

## FACTOR 1 CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION

**Checklist:** The Candidate Describes *Context Data* and *Environmental Factors*: N Y

Complete Contextual Information Sheet

0 1

**Total Checklist Score:**        / 1

**Rubric: Instructional Implications--**The degree to which the candidate specifically describes and uses contextual information to plan and describe instruction.

	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Unacceptable</b> (Minimal Performance)	<b>Acceptable</b> (Standard Performance)	<b>Competent</b> (High Performance)	<b>Exemplary</b> (Exemplary Performance)	
<b>Specificity</b>	The candidate did not complete, or only partially completed the Contextual Information sheet.	The candidate completed all components of the Contextual Information sheet.	The candidate addresses implications that the contextual information has for planning instruction, assessment, and student learning for the classroom as a whole, but only describes the implications for <b>some</b> of the following: specific student individual differences, groups for whom you will <i>disaggregate</i> data, community, school, and classroom environment.	The candidate addresses implications that the contextual information has for planning instruction, assessment, and student learning for the classroom as a whole, and describes the implications for <b>all</b> of the following: specific student individual differences, groups for whom you will <i>disaggregate</i> data, community, school, and classroom environment.	

**Total Rubric Score:**        / 4

**Total Score for Factor 1:**        / 5

## FACTOR 2 UNIT LEARNING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

### **Checklist: Unit Goals, Unit objectives and TWS Objectives:**

**N Y**

*Unit goals and unit objectives are aligned with state, or Common Core standards (or other standards if there are no state standards)*

0 1

*Unit objectives are correctly labeled by domain (cognitive, affective, psychomotor)*

0 1

*TWS objectives were identified and include low, middle and high objectives*

0 1

**Total Checklist Score: \_\_\_\_\_/ 3**

	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Unacceptable</b> (Minimal Performance)	<b>Acceptable</b> (Standard Performance)	<b>Competent</b> (High Performance)	<b>Exemplary</b> (Exemplary Performance)	
<b>Low level cognitive, affective and psychomotor TWS objectives</b>	Absent; no low level cognitive, affective <u>or</u> psychomotor objectives area listed.	At least one low level cognitive, affective <u>or</u> psychomotor objective is listed and meets the low level classification criteria.	At least two low level cognitive, affective <u>or</u> psychomotor objectives are listed and meet the low level classification criteria.	At least two low level cognitive, affective <u>and</u> psychomotor objectives are listed and meet the low level classification criteria.	
<b>Middle level cognitive, affective and psychomotor TWS objectives</b>	Absent; no middle level cognitive, affective <u>or</u> psychomotor objectives area listed.	At least one middle level cognitive, affective <u>or</u> psychomotor objective is listed and meets the middle level classification criteria.	At least two middle level cognitive, affective <u>or</u> psychomotor objectives are listed and meet the middle level classification criteria.	At least two middle level cognitive, affective <u>and</u> psychomotor objectives are listed and meet the middle level classification criteria.	
<b>High level cognitive, affective and psychomotor TWS objectives</b>	Absent; no high level cognitive, affective <u>or</u> psychomotor objectives area listed.	At least one high level cognitive, affective <u>or</u> psychomotor objective is listed and meets the high level classification criteria.	At least two high level cognitive, affective <u>or</u> psychomotor objectives are listed and meet the high level classification criteria.	At least two high level cognitive, affective <u>and</u> psychomotor objectives are listed and meet the high level classification criteria.	
<b>Goals and Objectives are Developmentally Appropriate</b>	Unit goals and objectives are not developmentally appropriate given the grade level(s) identified and the classroom context, nor is a rationale for the choice of the unit objectives is provided.	Most of the unit goals and objectives are developmentally appropriate given the grade level(s) identified and the classroom context; however the rationale for the choice of the unit objectives is limited to a statement the objectives are required by the school.	All unit goals and objectives are developmentally appropriate given the grade level(s) identified and the classroom context, and a rationale for the choice of the unit objectives is provided.	All unit goals and objectives are developmentally appropriate given the grade level(s) identified and the classroom context, and a rationale for the choice of the unit objectives is provided. Additionally, the goals and objectives are clearly articulated.	

