



**University of Vermont Department of Education
2020 Annual Report – Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
Standard 4.2 – Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness**

Executive Summary

The University of Vermont (UVM) Department of Education’s overall objective of data collection and analysis related to Standard 4.2 is to answer this primary question—**Do our completers demonstrate that they can effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that our educator preparation program (EPP) experiences were designed to achieve?** In order to answer this question, we observed alumni teaching in their classrooms, analyzed their plan for the observed lesson, and evaluated their performance using an instrument developed by the EPP.

Part I on this report focuses on our academic year 2019-2020 study of 2017 graduates. Part II of this report presents results aggregated from three successive years of study: 2017-2018, 2018-2019, and 2019-2020.

The data show that our alumni are generally effective in applying the professional knowledge and skills that they acquire in our programs. To varying degrees, in every observed class session our graduates’ students had opportunities to actively engage with accessible standards-aligned content through explorations, partner or small group work, critical thinking activities, creative play, and/or active problem-solving. Most of the observed graduates exhibited a very positive affect: their interactions with students conveyed genuine warmth, care, and interest.

At the time of each study our alumni were in their third year of teaching, and their instructional planning and classroom practice were clearly influenced not only by their formal teacher preparation but also by the school contexts in which they work. All school systems in Vermont are now implementing the state-wide shift to proficiency-based education, which includes a new emphasis on personalization and flexible pathways at the middle and high school levels. Our graduates reported regularly working with colleagues to identify learning targets for particular courses or instructional units, develop corresponding proficiency scales, assessment of proficiency, and unit planning. Their instruction includes helping students make connections between academic learning and their lives outside the school.

Participants shared their appreciation for their professional preparation at UVM. They reported learning overarching concepts, inquiry-based pedagogy, the importance of aligning instruction with assessment, and the importance of collecting and using student data to inform instruction. Several referred to specific methods classes as particularly important in their preparation, and most expressed a deep desire to continue improving their professional practice so that they can better meet student needs.

**University of Vermont Department of Education
2020 Annual Report – Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
Standard 4.2 – Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness**

Introduction

The University of Vermont (UVM) Department of Education’s overall objective of data collection and analysis related to Standard 4.2 is to answer this primary question—**Do our completers demonstrate that they can effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that our educator preparation program (EPP) experiences were designed to achieve?** In order to answer this question, we observed alumni teaching in their classrooms, analyzed their plan for the observed lesson, and evaluated their performance using an instrument developed by the EPP. The same participants were also interviewed and provided assessments and assessment data as part of the data collection for Standard 4.1, which focuses on the impact our alumni have on student learning growth.

Part I on this report focuses on our academic year 2019-2020 study of 2017 graduates. Part II of this report presents results aggregated from three successive years of study: 2017-2018, 2018-2019, and 2019-2020.

In addition to the observations and lesson plan analysis, another measure of teaching effectiveness for our alumni are the action research projects completed in the Middle Grades Institute. Each summer, in-service teachers attend an institute and develop an action research project. After enacting the action research during the fall semester, they present the results of their research at the Middle Grades Conference in January. Every year we have alumni from across our licensure programs that participate in the institute.

Part I: Academic Year 2019-2020 Study of 2017 Completers

Methods

Oversight of the data collection and analysis related to the observation data and lesson plan analysis for Standard 4.2 as well as the iterative process of using results for continuous improvement is provided by the CAEP Leadership Team composed of the Dean of the College, Associate Deans, Chair of the Department of Education, Director of Teacher Education, the College Director of Assessment, Data and Accreditation, and DOE Coordinator of Assessment and Accreditation.

Participant Selection

The sample for data collection in 2019-2020 for CAEP Standard 4.2 is from EPP graduates who completed their program in 2017 and are known to be employed in Vermont. At the time of data collection, most of these graduates were in their third year of teaching; new enough that their practice would still reflect their formal professional preparation but no longer novices. Our goal was to create a sample of 10 or more alumni across all licensure programs in schools across the state. The sample was obtained by first narrowing the list of all 2017 EPP graduates (n=140) to

those we were able to confirm were employed in a Vermont school in the fall of 2019. Narrowing the list based on this criterion reduced the study population to 49 recent graduates. Beginning in October 2019, we invited all of the 2017 graduates in the study population to participate in this study. Invitations were sent by email—up to five times per individual—and included a brief description of the study. As incentive, participants were offered a \$25 Amazon gift card.

