that details the type of reliability that is being investigated or has been established (e.g., inter-rater, internal consistency, consensus building activities with documentation) and the steps the EPP took to ensure the reliability of the data from the assessment.	All raters (candidates, coaches, and mentor teachers) receive training on scoring procedures. Multiple raters score candidates' performance, including candidates themselves, clinical coaches, and mentor teachers. Candidates are assessed at multiple timepoints, including at midpoint and final. Internal consistency as indicated by Cronbach's alpha = 0.97.
Training of scorers and checking on inter-rater agreement and reliability are documented.	Scores - including candidates, mentor teachers, and clinical coaches - receive information about the evaluation, criteria, and scoring guidelines at the start of each semester and during each evaluation period. The Teacher Education office provides this information through handbooks, the clinical website, and informational videos. Inter-rater reliability was investigated using multiple observations on each item.
The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing reliability.	Cronbach's alpha was used to measure internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha for this measure = 0.97

UNIVERSITY *of* VIRGINIA | SCHOOL *of* EDUCATION *and* HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Data Validity	
Sufficiency Criteria	**EPP Response**
A description or plan is provided that detailed steps the EPP has taken or is taking to ensure the validity of the assessment and its use.	Content validity was established using Lawshe's method. CVI = 0.87
The plan details the types of validity that are under investigation or have been established (e.g., construct, content, concurrent, predictive) and how they were established.	Steps taken to establish validity included development of an expert panel who conducted ratings of items as aligned to overarching constructs on relevance, clarity, and importance. This process was modeled after Lawshe's method.
If the assessment is new or revised, a pilot was conducted.	The assessment was piloted in spring 2019. Pilot data was reviewed by internal and external stakeholders and was used to develop the final version of the instrument.
The EPP details its current process or plans for analyzing and interpreting results from the assessment.	Assessment data are assessed regularly and shared with relevant stakeholders. The Assessment data review processes are detailed in the narrative for R5 and in the Quality Assurance Document.
The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing the validity of the data from an assessment.	The steps outlined above are predicated on evidence and research-based methods for establishing evidence of content validity.

STANDARDS CROSSWALK

Assessment Item	Virginia Uniform Performance Standards	InTASC Standards
Content Understanding: The candidate identifies and demonstrates understanding of essential components of a concept and makes explicit connections among knowledge, understandings, and skills.	2: Instructional Planning 3: Instructional Delivery	5: Application of Content
Curriculum Standards: The candidate effectively addresses appropriate state and local standards.	2: Instructional Planning	7: Planning for Instruction
Learning Targets: The candidate establishes clear learning targets.	2: Instructional Planning	7: Planning for Instruction
Lesson Plan Details: The candidate develops lesson and unit plans that make clear what students will do during the lesson, how they will be assessed, and how the candidate will facilitate learning activities and transitions.	2: Instructional Planning	7: Planning for Instruction
Planning with Data: The candidate uses qualitative and quantitative data to document learning and plan for instruction.	4: Assessment of and for Student Learning	6: Assessment
Preparation: The candidate is prepared to teach lessons, ensuring materials are prepared in advance and readily accessible.	2: Instructional Planning	7: Planning for Instruction
Instructional Dialogue: The candidate balances student and teacher dialogue, creating opportunities for extended dialogue among students. Students freely initiate questions and commentary.	3: Instructional Delivery 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices	8: Instructional Strategies
Higher Order Thinking for All Students: The candidate facilitates higher order thinking across all student demographics, cultural backgrounds, and readiness levels.	2: Instructional Planning 3: Instructional Delivery 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices	2: Learning Differences