**Total Rubric Score: \_\_\_\_\_/16**

**Total Score for Factor 2: \_\_\_\_\_/19**

### FACTOR 3: INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN

<b>Checklist:</b>	<b>Instructional Design:</b>	<u>N</u>	<u>Y</u>
	Is developmentally appropriate.....	0	1
	Provides evidence that context information is used in instructional decisions... ..	0	1
	Provides evidence of assessments.....	0	1
	Provides Instructional design table.....	0	1
<b>Total Checklist Score:</b>		_____/4	

**Rubric: Instruction Design**

	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Unacceptable</b> (Minimal Performance)	<b>Acceptable</b> (Standard Performance)	<b>Competent</b> (High Performance)	<b>Exemplary</b> (Exemplary Performance)	
<b>Multiple learning strategies</b>	Only 1 of the strategies from level 4 was incorporated throughout the unit <b>and/or</b> the strategies reflect only the more common/traditional types/levels of learning. (e.g., relies mostly on direct instruction, visual, verbal-linguistic, paper-pencil)	The candidate has included at least two of the strategies listed on Level 4.	The candidate has included three of the strategies listed on Level 4.	The candidate has included: 1. Multiple instructional strategies utilizing multiple types/levels of learning are incorporated throughout the unit. 2. Application of multiple intelligences and learning styles is evident. 3. Strategies which actively involve students in critical thinking, problem solving, or authentic performance tasks. 4. Multiple opportunities and strategies to check for student understanding.	
<b>Provide and adapt instructional strategies</b>	No <i>adaptations</i> are considered or stated.	<i>Adaptations</i> are stated which do not address the specific contextual needs stated for these individuals, small <i>groups</i> , or class. ( <i>Adaptations</i> should be made for instruction of those <i>groups</i> in need of them as identified in Factor One.)	<i>Adaptations</i> address <b>some</b> of the specifically identified contextual needs of these individuals, small <i>groups</i> , or class; if not, the candidate does not adequately defend the decision to not make instructional <i>adaptations</i> .	<i>Adaptations</i> address <b>all</b> of the specific identified contextual needs of the individuals, small <i>group</i> , or class; <b>or</b> the candidate adequately defends the decision to not make instructional <i>adaptations</i> .	

**FACTOR 3 INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN (CONT.)**

	<b>Level 1</b> <b>Unacceptable</b> (Minimal Performance)	<b>Level 2</b> <b>Acceptable</b> (Standard Performance)	<b>Level 3</b> <b>Competent</b> (High Performance)	<b>Level 4</b> <b>Exemplary</b> (Exemplary Performance)	<b>Score</b>
<b>Active Inquiry</b>	Unit design includes 1 or 2 of the strategies listed on Level 4 and /or procedures are too simplistic or are delivered in a more traditional teaching style.	Unit design includes 3 of the procedures listed on Level 4.	Unit design includes 4 of the procedures listed on Level 4.	Unit design includes: 1.Procedures that actively engage students in questioning concepts 2. Procedures that engage students in developing learning strategies 3.Procedures that engage students in seeking resources 4. Procedures that engage students in conducting independent investigation 5.Deliberate checks for understanding, and modification of instruction based on the assessment of student understanding.	
<b>Collaborative Instructional groups</b>	Plans include no provisions for varied collaborative /instructional groups, and does not provide a rationale for using collaborative teaching methods, nor link plans to instructional goals.	Plans include provisions for one of the parts listed in level 4.	Plans include provisions for 2 of the parts listed for Level 4.	Plans include: 1. Provisions for varied collaborative /instructional groups. 2.Provide a rationale for using collaborative teaching methods. 3. Are clearly linked to multiple instructional goals. ( If collaborative groups are not use, the candidate provides an appropriate rationale)	
<b>Technology</b>	Technology (see E. above for definition) is used without due regard to learning outcomes (i.e., it is just an add-on to fulfill the requirement).	Technology (see E. above for definition) is integrated throughout instruction and makes a meaningful contribution to learning, however, students do not have hands-on access or usage of technology.	Technology (see E. above for definition) is integrated throughout instruction and makes a meaningful contribution to learning, and students have hands-on access or usage of technology.	Technology (see E. above for definition) is integrated throughout instruction and makes a meaningful contribution to learning, and students have hands-on access or usage of technology. Additionally, technology was used as an assessment tool.	