Ten 2017 graduates agreed to participate in the data collection for this study. Of these, eight were able to complete their study participation prior to implementation of COVID-19 related social distancing and school closures in March 2020. (These same graduates also participated in the data collection for Standard 4.1.) The eight 2017 graduates who were able to participate in this study represent three of ten endorsement areas. Note that only six of ten endorsement areas are represented in the study population. The number of graduates from the study population in each endorsement area, the number in the sample, and the sample teaching grade levels are listed in Table 1 below. The schools in which study participants work represent four of Vermont’s 14 counties. The distribution of schools by Vermont county is detailed in Table 2 below.

Table 1
Number of 2017 Completers by Endorsement Area
Study Population (N=49) vs. Sample (N=8)

Endorsement Area	Number of Graduates Confirmed as Teaching in VT	Number of Study Participants	Study Participants Teaching Grade(s)
Art	0		
Consulting Teacher	0		
Early Childhood	0		
Early Childhood Special Education	2		
Elementary Education	13	1	K
Middle Grades			
ELA	2	1	7 th – 8 th
Math	1		
Science	1		
Social Studies	4	2	7 th – 8 th
Music	1		
Physical Education	0		
Secondary Ed			
English	6		
Math	9	3	6 th – 9 th
Science	3	1	9 th – 12 th
Social Studies	4		
Special Education	3		

Table 2
Number of Study Participant Schools by Vermont County

County	Number Participants
Chittenden	4
Franklin	2
Washington	1
Windsor	1

Data Collection

All eight study participants were observed teaching a lesson, and all ten shared the plan for that lesson prior to or at the time of the observation. The observer, Coordinator for Assessment and Accreditation for the University of Vermont’s Department of Education, took notes during the observation. All of the participants were interviewed prior to or following the observation as part of data collection for Standard 4.1 during which they provided additional information about planning for instruction.

Data Analysis

The observer rated each lesson using a modified version of the Summative Student Teaching Assessment, which is also used to evaluate our pre-service teachers at the end of student teaching. Ratings for planning were based on written plans submitted at the time of the observation, instructional tools used during the lesson (including posted notices of lesson objectives or standards, handouts, ready availability of materials, etc.), as well as the interview data collected for 4.1. A copy of the instrument is included in the appendix. The instrument was piloted for observing in-service teachers in 2017 by two raters, the previous CAEP Coordinator and the current Coordinator of Assessment and Accreditation who conducted the observations for this study. Each observed and rated a videotaped lesson by an in-service teacher; then the two raters discussed initial coding and came to agreement on coding decisions. In fall 2019 the observer also calibrated with university faculty who use the instrument with pre-service teacher candidates.

The observation instrument addresses 16 dimensions within the categories of Planning for Instruction and Classroom Practice. Each dimension is rated on a scale of 1 to 4, defined as follows:

- 1 – Undeveloped
- 2 – Developing
- 3 – Target
- 4 – Advanced

At the time of graduation, pre-service teachers are expected to meet the target in most dimensions. The benchmark we have set for the collective sample of alumni, at 2-3 years after graduation, is a mean of 3.5 (out of 4) for each item on the observation instrument. For individuals, the expectation is that for each participant the rubric ratings should be primarily advanced (4s) with no underdeveloped (1s) or developing (2s).

Findings

Mean ratings on the sixteen dimensions on the Alumni Teacher Observation Tool ranged from 2.5 to 3.9. The benchmark of 3.5 was met for fifteen of the sixteen indicators (3.5 to 3.9 range), and one indicator was below at 3.0. Of the total 128 individual ratings, 66% were advanced, 28% were on target, and 6% were developing. Frequencies and means for each dimension are presented in Tables 3 and 4 below.