UNIVERSITY *of* VIRGINIA | SCHOOL *of* EDUCATION *and* HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Assessment Item	Virginia Uniform Performance Standards	InTASC Standards
Differentiation: The candidate differentiates instruction based on students' prior knowledge, assessment data, and the candidates' knowledge of students' lived experiences.	1: Professional Knowledge 2: Instructional Planning 3: Instructional Delivery 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices	1: Learner Development
Instructional Technology: The candidate makes appropriate use of instructional and assistive technology to engage students and support student learning.	3: Instructional Delivery 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices	8: Instructional Strategies
Assessment Strategies and Tools: The candidate uses appropriate, relevant, and valid assessments and assessment strategies to generate data that are appropriate to use for instructional planning and future assessment.	4: Assessment of and for Student Learning	6: Assessment
Checking for Understanding During Instruction: The candidate acknowledges background knowledge, checks in with students for content understanding, notices difficulties, and adjusts instructions as needed.	4: Assessment of and for Student Learning	6: Assessment
Quality of Feedback: The candidate provides high-quality feedback, including scaffolding, timely assistance, and affirmation of students' efforts.	4: Assessment of and for Student Learning	6: Assessment
Student Metacognition: The candidate provides opportunities for student metacognition (i.e., thinking about, planning for, evaluating, and reflecting on their own learning).	4: Assessment of and for Student Learning	6: Assessment
Teacher Affect: The candidate demonstrates interest and engagement equitably toward all students in order to build rapport with all students.	3: Instructional Delivery 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices	3: Learning Environments
Expectations for Student Behavior: The candidate establishes a climate conducive to learning by setting and consistently enforcing clear expectations for student behavior.	3: Instructional Delivery 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices	3: Learning Environments
Behavior Management: The candidate uses proactive strategies to address student behavior and is effective in redirecting misbehavior.	3: Instructional Delivery 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices	3: Learning Environments

Assessment Item	Virginia Uniform Performance Standards	InTASC Standards
Cultural Competence: The candidate demonstrates cultural competence and responsiveness to diverse student and family funds of knowledge.	2: Instructional Planning 3: Instructional Delivery 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices	2: Learning Differences
Professional Communication: The candidate communicates professionally and effectively within the school community to promote students' well-being and success.	7: Professionalism	10: Leadership and Collaboration
Collaboration and Collegiality: The candidate works in a collegial and collaborative manner with administrators, school and university personnel, and the community.	7: Professionalism	10: Leadership and Collaboration
Legal and Ethical Guidelines: The candidate adheres to federal and state laws, school and division policies, and ethical guidelines.	7: Professionalism	9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice
Goal Setting: The candidate sets and articulates goals for improving their own knowledge and skills and seeks out resources to achieve those goals.	7: Professionalism	9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice
Personal Reflection: Through personal reflection, the candidate reflects on their identity, their personal and professional experiences, and the ways in which those factors interact with children's backgrounds and inform instruction.	7: Professionalism	9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice

Professional Knowledge					
	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Content Understanding: The candidate identifies and demonstrates understanding of essential components of a concept and makes explicit connections among knowledge, understandings, and skills.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate is unable to identify the essential components of a concept. The candidate is unable to make connections among knowledge, understandings, and skills required of students in order to master the concept.	The candidate is able to identify the essential components of a concept, though connections may be inconsistent, unclear, and/or inaccurate.	The candidate is able to identify and demonstrate knowledge of the essential components of a concept and consistently makes accurate connections among concepts, knowledge, skills, and understandings to support student learning and growth.	The candidate is able to identify and demonstrate knowledge of the essential components of a concept and consistently makes accurate connections among concepts, knowledge, skills, and understandings to support student learning and growth. The candidate can adjust strategies to foster these connections during a lesson to ensure student understanding.
Curriculum Standards: The candidate effectively addresses appropriate state and local standards.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not address appropriate state and local standards.	The candidate may address state or local standards without depth or inconsistently.	The candidate consistently identifies state and local standards during planning and can demonstrate alignment and application through instruction.	The candidate consistently identifies state and local standards and adjusts instruction to ensure that all students meet these standards. The candidate engages in long-term planning using standards and scope and sequence documents.