**FACTOR 3 INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN (CONT.)**

	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Unacceptable</b> (Minimal Performance)	<b>Acceptable</b> (Standard Performance)	<b>Competent</b> (High Performance)	<b>Exemplary</b> (Exemplary Performance)	
<b>Knowledge of factors in the students' environment outside the school</b>	Instructional design and implementation fail to demonstrate knowledge of factors in the students' environment outside of school (e.g., family circumstances, <i>community</i> environments, health, economic conditions, and <i>community</i> resources).	Instructional design and implementation demonstrate knowledge of specific factors in the students' environment outside of school (e.g., family circumstances, <i>community</i> environment, health, economic conditions, and <i>community</i> resources) but are not included in the plan for instruction.	Instructional design and implementation demonstrate knowledge of specific factors in the students' environment outside of school (e.g., family circumstances, <i>community</i> environment, health, economic conditions, and <i>community</i> resources) and are included in the plan for instruction, but some of the adjustments are unrealistic.	Instructional design and implementation demonstrate knowledge of specific factors in the students' environment outside of school (e.g., family circumstances, <i>community</i> environment, health, economic conditions, and <i>community</i> resources) and are included in the plan for instruction and are clearly linked to the students' environment outside the school..	
<b>Alignment of goals and objectives, activities, and assessments</b>	Candidate does not have a clear understanding of the alignment of goals, objectives, activities, and assessments.	The candidate aligns some of the goals, objectives, and activities, but not all of the assessments are aligned.	Candidate aligns most of the goals, objectives, activities, and assessments.	Candidate has a clear understanding of the alignment of goals, objectives, activities, and assessments, and has aligned all of the goals, objectives, activities, and assessments.	

**Total Rubric Score: \_\_\_\_\_/28**

**Total Score for Factor 3: \_\_\_\_\_/32**

# **FACTOR 4 ASSESSMENT PLAN**

<b>Checklist:</b>	<b>The Teacher:</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>
	Provides a table describing the assessment plan .....	0	1
	Provides copies with answer keys of the pre and post assessment(s). ....	0	1
<b>Total Checklist Score:</b>		_____/ 2	

## **Rubric:**

	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Unacceptable</b> (Minimal Performance)	<b>Acceptable</b> (Standard Performance)	<b>Competent</b> (High Performance)	<b>Exemplary</b> (Exemplary Performance)	
<b>Assessment Plan</b>	No description of the assessment plan was included, or response includes only 1 of the criteria listed in the exemplary section.	Response includes only 2 of the criteria listed in the exemplary section.	Response includes three of the criteria listed in the exemplary section.	<u>Validity</u> -The assessments specifically address each of the objectives. <u>Formative Assessments</u> -The plan demonstrates the use of formative assessments throughout the instructional sequence. <u>Format</u> -Assessment format matches the condition specified in the objectives. <u>Technology</u> -Technology is used for collecting and analyzing student data.	
<b>Variety of Assessments</b>	The assessment plan includes only one type of assessment..	The assessment plan includes multiple types of assessments but all assessments are pencil/paper based (i.e., they are not performance assessments) <b>and/or</b> do not address the integration of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor ability.	The assessment plan includes multiple types of assessments including performance assessments, but only addresses two components of the integration of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor ability.	The assessment plan includes multiple types of assessments including performance assessments, and requires the integration of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor ability.	