Ratings for five of the participants met the expectation that rubric ratings be primarily advanced (4’s). Seven met the expectation of no ratings at developing (2’s) or underdeveloped (1’s).

Planning for Instruction

As shown in Table 3, the mean ratings on all of the seven dimensions of planning for instruction met the benchmark of 3.5 (out of 4). These dimensions are: 1) developmentally appropriate and challenging lessons, 2) inclusive lessons with high expectations for diverse learners, 3) discipline appropriate lessons that are accessible and meaningful, 4) multiple assessment methods aligned with objectives and standards, 5) selecting rigorous learning objectives based on standards, 6) lesson grounded in rigorous standards, 7) and planning use of materials, technology and curricular resources to support and enhance instruction.

Table 3
2020 Study of 2017 Completers
Dimensions of Planning for Instruction
Frequencies and Means (N = 8)

Dimension	Frequencies				Mean
	1 Undeveloped	2 Developing	3 Target	4 Advanced	
Developmentally Appropriate & Challenging	0	0	1	7	3.9
Inclusive with High Expectations for Diverse Learners	0	0	4	4	3.5
Discipline Appropriate, Accessible and Meaningful	0	0	1	7	3.9
Multiple Assessment Methods Aligned with Objectives and Standards	0	0	1	7	3.9
Rigorous Learning Objectives Based on Content Standards	0	0	2	6	3.8
Rigorous Standards to Focus Instruction	0	0	3	5	3.6
Technology, Instructional Materials, & Curricular Resources	0	0	4	4	3.5

Classroom Practice

As shown in Table 4, the mean ratings on eight of the nine dimensions of classroom practice met the benchmark. These dimensions are: 1) differentiating and modifying instruction to meet

learner needs, 2) fostering a positive learning environment through active engagement and collaborative learning, 3) connecting concepts and differing perspectives to engage students in higher order thinking, 4) using a variety of instructional strategies to support deep understanding, 5) using assessment data to monitor student progress and adjust instruction, and 6) using multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, 7) effective classroom routines and communication strategies, and 8) transition monitoring for active participation.

Only one dimension of classroom practice, use of technology to support student learning, had a mean rating (2.5) below the Target level. Since the use of technology has not emerged as a concern for our preservice teachers, we will continue to monitor these data to determine whether the issue is with their preparation or with the access to technological resources in schools.

Table 4
2020 Study of 2017 Completers
Dimensions of Classroom Practice
Frequencies and Means (N=8)

Dimension	Frequencies				Mean
	1 Undeveloped	2 Developing	3 Target	4 Advanced	
Differentiation & Modifications Based	0	0	2	6	3.8
Positive Learning Environment for Active, Collaborative Learning	0	1	0	7	3.8
Concept Connections, Questioning, and Perspectives for Higher Order Critical Thinking	0	0	4	4	3.5
Variety of Instructional Strategies	0	0	3	5	3.6
Technology Use	0	5	2	1	2.5
Multiple Assessment Methods to Engage Learners in their Growth	0	0	3	5	3.6
Monitors Student Progress & Data Use for Instructional Decisions	0	0	3	5	3.6
Classroom Routines & Effective Communication Strategies	0	1	1	6	3.6
Transition Monitoring to Encourage Active Participation	0	1	2	5	3.5

Discussion

The data show that our alumni are generally effective in applying the professional knowledge and skills that they acquire in our programs. To varying degrees, in every observed class session our graduates’ students had opportunities to actively engage with accessible standards-aligned content through explorations, partner or small group work, critical thinking activities, creative

play, and/or active problem-solving. Most of the observed graduates exhibited a very positive affect: their interactions with students conveyed genuine warmth, care, and interest.

As noted in past annual reporting, alumni in this study are in their third year of teaching, and their instructional planning and classroom practice are clearly influenced not only by their formal teacher preparation but also by the school contexts in which they work. All school systems in Vermont are now implementing the state-wide shift to proficiency-based education, which includes a new emphasis on personalization and flexible pathways at the middle and high school levels. Teachers in the study report regularly working with colleagues to identify learning targets for particular courses or instructional units, develop corresponding proficiency scales, assessment of proficiency, and unit planning.