Instructional Planning				
	No Opportunity to Observe	**Unacceptable: Rarely/Never**	**Developing: Inconsistently**	**Proficient: Consistently**	**Exemplary: Model for Colleagues**
Learning Targets: The candidate establishes clear learning targets.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate is unable to establish learning targets that are clear and actionable.	The candidate establishes learning targets, though at times they are unclear and/or are not actionable.	The candidate establishes learning targets that are both clear and actionable and guide the lesson planning process, including pre- and post-assessment, materials, and activities.	The candidate establishes learning targets that are both clear and actionable and guide the lesson planning process. The candidate self-reflects on and can assess the effectiveness of the learning targets and revises for future planning as necessary.
Lesson Plan Details: The candidate develops lesson and unit plans that make clear what students will do during the lesson, how they will be assessed, and how the candidate will facilitate learning activities and transitions.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate's lesson and unit plans are unclear, with undefined learning targets, tasks, and assessments.	The candidate's lesson and unit plans are mostly clear, though some elements (e.g., learning activities, assessments) may require more detail to ensure clarity.	The candidate develops plans that are consistently clear and appropriate across each element (e.g., learning targets, assessments, tasks) ensuring developmental appropriateness and basing on knowledge of children.	The candidate develops plans that are consistently clear and appropriate across each element (e.g., learning targets, assessments, tasks) and reflects upon the effectiveness of the plans in preparation for future planning.
Planning with Data: The candidate uses qualitative and quantitative data to document learning and plan for instruction.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not use data to plan for instruction.	The candidate uses data to document learning but does not consistently use data to plan for instruction.	The candidate uses data to document learning and plan for instruction that is differentiated for diverse learners.	The candidate systematically uses data to document learning and consistently plans instruction that is differentiated for diverse learners. The candidate involves students in planning for their own learning using data.

Instructional Planning					
	No Opportunity to Observe	**Unacceptable: Rarely/Never**	**Developing: Inconsistently**	**Proficient: Consistently**	**Exemplary: Model for Colleagues**
Preparation: The candidate is prepared to teach lessons, ensuring materials are prepared in advance and readily accessible.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate is unprepared to teach. Materials are not readily available prior to or during the lesson.	The candidate is prepared to teach, though materials may not be appropriate for the lesson.	The candidate is consistently prepared to teach, and materials are prepared in advance and appropriate for the lesson and learning targets.	The candidate is consistently prepared to teach, and materials are prepared in advance. Materials are appropriate for the lesson and learning targets, and the candidate is prepared to adjust instruction with materials for extension and intervention. The candidate uses students' prior knowledge and understandings and students' backgrounds to ensure materials are relevant and appropriate.
Instructional Delivery					
Instructional Dialogue: The candidate balances student and teacher dialogue, creating opportunities for extended dialogue among students. Students freely initiate questions and commentary.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not balance student and teacher dialogue. Instructional activities are dominated by teacher talk, and there are limited discussions.	The candidate uses some facilitation strategies that encourage student dialogue, but they may be brief, inconsistent, or ineffective at consistently engaging students in extended dialogues.	The candidate consistently uses strategies (e.g., open-ended questions, grouping structures) that cause students to take an active role in classroom dialogue.	The candidate uses strategies to facilitate frequent, content-driven discussions between teachers and students and among students. Students freely initiate questions and commentaries, as well engage in extended conversations.

	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Instructional Delivery					
Higher Order Thinking for All Students: The candidate facilitates higher order thinking across all student demographics, cultural backgrounds, and readiness levels.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not create opportunities for higher order thinking for all learners.	The candidate creates some opportunities for higher order thinking, but these opportunities are inconsistent and only for a small group of students.	The candidate routinely integrates opportunities for higher order thinking into instructional activities. These opportunities are available to all students.	The candidate makes higher order thinking central to planning for instruction and provides all students with extended opportunities for analysis and inquiry. The candidate gives students frequent opportunities to reflect on and evaluate their own learning.
Differentiation: The candidate differentiates instruction based on students' prior knowledge, assessment data, and the candidates' knowledge of students' lived experiences.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not differentiate instruction.	The candidate attempts to differentiate instruction, though efforts are based on a superficial understanding of students' prior knowledge, assessment data, and knowledge of students' lived experiences.	The candidate consistently differentiates instruction based on students' prior knowledge, assessment data, and the candidates' knowledge of students' lived experiences.	The candidate employs systematic routines and procedures that facilitate differentiation based on students' prior knowledge, assessment data, and the candidates' knowledge of students' lived experiences. The candidate engages students in making decisions about their own learning within the classroom system.