### FACTOR 4 ASSESSMENT PLAN (CONT.)

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Score
	Unacceptable (Minimal Performance)	Acceptable (Standard Performance)	Competent (High Performance)	Exemplary (Exemplary Performance)	
<b>Assessment Challenge</b>	The assessments are overly easy (i.e., requires only simple responses, gives answers away, easy to guess, etc.), Students are able to answer correctly if they have missed class, not paid attention, or they can easily guess, etc.). Additionally, information asked on assessment instruments do not cover essential content and skills from <b>all</b> those addressed during instruction.	One of the Level 4 objectives has been met completely.	Two of the Level 4 objectives have been met.	1. The assessments are challenging (i.e., tasks are not simplistic; test can discriminate between students who attain the outcome and those that cannot. Students should not be able to answer correctly if they have missed class, not paid attention, guessed, etc.). 2. Information asked on assessment instruments are relevant to material covered during instruction. 3. The assessments cover essential content and skills from <b>all</b> those addressed during instruction.	
<b>Alignment among TWS objectives, instruction and assessment</b>	Does not align <i>TWS objectives</i> , instruction, and assessment. nor are the formative assessments congruent with pre/post assessments.	Aligns some among <i>TWS objectives</i> , instruction, and assessment (i.e. omits alignment of one of the three.) and the formative assessments are not congruent with pre/post assessments.	Aligns most <i>TWS objectives</i> with instruction and assessment. However, not all of the formative assessments are congruent with pre/post assessments.	Aligns all <i>TWS objectives</i> with instruction and assessment and all of the formative assessments are congruent with pre/post assessments.	
<b>Justification of adaptations</b>	Did not address needed <i>adaptations</i> , nor were justifications provided for why no adaptations were made.	Needed adaptations were addressed but not for all subgroups identified in Factor One, nor were justifications provided for the sub-groups that no <i>adaptations</i> were provided.	Needed adaptations were addressed for all sub-groups or justifications were provided for the those sub-groups for which no <i>adaptations</i> were provided. However, some of the adaptations were not congruent with the student needs.	Needed adaptations were addressed for all sub-groups or justifications were provided for the those sub-groups for which no <i>adaptations</i> were provided. Additionally, all the adaptations were congruent with student needs.	

**Total Rubric Score:** \_\_\_\_/ 20

**Total Score for Factor 4:** \_\_\_\_/ 22

**FACTOR 5: ANALYSIS OF PRE-ASSESSMENT RESULTS AND INSTRUCTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS**

<b>Checklist:</b>	<b>Analysis of Pre-Assessment Results and Instructional Adjustments</b>	<b><u>N</u></b>	<b><u>Y</u></b>
	Provides Pre-Assessments Results Table	0	1
	Provides graphic representation of pre-assessment data .....	0	1
	Provides Design of Instruction Table with Adjustments	0	1
		<b>Total Checklist Score _____/ 3</b>	

**Rubric**

	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Unacceptable</b> (Minimal Performance)	<b>Acceptable</b> (Standard Performance)	<b>Competent</b> (High Performance)	<b>Exemplary</b> (Exemplary Performance)	
<b>Analysis of Pre-Assessment Results Data</b>	The candidate does not analyze the pre-assessment data correctly, or only analyzes the data as it relates to the whole group. Nor is analysis of the pre-assessment results aligned to the objectives.	The candidate analyzes the pre-assessment results data as it relates to the whole group, only part of the subgroups identified in Factor 1, and some the individual students. Analysis of the pre-assessment results is aligned to the objectives However, the candidate does not identify additional sub-groups based on the pre-assessment results	The candidate addresses two of the objectives described in Level 4 completely, but one objective is incomplete or missing.	1.The candidate analyzes the pre-assessment results data as it relates to the whole group, the subgroups identified in Factor 1, and the individual students. 2.Analysis of the pre-assessment results is aligned to the objectives 3.The candidate identifies additional sub-groups based on the pre-assessment results	
<b>Adaptations based on pre-Assessment results</b>	No adaptations are made based on pre-assessment results, nor does the candidate adequately defend their choice to not make adaptations.	The candidate describes general adaptations based on pre-assessment results but does not link specific adaptations to the whole group, sub-groups, or individual students, nor does the candidate adequately defend their choice to not make adaptations.	The candidate describes specific adaptations based on pre-assessment results linking them to some specific individual students or sub-groups, or adequately defends their choice to not make adaptations. .	The candidate describes specific adaptations based on pre-assessment results linking all of them to specific individual students or sub-group or adequately defends their choice to not make adaptations s.	

