

CONTINUOUS TEACHING CYCLE EVALUATION FORM

Candidate's name: _____ Evaluator's name: _____ Evaluator's role: cooperating teacher; university supervisor; faculty advisor
 Student teaching experience: first second Semester: _____ Course # _____

Please evaluate the extent to which the candidate has completed each component of the Continuous Teaching Cycle report as intended, using the following rubrics:

1. **Unacceptable/Insufficient:** The criteria described are not met. In order to obtain a passing grade in this assignment, the candidate must redo all or part of the Continuous Teaching Cycle as directed by the course professor.
2. **Needs improvement/Emerging:** The criteria described are partially met. Minor revisions in the paper are called for to address the shortcomings identified and should be completed before the candidate can "pass" this assignment.
3. **Basic proficiency:** The criteria described are essentially met. The Continuous Teaching Cycle report can be used as evidence that the candidate is able to plan, implement and evaluate worthwhile instructional units.
4. **Outstanding performance:** The unit Continuous Teaching Cycle meets the criteria described and provides an outstanding example that the candidate is able to plan, implement and evaluate worthwhile and innovative instructional units.

Category	(1) Unacceptable/Insufficient	(2) Needs Improvement/Emerging	(3) Basic Proficiency	(4) Outstanding Performance	Self Score	Faculty Score
1. Theoretical Framework <i>CEC: 1</i> <i>Weight, 1 = 5</i> (Section 2 of guidelines)	The theoretical framework is not articulated. Candidate has not adequately used course readings. The definition of the content area addressed and the theory of learning are unclear. There is little evidence of an understanding of theory and research relevant to special education and how this influences instructional design. The rationale for the unit is not clearly stated with little or no articulation of the importance of the unit to meaningful and relevant student learning and inclusive practice.	The theoretical framework is somewhat articulated. Candidate has used some course readings where appropriate. The definition of the content area addressed and the theory of learning are provided. Evidence of an understanding of theory and research related to special education and how this influences instructional design is unclear. The rationale for the unit provides some articulation of the importance of the unit to meaningful and relevant student learning and inclusive practice.	The theoretical framework sufficiently guides, and provides a foundation for, the unit. Candidate has used course readings where appropriate. There is both a definition of the content area addressed and a theory of learning. Candidate offers evidence of understanding of evidence-based principles and theories related to special education, and how these influence their design of assessment, instructional planning, and implementation. The rationale for the unit sufficiently explains the importance of the unit to meaningful and relevant student learning and inclusive practice.	The theoretical framework is clear and well thought out. It clearly guides, and provides a foundation for, the unit. Candidate has used course readings and has included outside readings where appropriate. There is both a definition of the content area addressed and a theory of learning. Candidate offers superior evidence of understanding of philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories relevant to special education and how these influence their design of assessment, instructional planning, and implementation. The rationale for the unit clearly explains the importance of the unit to meaningful and relevant student learning and inclusive practice.		