Instructional Delivery					
	No Opportunity to Observe	**Unacceptable: Rarely/Never**	**Developing: Inconsistently**	**Proficient: Consistently**	**Exemplary: Model for Colleagues**
Instructional Technology: The candidate makes appropriate use of instructional and assistive technology to engage students and support student learning.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate makes limited use of instructional and assistive technology.	The candidate uses some instructional and assistive technology, but its use is teacher-centered with few opportunities for students to interact with the technology.	The candidate's use of instructional technology is student-centered with frequent opportunities for students to interact with the technology in ways that enhance student learning.	The candidate's use of instructional technology is student-centered with frequent opportunities for students to create and interact with the technology in ways that enhance student learning. The candidate uses technology to track student learning and to plan for differentiated instruction.
Assessment					
Assessment Strategies and Tools: The candidate uses appropriate, relevant, and valid assessments and assessment strategies to generate data that are appropriate to use for instructional planning and future assessment.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate uses few strategies and tools to assess students learning. Assessments may be inappropriate and invalid for the content and student population.	The candidate uses a limited range of strategies and tools to assessment student learning. Some assessments are appropriate and valid for the content and student population, while other assessments are not.	The candidate uses a range of assessment strategies and tools. Assessments are appropriate and valid for the content and student population and are used to adjust future instruction.	In the use of appropriate and assessments, the candidate creates opportunities for students to demonstrate progress toward stated learning targets in multiple ways. The candidate uses assessments results to adjust future assessments and instruction.

	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Assessment					
Checking for Understanding During Instruction: The candidate acknowledges background knowledge, checks in with students for content understanding, notices difficulties, and adjusts instructions as needed.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate is unable to check for student understanding during instruction.	The candidate attempts to check for understanding during instruction. The candidate may notice difficulties but is unable to adjust instruction as needed.	The candidate routinely checks for understanding during instruction. The candidate is able to adjust instruction in response to students' difficulties or misconceptions.	The candidate routinely checks for understanding and adjusts instruction in response to students' difficulties. The candidate uses information gathered to plan for future instruction.
Quality of Feedback: The candidate provides high-quality feedback, including scaffolding, timely assistance, and affirmation of students' efforts.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate provides limited feedback to students, leaving students to struggle through instructional activities.	The candidate attempts to use scaffolding, timely assistance, and affirmation, though these efforts are inconsistent. Feedback may be vague or perfunctory.	The candidate uses scaffolding, timely assistance, and affirmation to provide feedback to students. Feedback is specific and moves student learning forward as evidenced by student understanding of feedback.	The candidate uses scaffolding, timely assistance, and affirmation to provide feedback to students. Feedback is specific and enables students to reach a deeper understanding of material and concepts than they would be able to do independently. The candidate creates opportunities for peer feedback.

	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Assessment					
Student Metacognition: The candidate provides opportunities for student metacognition (i.e., thinking about, planning for, evaluating, and reflecting on their own learning).	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not provide opportunities for student metacognition.	The candidate provides occasional opportunities for students to engage in metacognition. However, these opportunities are brief and limited in depth.	The candidate routinely provides extended opportunities for students to engage in metacognition.	In addition to providing consistent opportunities for students to engage in metacognition, the candidate models metacognitive strategies by "thinking out loud" and draws attention to the mental process that underlie the learning process.
Learning Environment					
Teacher Affect: The candidate demonstrates interest and engagement equitably toward all students in order to build rapport with all students.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not demonstrate interest and engagement and/or does not do so equitably toward all students.	The candidate demonstrates interest and engagement, but the demonstrations are inconsistent and may not be directed equitably toward all students.	The candidate consistently demonstrates interest and engagement equitably toward all students. There is evidence of rapport among teachers and students.	The candidate consistently demonstrates interest and engagement equitably toward all students. The candidates' use of respectful language and positive communication contribute to the development of supportive relationships among teachers and students.