Most observed lessons focused on making the content relevant to their students' lives outside the classroom. In one observed lesson during an argument writing unit, for example, a middle level humanities teacher engaged students in collectively defining the term "social justice" and then brainstorming issues they know and care about that fit the definition. The students were then asked to choose one social justice issue important to them, and also a person, organization, or media outlet to address in their argument letter. This assignment replaces a more traditional argument essay, and the plan was to actually send out the letters at the end of the unit. As another example, one middle level math teacher made content relatable with a flyer for her students' notebooks that specified levels of proficiency in a rates and ratios unit using a restaurant menu format (starters through dessert), and many of the learning activities were grounded in recipes students could make at home.

Participants shared their appreciation for their professional preparation at UVM. They reported learning overarching concepts, inquiry-based pedagogy, the importance of aligning instruction with assessment, and the importance of collecting and using student data to inform instruction. Several referred to specific methods classes as particularly important in their preparation. Suggestions for program improvement included more exposure to strategies for supporting learning for high-needs students and collecting data and using data in a proficiency-based system. Personal goals for continued learning include better methods of formative and summative data collection and analysis, explicitly posting learning targets and standards so students see them daily, and designing opportunities for students to assess and monitor their own progress toward meeting learning targets.

Part II: Results from Three Cycles of Data Collection

Methods

The same participant selection, data collection and data analysis methods were used in each of the three academic years (AY 2017-2018, AY2018-2019, and AY 2019-2020) we have conducted this study, and the same rater has conducted the observations in each of those three years. Those methods are described in detail in Part I one of this report. Over the three years, the rubric descriptors in the Summative Assessment of Student Teaching observation tool were

modified somewhat to support increased inter-rater reliability of pre-service teacher candidates, but not so much as to invalidate comparison across the three years.

In each of the three data collection cycles we met our goal of study sample size of ten program completers. In the first year of the study we had eleven participants, in the second year ten, and in the third year ten who agreed to participate – with eight able to complete the study prior to school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic. These participants represent seven of the ten endorsement areas. The aggregate number of graduates in the three study populations in each endorsement area, the aggregate number in the sample, and the aggregate sample teaching grade levels are listed in Table 5 below. The schools in which study participants work represent nine of Vermont’s 14 counties. The distribution of schools by Vermont county is detailed in Table 6 below.

Table 5
Three-Year Aggregated (2015, 2016, & 2017) Completers by Endorsement Area
Study Population (N=127) vs. Sample (N=29)

Endorsement Area	Number of Graduates Confirmed as Teaching in VT	Number of Study Participants	Study Participants Teaching Grade(s)
Art	3		
Consulting Teacher	4		
Early Childhood	5		
Early Childhood Special Education	10	2	PK
Elementary Education	27	5	PK-6 th SPED; K; 1 st ; 4 th -5 th
Middle Grades			
ELA	3	2	7 th – 8 th
Math	3	1	6 th
Science	2	1	4 th
Social Studies	4	2	7 th – 8 th
Music	3	1	K-6 th
Physical Education	1	1	K-6 th
Secondary Ed			
English	12	1	9 th -12 th
Math	14	6	9 th -12 th
Science	12	5	7 th -12 th
Social Studies	11	1	9 th -12 th
Special Education	13	1	K-8 th

Table 6
Number of Study Participant Schools by Vermont County

County	Number Participants
Addison	1
Caledonia	1
Chittenden	11
Franklin	9
Grand Isle	1
Lamoille	1
Rutland	1
Washington	2
Windsor	2

Findings

Mean ratings on the sixteen dimensions on the Alumni Teacher Observation Tool across the three study years ranged from 2.5 to 3.8. The benchmark of 3.5 was met for thirteen of the sixteen indicators (3.5 to 3.8 range), two indicators were just below the benchmark (3.4), and one was below target (2.5). Of the total 456 individual ratings, 59% were advanced, 36% were on target, and 5% were developing. Frequencies and means for each dimension are presented in Tables 7 and 8 below.