Category	(1) Unacceptable/Insufficient	(2) Needs Improvement/Emerging	(3) Basic Proficiency	(4) Outstanding Performance	Self Score	Faculty Score
2. Student Learning Environment <i>CEC: 1, 5, 6, 9</i> <i>Weight, 2 = 10</i> (Section 1 of guidelines)	Displays minimal or no knowledge of characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning and minimal or no understanding and value of the importance and complex characteristics of families of students with ELN; displays minimal, stereotypical, irrelevant, or no knowledge of ELN student differences (e.g., developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests); identifies the value of understanding students' skills and prior learning but provides no implications of this information for planning and assessment based on student individual differences and learning environment characteristics	Displays some knowledge of characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning and some understanding and value of the importance and complex characteristics of families of students with ELN; displays general knowledge of ELN student differences (e.g., developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests); identifies the value of understanding students' skills and prior learning and provides general implications of this information for planning and assessment based on student individual differences and learning environment characteristics	Articulates a comprehensive understanding of characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning and a good understanding and value of the importance and complex characteristics of families of students with ELN; displays specific knowledge of ELN student differences (e.g., developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests); displays knowledge of students' skills and prior learning and provides specific implications of this information for planning and assessment based on student individual differences and learning environment characteristics	Articulates an in-depth understanding of characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning with specific data, cited sources, and/or statistics; candidate understands and values the importance and complex characteristics of families of students with ELN; articulates in-depth knowledge of ELN student differences (e.g., developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests); displays an in-depth knowledge of students' skills and prior learning and articulates the implications of this information for planning and assessment through an analysis of decisions for instruction based on student individual differences and learning environment characteristics		
3. Lesson Planning to Meet District/state Requirements <i>CEC: 2, 7, 8</i> <i>Weight, 2 = 10</i> (Sections 3 and 4 of guidelines)	Lesson plans do not contain the essential components of an effective lesson plan, no evidence or vague reference to NYS standards; goals and objectives are vague or not included, are inappropriate and unrealistic, and reflect only one level of learning	Lesson plans demonstrate knowledge of content area and incorporate NYS standards; goals and objectives are not developmentally appropriate and do not address pre-requisite knowledge, skills, and other student needs, are not appropriately challenging, and reflect only one level of learning	Lesson plans are effective, demonstrate knowledge of content area, incorporate NYS standards; goals and objectives are developmentally appropriate and address pre-requisite knowledge, skills, and other student needs, are appropriately challenging, and reflect 3 levels of learning	Lesson plans are well written, creatively and effectively demonstrate knowledge of content area, incorporate NYS standards; goals and objectives demonstrate realistic expectations for all students, provide for critical thinking and reflection, appropriately challenge thought and expectations, and include 3 or more levels of learning		
4: Assessment Plan <i>CEC: 8</i> <i>Weight, 4 = 20</i> (Section 5 of guidelines)	Assessment criteria minimally or not linked to learning goals; assessment plan uses only one assessment mode; displays limited knowledge of formal/informal assessments; assessments not designed or varied to meet the individual needs of students; pre- and post-assessments from 3 levels of learning are included with no reflection of student progress	Assessment criteria linked to some learning goals; assessment plan uses multiple assessment modes to document student performance, but are not performance based and/or do not require integration of knowledge, skills, and critical thinking; assessments are designed and varied to meet the individual needs of some students; pre- and post-assessments from 3 levels of learning are included with brief reflection of student progress	Assessment criteria linked to learning goals; assessment plan uses pre-/post-, multiple assessment modes to document student performance, strengths and needs, and effectiveness of instruction; assessments are designed and varied to meet the individual needs of most students; pre- and post-assessments from 3 levels of learning are included with reflection on student progress; provides additional instructional strategies	Assessment criteria clearly linked to learning goals; assessment plan uses pre-/post-, formal/informal, and self-assessments; data used to document student performance, strengths and needs, and effectiveness of instruction; assessments designed and varied for all students' needs and are creative and show evidence of problem-solving skills; pre- and post-assessments from 3 levels of learning are included with reflection on student progress; additional instructional strategies that may be needed to master lesson content for individuals or groups provided		