Learning Environment					
	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Expectations for Student Behavior: The candidate establishes a climate conducive to learning by setting and consistently enforcing clear expectations for student behavior.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not establish expectations for student behavior. The candidate inconsistently enforces rules and behavioral expectations.	The candidate establishes expectations for student behavior, but they may be unclear and/or inconsistently enforced.	The candidate establishes clear expectations for student behavior equitably and consistently enforces those expectations.	The candidate involves students in identifying, establishing, and reviewing clear expectations for student behavior. The candidate equitably and consistently enforces those expectations.
Behavior Management: The candidate uses proactive strategies to address student behavior and is effective in redirecting misbehavior.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not address student behavior. The candidate either ignores or is in effective in redirecting misbehavior.	The candidate sometimes addresses behavior but at other times misses early indicators of problems. The candidate uses a mix of proactive and reactive strategies to redirect misbehavior.	The candidate proactively addresses behavior to prevent behavior problems from developing. The candidate equitably uses effective verbal and nonverbal strategies to redirect misbehavior.	The candidate proactively addresses behavior to prevent behavior problems from developing. In addition to using verbal and nonverbal strategies equitably to redirect misbehavior, the candidate engages students in self-reflection on individual and classroom behaviors to develop strategies for improving behavior.

Learning Environment					
	No Opportunity to Observe	**Unacceptable: Rarely/Never**	**Developing: Inconsistently**	**Proficient: Consistently**	**Exemplary: Model for Colleagues**
Cultural Competence: The candidate demonstrates cultural competence and responsiveness to diverse student and family funds of knowledge.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate demonstrates limited cultural competence and is unable to draw on student and family funds of knowledge when planning instruction.	The candidate attempts to draw on student and family funds of knowledge when planning instruction, though these efforts may be infrequent and/or superficial.	The candidate draws on student and family funds of knowledge to ensure content is relevant, to draw on learners' assets, and to help students make authentic, real-world connections. The candidate makes consistent efforts to engage families and the community within and outside of the classroom.	The candidate draws on student and family funds of knowledge to ensure content is relevant, to draw on learners' assets, and to help students make authentic, real-world connections. The candidate independently identifies and acts on opportunities to engage with and differentiate for families and to include families in the learning partnership.
Professionalism					
Professional Communication: The candidate communicates professionally and effectively within the school community to promote students' well-being and success.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate is unprofessional in communication within the school.	The candidate is professional in communication within the school, though communication may not be effective in promoting student success or is not goal oriented.	The candidate is professional in communication within the school and is focused on achieving goals and promoting student success in all communications.	The candidate is professional in communication within the school and seeks leadership or engagement opportunities to promote student well-being and success among faculty, leadership, and staff, families, and students.

Professionalism					
	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Collaboration and Collegiality: The candidate works in a collegial and collaborative manner with administrators, school and university personnel, and the community.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not work in a collegial or collaborative manner with school administrators, personnel, and community.	The candidate works collegially and collaboratively with some members of the school community but struggles to do so with others.	The candidate works collegially and collaboratively with all members of the school community.	The candidate works collegially and collaboratively with all members of the school community and seeks opportunities to serve in leadership roles or roles that connect members of the school community to foster student development and growth.
Legal and Ethical Guidelines: The candidate adheres to federal and state laws, school and division policies, and ethical guidelines.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate is unable to adhere to federal and state laws, school and division policies, and ethical guidelines.	The candidate is able to adhere to federal and state laws, school and division policies, and ethical guidelines but requires significant support in making legal and ethical decisions.	The candidate adheres to federal and state laws, school and division policies, and ethical guidelines.	The candidate adheres to federal and state laws, school and division policies, and ethical guidelines. The candidate seeks opportunities to learn about and engage with legal and ethical issues and decision-making processes.
Goal Setting: The candidate sets and articulates goals for improving their own knowledge and skills and seeks out resources to achieve those goals.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not recognize gaps in their own knowledge and does not actively seek out resources to achieve goals related to addressing those gaps.	The candidate may recognize gaps or misunderstandings in their own knowledge and attempts to seek out resources to address these, though sometimes without success.	The candidate is able to recognize gaps in their own knowledge and can successfully identify and use resources to improve knowledge and skills.	The candidate is able to recognize and address gaps in knowledge and seeks to share resources with others in the school community.