Ratings for 20 of the participants met the expectation that rubric ratings be primarily advanced (4's). Nineteen met the expectation of no ratings at developing (2's) or underdeveloped (1's).

Planning for Instruction

As shown in Table 7, the mean ratings on all seven dimensions of planning for instruction met the benchmark of 3.5 (out of 4). These dimensions are: 1) developmentally appropriate and challenging lessons, 2) inclusive lessons with high expectations for diverse learners, 3) discipline appropriate lessons that are accessible and meaningful, 4) multiple assessment methods aligned with objectives and standards, 5) selecting rigorous learning objectives based on standards, 6) lesson grounded in rigorous standards, 7) and planning use of materials, technology and curricular resources to support and enhance instruction.

Table 7
Aggregated Data from Studies of 2015, 2016, & 2017 Completers
Dimensions of Planning for Instruction
Frequencies and Means (N = 28)*

Dimension	Frequencies				Mean
	1 Undeveloped	2 Developing	3 Target	4 Advanced	
Developmentally Appropriate & Challenging	0	0	8	20	3.7
Inclusive with High Expectations for Diverse Learners	0	0	10	18	3.6
Discipline Appropriate, Accessible and Meaningful	0	0	7	21	3.8
Multiple Assessment Methods Aligned with Objectives and Standards	0	0	10	18	3.6
Rigorous Learning Objectives Based on Content Standards	0	0	12	16	3.6
Rigorous Standards to Focus Instruction	0	0	14	14	3.5
Technology, Instructional Materials, & Curricular Resources	0	0	14	14	3.5

*One participant did not share lesson plans.

Classroom Practice

As shown in Table 4, the mean ratings on six of the nine dimensions of classroom practice met the benchmark. These dimensions are: 1) differentiating and modifying instruction to meet

learner needs, 2) fostering a positive learning environment through active engagement and collaborative learning, 3) using a variety of instructional strategies to support deep understanding, 5) using assessment data to monitor student progress and adjust instruction, and 6) using multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, and 7) effective classroom routines and communication strategies.

Two dimensions of classroom practice were just below the benchmark mean rating of 3.5. These dimensions are: 1) connecting concepts and differing perspectives to engage students in higher order thinking and 2) transition monitoring for active participation. Only one dimension of classroom practice – use of technology to support student learning – had a mean rating (2.5) below the Target level. Since the use of technology has not emerged as a concern for our preservice teachers, we will continue to monitor these data to determine whether the issue is with their preparation or with the access to technological resources in schools.

Table 8
Aggregated Data from Studies of 2015, 2016, & 2017 Completers
Dimensions of Classroom Practice
Frequencies and Means (N=29)

Dimension	Frequencies				Mean
	1 Undeveloped	2 Developing	3 Target	4 Advanced	
Differentiation & Modifications Based	0	1	8	20	3.7
Positive Learning Environment for Active, Collaborative Learning	0	2	7	20	3.6
Concept Connections, Questioning, and Perspectives for Higher Order Critical Thinking	0	2	14	13	3.4
Variety of Instructional Strategies	0	0	8	21	3.7
Technology Use	0	14	12	2	2.5
Multiple Assessment Methods to Engage Learners in their Growth	0	0	11	18	3.6
Monitors Student Progress & Data Use for Instructional Decisions	0	0	10	19	3.7
Classroom Routines & Effective Communication Strategies	0	3	8	18	3.5
Transition Monitoring to Encourage Active Participation	0	3	11	15	3.4

Discussion

Aggregated data from three years of reporting show that over time alumni from across our programs consistently demonstrate effective application of the professional knowledge and skills for planning and classroom practice that they acquired in our educator preparation programs. The benchmark of a mean rating of 3.5 on each indicator reflects our expectation that by their third year in the field, our alumni will have continued to develop their professional practice, and the majority of study participants met that expectation. Across the board, the alumni who participated in this study expressed awareness of and/or goals for continued professional growth. The observer was struck by the profound kindness and respect that study participants extended to their students, and the deep desire expressed during interviews to continue to improve their practice so that they can better meet their students' needs.