**Total Rubric Score:\_\_\_\_/8**

**Total Score for Factor 5:\_\_\_\_/11**

(Suggested total page length for **Analysis of Pre-Assessment Results and Instructional Adjustments**: 5 pages)

## FACTOR 6: ANALYSIS OF LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

<b>Checklist:</b>	<b>The Teacher:</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>
	Presents graphics and data that are easily read and interpreted.....	0	1
	Includes accurate calculations of gain scores in a completed worksheet.....	0	1
		<b>Total Checklist Score: ____/2</b>	

### **Rubric:Analysis of Learning Results**

	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Unacceptable</b> (Minimal Performance)	<b>Acceptable</b> (Standard Performance)	<b>Competent</b> (High Performance)	<b>Exemplary</b> (Exemplary Performance)	
<b>Analysis of Pre/Post-Assessment Results Data</b>	The candidate does not analyze the pre/post-assessment data correctly, or only analyzes the data as it relates to the whole group. Nor is analysis of the pre/post-assessment results aligned to the objectives.	The candidate analyzes the pre/post-assessment results data as it relates to the whole group, only one of the subgroups identified in Factor 1, and some the individual students. However, the candidate does not analyze the pre/post assessment results for the additional sub-groups identified as a result of the pre-assessment data analysis, Analysis of the pre/post-assessment results is aligned to the objectives	The candidate addresses 4 of the Level 4 areas.	The candidate analyzes the pre/post-assessment results data: 1.As it relates to the whole group, 2. As it relates to the subgroups identified in Factor 1, and 3. As it relates to the individual students, and 4. As it relates to the additional sub-groups based on the pre-assessment results 5. Analysis of the pre-assessment results is aligned to the objectives.	
<b>Interpretation of Student Learning</b>	Evidence of student learning was provided, but conclusions drawn were not based on the analysis of student learning.	Provides evidence of conclusions based on the analysis of student learning. However, conclusions are too simplistic or superficial.	Provides evidence of appropriate conclusions based on the analysis of student learning. However, the candidate does not provided evidence for why some students or sub-groups did not overcome barriers to achieve learning results.	Provides evidence of appropriate conclusions based on the analysis of student learning and explores multiple hypotheses for why some students or sub-groups did not overcome barriers to achieve learning results.	

**FACTOR 6: ANALYSIS OF LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES, CONT.**

	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Unacceptable (Minimal Performance)</b>	<b>Acceptable (Standard Performance)</b>	<b>Competent (High Performance)</b>	<b>Exemplary (Exemplary Performance)</b>	
<b>Insights on Best Practices and Assessment</b>	The candidate does not describe the effects that student motivation and behavior, social interaction, self-motivation, or student engagement had on the success or barriers to student learning, nor was a rationale provided for why some activities or assessments were more successful than others provided.	The candidate identifies successful and unsuccessful activities <b>or</b> assessments based on student motivation and behavior, social interaction, self-motivation, and student engagement, but do not explore reasons for their success or lack thereof.	The candidate identifies successful and unsuccessful activities <b>and</b> assessments based on student motivation and behavior, social interaction, self-motivation, and student engagement, but do not explore reasons for their success or lack thereof.	The candidate identifies successful and unsuccessful activities <b>and</b> assessments based on student motivation and behavior, social interaction, self-motivation, and student engagement. The candidate does explore reasons for their success or lack thereof.	
<b>Alignment Among Goals, Instruction and Assessment</b>	The candidate does not analyze the alignment or misalignment among goals, instruction, and assessment results.	The candidate analyzes the alignment or misalignment among goals and instruction but only in general and does not include discussion of assessment results.	The candidate analyzes the alignment or misalignment among goals, instruction, and assessment results, but does not relate information to students or sub-groups.	The candidate analyzes the alignment or misalignment among goals, instruction, and assessment results and relates information to students or sub-groups	