Professionalism					
	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Personal Reflection: Through personal reflection, the candidate reflects on their identity, their personal and professional experiences, and the ways in which those factors interact with children's backgrounds and inform instruction.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not reflect on their background, biases, or other schemas related to their practice.	The candidate reflects on their background and experiences and ways in which those factors inform their practice inconsistently or is unable to make connections between their own background and those of their students or how their background informs their teaching.	The candidate regularly reflects upon their background and experiences and is able to make connections between those factors and their students' backgrounds and their own practice.	The candidate regularly reflects upon their background and experiences and is able to make connections between those factors and their students' backgrounds and their own practice and seeks resources to more fully understand students' lived experiences as well as resources to foster connection between these factors and instruction, student growth, and student development.

PRACTICUM EVALUATION

In the undergraduate teacher education program, candidates complete a classroom-based practicum in the spring of their third year. Candidates spend approximately 4 hours per week working under the guidance of a local mentor teacher. At the end of the semester, the mentor teacher evaluates the candidate, and the candidate completes a self-evaluation.

Prior to the redesign of the teacher education program, the practicum evaluation focused primarily on professionalism. Although a four-point rating scale was used, descriptors were only in place for the **unacceptable** and **proficient** levels.

Sample items from the previous practicum evaluation:

Item	Unacceptable	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Field Placement Attendance	The candidate does not attend the field placement regularly and on time, staying for the full session.	[no description]	The candidate attends the field placement regularly and on time, staying for the full session.	[no description]
Enthusiasm	The candidate does not display appropriate affect and demonstrates enthusiasm when speaking or teaching.	[no description]	The candidate displays appropriate affect and demonstrates enthusiasm when speaking or teaching.	[no description]
Self-Management	The candidate does not show evidence of self-management skills, such as timeliness, responsible behavior, alertness, etc.	[no description]	The candidate shows evidence of self-management skills, such as timeliness, responsible behavior, alertness, etc.	[no description]

When the undergraduate program was created, faculty created a new practicum evaluation consisting of a subset of items from the internship evaluation. The performance levels and descriptors are identical to those on the internship evaluation. The faculty identified items reflective of knowledge and skill candidates would have learned and should be able to demonstrate at the end of the spring practicum. Selected items focused on instructional planning, classroom management, and professionalism. The practicum evaluation was piloted in spring 2021.

Heading into the spring 2022 year, faculty added one item to the practicum evaluation to measure candidate's reflection on their personal biases to increase their understanding and practice of diversity, equity, and inclusion: "**Personal Reflection:** Through personal reflection, the candidate reflects on their identity, their personal and professional experiences, and the ways in which those factors interact with children's backgrounds and inform instruction." As with the other items, this item is taken directly from the internship evaluation.

Professional Knowledge					
	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Curriculum Standards: The candidate effectively addresses appropriate state and local standards.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not address appropriate state and local standards.	The candidate may address state or local standards without depth or inconsistently.	The candidate consistently identifies state and local standards during planning and can demonstrate alignment and application through instruction.	The candidate consistently identifies state and local standards and adjusts instruction to ensure that all students meet these standards. The candidate engages in long-term planning using standards and scope and sequence documents.
Learning Targets: The candidate establishes clear learning targets.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate is unable to establish learning targets that are clear and actionable.	The candidate establishes learning targets, though at times they are unclear and/or are not actionable.	The candidate establishes learning targets that are both clear and actionable and guide the lesson planning process, including pre- and post-assessment, materials, and activities.	The candidate establishes learning targets that are both clear and actionable and guide the lesson planning process. The candidate self-reflects on and can assess the effectiveness of the learning targets and revises for future planning as necessary.