Appendix

**Summative Student Teaching Assessment
(Revised Dec. 4, 2018)**

Please complete this assessment at the end of the student teaching semester for each candidate that you supervise. This is a summative assessment that should evaluate the candidate’s work across the semester and should reflect where the candidate is at the end (versus performance on one lesson). The expectation is that most ratings should be at the “Target” level with no areas rated at the “Undeveloped” level. The ratings on this assessment should contribute to the decision-making process for the candidate’s student teaching grade.

Part A: Planning for Instruction

	Performance Indicator	Undeveloped	Developing	Target	Advanced	Rating	Comments
1	The candidate uses an understanding of how learners grow and develop (in cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas) to design developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. (InTASC 1)	The candidate <u>designs or adapts</u> learning experiences that are <u>not appropriate for the developmental level of learners</u> and <u>are not appropriately challenging</u> for learners.	The candidate <u>designs or adapts</u> learning experiences that are either developmentally appropriate or challenging based on an understanding of how learners grow and develop.	The candidate <u>designs or adapts</u> learning experiences that are both developmentally appropriate and challenging based on an understanding of how learners grow and develop.	The candidate <u>gathers data on learner development then designs or adapts</u> learning experiences that are <u>developmentally appropriate and challenging</u> based on an understanding of how learners grow and develop, and the candidate’s <u>subsequent planning demonstrates attention to learner development based on knowledge attained through prior lesson implementation.</u>		
2	The candidate uses an understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to design inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards. (InTASC 2)	The candidate <u>designs or adapts</u> learning experiences that <u>do not take into account</u> individual learner differences or diverse cultures and communities.	The candidate <u>designs or adapts</u> learning experiences that respond to either individual learner differences or diverse cultures and communities.	The candidate <u>designs or adapts</u> learning experiences that respond to both individual learner differences as well as diverse cultures and communities.	The candidate <u>gathers data on learner differences and the diverse cultures and communities</u> represented in the school then <u>designs or adapts</u> learning experiences that <u>respond to individual learner differences as well as diverse cultures and communities</u> , and the candidate’s <u>subsequent planning</u>		

					<u>demonstrates attention to learner differences and diverse cultures and communities based on knowledge attained through prior lesson implementation.</u>		
3	The candidate uses an understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) to design learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners. (InTASC 4)	The candidate <u>designs or adapts</u> learning experiences that are <u>ineffective</u> in making the content accessible and meaningful for learners.	The candidate uses content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge <u>to design or adapt</u> learning experiences that make the content <u>either accessible or meaningful</u> for learners.	The candidate uses content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge <u>to design or adapt</u> learning experiences that make the content <u>both accessible and meaningful</u> for learners.	The candidate <u>gathers data on student prior knowledge in regard to content</u> then uses content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge to <u>design or adapt</u> learning experiences that make the content <u>both accessible and meaningful for learners</u> , and the candidate's <u>subsequent planning demonstrates attention to building upon content knowledge to extend learning.</u>		
4	The candidate's planning uses multiple methods of assessment (formative and summative) that align with objectives and standards. (InTASC 6)	The candidate <u>designs or adapts ineffective</u> assessments, and assessments <u>do not align</u> with objectives and standards.	The candidate <u>designs or adapts</u> formative and summative assessments that are <u>either effective or are aligned</u> with objectives and standards.	The candidate <u>designs or adapts</u> formative and summative assessments that are <u>both effective and are aligned</u> with objectives and standards.	The candidate <u>designs or adapts</u> formative and summative assessments that are <u>both effective and are aligned</u> with objectives and standards. The candidate's planning shows the <u>ability to develop a range of effective formative and summative assessments</u> that get at the nuances of learning tied to particular objectives/standards.		
5	The candidate uses rigorous learning objectives based on content standards to plan learning experiences and performance tasks.	The candidate's objective(s) <u>lack rigor</u> . <u>Connections</u> to standards, assessments, and/or instructional components <u>are not apparent</u> .	The candidate's objective(s) are <u>either rigorous, or they are connected</u> to the standards, assessments, and instructional components of the lesson/unit.	The candidate's objective(s) are <u>both rigorous and are connected</u> to the standards, assessments, and instructional components of the lesson/unit.	The candidate's objective(s) <u>are rigorous and are connected</u> to the standards, assessments, and instructional components of the lesson/unit. The candidate <u>selects an</u>		