**Total Rubric Score: \_\_\_\_/16**

**Total Score for Factor 6: \_\_\_\_/ 19**

## FACTOR 7 REFLECTION ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

### Rubric

	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Unacceptable</b> (Minimal Performance)	<b>Acceptable</b> (Standard Performance)	<b>Competent</b> (High Performance)	<b>Exemplary</b> (Exemplary Performance)	
<b>Impact on Student Learning</b>	The candidate does not describe successful or non-successful activities or assessments, and how his or her decisions impacted student learning. The candidate does not describe how decisions regarding mid-unit adaptation impacted student learning.	The candidate described one successful and one non-successful activity or assessment, and how his or her decisions impacted student learning. However, the candidate does not describe how decisions regarding mid-unit adaptation impacted student learning. Statements on impacting student learning were plausible.	The candidate described only one successful and one non-successful activity or assessment, and how his or her decisions impacted student learning. Additionally, the candidate described how decisions regarding mid-unit adaptation impacted student learning. Reasons given were plausible.	The candidate described: 1. Two successful activities or assessments 2. Two non-successful activities or assessments 3. How his or her decisions impacted student learning. 4. How decisions regarding mid-unit adaptation impacted student learning. 5. Reasons given were plausible.	
<b>Implications for Future Teaching</b>	The candidate does not address any of the objectives listed in Level 4.	The candidate identified at least one of the objectives listed in Level 4.	The candidate identified two of the three objectives listed in Level 4.	The candidate identified: 1. Teaching strategies needing strengthening or modifications 2. Appropriate ideas for redesigning instruction. 3. Connection to his/her improvements having a positive impact on student learning.	
<b>Implication of a Christian Worldview in the Learning Community</b>	The candidate addressed implications of a Christian Worldview but provides no description of the effect of his or her disposition, decisions, practices, or actions on the learning community.	The candidate provided a description of the effect of his or her disposition, decisions, practices, or actions on the learning community, but does not address it from a Christian Worldview.	The candidate provided a description of the effect of his or her disposition, decisions, practices, or actions on the learning community, from a Christian Worldview, but does not include implications for self change.	The candidate provided a description of the effect of his or her disposition, decisions, practices, or actions on the learning community, from a Christian Worldview, and includes implications for self change	

Italicize

<b>FACTOR 7: REFLECTION ON TEACHING AND LEARNING (CONT.)</b>
--

	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Unacceptable</b> (Minimal Performance)	<b>Acceptable</b> (Standard Performance)	<b>Competent</b> (High Performance)	<b>Exemplary</b> (Exemplary Performance)	
<b>Implications for Professional Development</b>	The candidate provided implications for professional development; however no goals are included in the discussion, or are the insights and experiences based on information provided in this section.	The candidate presented professional development goals, which are either vague or not strongly related to the insights and experiences described in this section	The candidate presented one professional development <i>goal</i> that clearly emerges from the insights and experiences described in this Factor and describes at least one activity to meet the goal <b>or</b> presents two professional development <i>goals</i> that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in Factor but no activity is describe to meet each goal.	The candidate presented at least two professional development <i>goals</i> that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this Factor and describe at least one activity to meet each goal.	

**Total Score for Rubric: \_\_\_\_\_ / 16**