Instructional Planning					
	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Lesson Plan Details: The candidate develops lesson and unit plans that make clear what students will do during the lesson, how they will be assessed, and how the candidate will facilitate learning activities and transitions.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate's lesson and unit plans are unclear, with undefined learning targets, tasks, and assessments.	The candidate's lesson and unit plans are mostly clear, though some elements (e.g., learning activities, assessments) may require more detail to ensure clarity.	The candidate develops plans that are consistently clear and appropriate across each element (e.g., learning targets, assessments, tasks) ensuring developmental appropriateness and basing on knowledge of children.	The candidate develops plans that are consistently clear and appropriate across each element (e.g., learning targets, assessments, tasks) and reflects upon the effectiveness of the plans in preparation for future planning.
Preparation: The candidate is prepared to teach lessons, ensuring materials are prepared in advance and readily accessible.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate is unprepared to teach. Materials are not readily available prior to or during the lesson.	The candidate is prepared to teach, though materials may not be appropriate for the lesson.	The candidate is consistently prepared to teach, and materials are prepared in advance and appropriate for the lesson and learning targets.	The candidate is consistently prepared to teach, and materials are prepared in advance. Materials are appropriate for the lesson and learning targets, and the candidate is prepared to adjust instruction with materials for extension and intervention. The candidate uses students' prior knowledge and understandings and students' backgrounds to ensure materials are relevant and appropriate.

Learning Environment					
	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Teacher Affect: The candidate demonstrates interest and engagement equitably toward all students in order to build rapport with all students.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not demonstrate interest and engagement and/or does not do so equitably toward all students.	The candidate demonstrates interest and engagement, but the demonstrations are inconsistent and may not be directed equitably toward all students.	The candidate consistently demonstrates interest and engagement equitably toward all students. There is evidence of rapport among teachers and students.	The candidate consistently demonstrates interest and engagement equitably toward all students. The candidates' use of respectful language and positive communication contribute to the development of supportive relationships among teachers and students.
Behavior Management: The candidate uses proactive strategies to address student behavior and is effective in redirecting misbehavior.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not address student behavior. The candidate either ignores or is in effective in redirecting misbehavior.	The candidate sometimes addresses behavior but at other times misses early indicators of problems. The candidate uses a mix of proactive and reactive strategies to redirect misbehavior.	The candidate proactively addresses behavior to prevent behavior problems from developing. The candidate equitably uses effective verbal and nonverbal strategies to redirect misbehavior.	The candidate proactively addresses behavior to prevent behavior problems from developing. In addition to using verbal and nonverbal strategies equitably to redirect misbehavior, the candidate engages students in self-reflection on individual and classroom behaviors to develop strategies for improving behavior.

Professionalism					
	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Professional Communication: The candidate communicates professionally and effectively within the school community to promote students' well-being and success.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate is unprofessional in communication within the school.	The candidate is professional in communication within the school, though communication may not be effective in promoting student success or is not goal oriented.	The candidate is professional in communication within the school and is focused on achieving goals and promoting student success in all communications.	The candidate is professional in communication within the school and seeks leadership or engagement opportunities to promote student well-being and success among faculty, leadership, and staff, families, and students.
Personal Reflection: Through personal reflection, the candidate reflects on their identity, their personal and professional experiences, and the ways in which those factors interact with children's backgrounds and inform instruction.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not reflect on their background, biases, or other schemas related to their practice.	The candidate reflects on their background and experiences and ways in which those factors inform their practice inconsistently or is unable to make connections between their own background and those of their students or how their background informs their teaching.	The candidate regularly reflects upon their background and experiences and is able to make connections between those factors and their students' backgrounds and their own practice.	The candidate regularly reflects upon their background and experiences and is able to make connections between those factors and their students' backgrounds and their own practice and seeks resources to more fully understand students' lived experiences as well as resources to foster connection between these factors and instruction, student growth, and student development.