	(InTASC 7)				<u>achievable number of objectives</u> for each lesson.		
6	The candidate selects rigorous standards (e.g. Next Generation Science Standards, Common Core) to focus instruction. (InTASC 7)	The candidate <u>does not reference standards for every learning experience.</u>	The candidate <u>selects standards</u> from the Common Core, Next Generation Science Standards, National Core Arts Standards, Vermont Early Learning Standards, C3 Social Studies Standards, and/or Vermont Grade Level Expectations <u>for every learning experience</u> , but standards are <u>not always directly applicable</u> .	The candidate selects <u>applicable standards</u> from the Common Core, Next Generation Science Standards, National Core Arts Standards, Vermont Early Learning Standards, C3 Social Studies Standards, and/or Vermont Grade Level Expectations <u>for every learning experience</u> .	The candidate <u>selects applicable standards from across sets of standards</u> including the Common Core, Next Generation Science Standards, National Core Arts Standards, Vermont Early Learning Standards, C3 Social Studies Standards, and Vermont Grade Level Expectations <u>for every learning experience</u> . The candidate <u>selects an achievable number of standards</u> for each lesson.		
7	The candidate plans for the use of technologies, instructional materials and curricular resources that support and enhance instruction. (InTASC 7)	The candidate <u>does not identify</u> resources (including technological resources) needed to support instruction.	The candidate <u>identifies</u> resources (including technological resources) needed to support instruction.	The candidate <u>identifies a comprehensive list of</u> resources (including technological resources).	The candidate <u>identifies a comprehensive list of</u> resources (including technological resources) that <u>support and enhance</u> instruction.		
General Summative Feedback on Planning for Instruction:							

Part B: Evaluation of Classroom Practice

1. Instruction							
	Performance Indicator	Undeveloped	Developing	Target	Advanced	Rating	Comments
8	The candidate differentiates and modifies aspects of instruction based on individual learner readiness, interest, and preference to engage all learners. (InTASC 2)	The candidate <u>does not differentiate</u> instruction or <u>provide</u> accommodations, and aspects of lessons are <u>inappropriate</u> for learners.	The candidate <u>differentiates</u> instruction and <u>provides</u> accommodations.	The candidate <u>differentiates</u> instruction and <u>provides</u> accommodations needed to <u>engage all learners</u> .	The candidate <u>differentiates and modifies multiple aspects</u> of instruction based on individual learner readiness, interest, and preference in ways that <u>support and engage</u> all learners.		
9	The candidate creates environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction and active engagement in learning. (InTASC 3)	The candidate is <u>not able to create</u> an engaged learning environment that supports individual or collaborative learning, and interactions are minimal.	The candidate <u>creates</u> a learning environment that <u>focuses primarily on either</u> individual or collaborative learning.	The candidate <u>creates</u> a learning environment that <u>supports both</u> individual and collaborative learning, and which supports <u>positive social interactions</u> .	The candidate <u>creates a learning community</u> that <u>fosters both</u> individual and collaborative learning, and which encourages <u>positive social interactions</u> and <u>active engagement</u> .		
10	The candidate understands how to connect concepts, use questioning techniques and use differing perspectives to engage learners in higher order, critical thinking. (InTASC 5)	The candidate is <u>unable</u> to connect concepts or use other strategies to engage learners in higher order thinking.	The candidate <u>connects concepts</u> to prompt higher order thinking.	The candidate <u>connects concepts</u> and <u>uses questioning techniques</u> to prompt higher order thinking.	The candidate <u>uses questioning techniques</u> and <u>different perspectives</u> to engage learners in <u>higher order, critical thinking</u> that <u>encourages learners to connect concepts</u> .		

11	The candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply in meaningful ways. (InTASC 8)	The candidate <u>uses the same instructional strategies</u> for lessons and this limits the development of content knowledge and skills.	The candidate <u>uses a limited range of different instructional strategies</u> that engage learners in developing content knowledge and skills.	The candidate <u>uses a variety of appropriate instructional strategies</u> to engage learners in developing content knowledge and skills.	The candidate <u>uses a broad range of appropriate instructional strategies</u> to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply in meaningful ways.		
12	The candidate understands the ways that technology can be used to support instruction and assessment and models appropriate use to improve student learning. (ISTE 1, 2, 3)	The candidate <u>does not use</u> technology to support instruction.	The candidate <u>uses technology to support instruction.</u>	The candidate <u>uses technology to support instruction and assessment.</u>	The candidate <u>effectively models the use of technology</u> to support <u>instruction and assessment</u> in ways that <u>improve student learning.</u>		
General Summative Feedback on Instruction:							

2. Assessment							
	Performance Indicator	Undeveloped	Developing	Target	Advanced	Rating	Comments
13	The candidate uses multiple methods of assessment (formative and summative) to engage learners in their own growth. (InTASC 6)	The candidate <u>uses irrelevant or ineffective</u> assessments.	The candidate <u>uses formative and summative assessments</u> , but they do not require learners to examine their own growth.	The candidate <u>uses a variety of formative and summative assessments</u> that include opportunities for learner self-evaluation.	The candidate <u>uses a broad range of relevant formative and summative assessments</u> that engage learners in reflecting on their own learning.		
14	The candidate monitors student progress and uses assessment data to make instructional decisions and to	The candidate <u>does not monitor</u> student progress and <u>does not use</u> assessment data to make	The candidate <u>monitors student progress</u> but <u>is not able to use</u> assessment data to make	The candidate <u>monitors student progress</u> and <u>uses assessment data to adjust practice</u>	The candidate <u>monitors student progress</u> and <u>identifies appropriate assessment data</u>		

	guide the teacher’s and learner’s decision making. (InTASC 6)	instructional decisions.	instructional adjustments.	during instruction.	<u>to guide both</u> teacher and learner decision-making during instruction.		
General Summative Feedback on Assessment:							

3. Classroom Management							
15	Performance Indicator	Undeveloped	Developing	Target	Advanced	Rating	Comments
15	The candidate establishes classroom routines, procedures, and expectations to actively and equitably engage learners and uses respectful and <i>effective</i> verbal and nonverbal communication strategies (InTASC 3)	The candidate <u>does not</u> implement routines or hold students accountable and <u>uses ineffective</u> verbal and non-verbal communication thus limiting student engagement and resulting in loss of instructional time.	The candidate <u>implements routines, or uses effective</u> verbal and nonverbal communication strategies but is <u>ineffective in engaging students.</u>	The candidate <u>implements routines and expectations,</u> and <u>uses effective</u> verbal and nonverbal communication strategies <u>to engage students.</u>	The candidate <u>implements clear, effective and understandable routines and expectations,</u> <u>holds students accountable</u> and <u>uses respectful and effective</u> verbal and nonverbal communication strategies <u>to engage all students.</u>		
16	The candidate monitors transitions and changes in the learning environment and uses a variety of instructional and behavioral management strategies to encourage learning and active participation. (InTASC 3)	The candidate <u>does not</u> monitor transitions or changes in the learning environment and <u>uses ineffective</u> instructional and behavioral management strategies.	The candidate <u>monitors transitions or changes</u> in the learning environment but <u>uses ineffective instructional or behavioral management strategies</u> that do not encourage appropriate participation.	The candidate <u>monitors transitions and changes</u> in the learning environment and is able to <u>use instructional and behavioral management strategies</u> to encourage appropriate participation.	The candidate <u>monitors transitions and changes</u> in the learning environment and <u>uses a variety of effective instructional and behavioral management strategies</u> to encourage learning and active participation.		
General Summative Feedback on Classroom Management:							