Category	(1) Unacceptable/Insufficient	(2) Needs Improvement/Emerging	(3) Basic Proficiency	(4) Outstanding Performance	Self Score	Faculty Score
<p>5: Pedagogy CEC: 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 Weight, 4 = 20</p> <p>(Section 6 of guidelines)</p>	Lesson plans provide little or no adjustment for individual learning needs; lessons are not linked to learning goals; no levels of support appropriate to the individual (developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests) are provided; activities and assignments not appropriate for each student; minimal or no connections to previous lessons; plans do not incorporate technology; no description of collaboration with other school professionals	Lesson plans provide some adjustment for individual learning needs through differentiation; lessons are not linked to all learning goals; levels of support appropriate to the individual (developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests) minimally provided; activities and assignments not appropriate for each student; minimal connections to previous lessons; plans incorporate technology, but is inappropriately used; minimal description of collaboration with other school professionals	Lesson plans incorporate student interests and previous knowledge while adjusting for individual learning needs through differentiation; lessons are linked to learning goals; levels of support appropriate to the individual (developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests) provided through research-based instructional strategies (accommodations, modifications, adaptation, UDL); connections to previous lessons; plans incorporate technology and/or appropriate materials to provide opportunities for critical thinking; general description of collaboration with other school professionals	Lesson plans incorporate student interests and previous knowledge while adjusting for individual learning needs through differentiation; lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals; demonstrate critical thinking and reflection in activities and assignments; levels of support appropriate to the individual (developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests) provided through research-based instructional strategies (accommodations, modifications, adaptation, UDL); clear connections to previous lessons; plans incorporate technology and/or appropriate materials to promote critical thinking and reflection in activities and assignments; specific description of collaboration with other school professionals		
<p>6: Analysis of Student Learning CEC: 5, 8, 9 Weight, 4 = 20</p> <p>(Section 8 of guidelines)</p>	Assessment data are not utilized to monitor and document student progress; minimal or no summary of the 3 students' performance after instruction is included to compare pre-/ post- results; minimal or no analysis of whole class that fails to include evidence of impact on student learning, achievement, and progress	Assessment data are minimally utilized to monitor and document student progress; summary of the 3 students' performance after instruction is included to compare pre-/ post- results; analysis of whole class fails to include evidence of impact on student learning, achievement, and progress; no visuals provided to support narrative summaries	Assessment data are utilized to monitor and document student progress; an accurate summary of the 3 students' performance after instruction is included to compare pre-/ post- results; analysis of whole class learning, achievement, and progress included; visual and narrative summaries demonstrate the extent of student progress	Assessment data are utilized to monitor and document student progress; an accurate summary of the 3 students' performance after instruction is included to compare pre-/ post- results; thorough analysis of whole class learning, achievement, and progress included with implications for further instruction; visual and narrative summaries demonstrate the extent of student progress		
<p>7: Reflection CEC: 9 Weight, 3 = 15</p> <p>(Sections 7 and 9 of guidelines)</p>	Reflection minimally probes the lesson outcomes, and tends to blame learning outcomes on student's lack of preparedness and understanding of previous content; candidate demonstrates minimal insight into his/her role in improving instruction; reflection does not connect learning goals, instruction, and assessment data in discussion of student learning and effective instruction; provides no ideas for redesigning goals, instruction, and assessment	Reflection vaguely probes the lesson outcomes; candidate minimally reflects on performance and changes/revisions to improve instruction; reflection connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment data in discussion of student learning and effective instruction, but misunderstandings of conceptual gaps are present; provides limited ideas for redesigning goals, instruction, and assessment	Reflection probes the lesson outcomes including timing, the instructional strategies, use of groupings and effectiveness of technology/materials; candidate reflects on performance and changes/revisions to improve instruction, including specific strategies that may improve outcomes for individuals and the whole class; reflection connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment data in discussion of student learning and effective instruction; provides implications for future teaching, including ideas for redesigning goals, instruction, and assessment	Reflection thoughtfully probes the lesson outcomes including timing, the instructional strategies, use of groupings and effectiveness of technology / materials; candidate reflects on performance and changes/revisions to improve instruction, including specific strategies that may improve outcomes for individuals and the whole class; reflection connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment data in discussion of student learning and effective instruction, including exploring multiple hypotheses for why some students did and other did not meet learning goals, including the 3 target students; provides implications for future teaching, including specific alternative actions for redesigning goals, instruction, and assessment; current research findings are incorporated as supportive documentation		
<p>8. References and Citations CEC: 9 Weight, 1 = 5</p>	Citations not in proper APA format	Many errors in proper APA format	Some errors in proper APA format	All citations in proper APA format		

9. Mechanics and Usage <i>CEC: 9</i> <i>Weight, 1 = 5</i>	More than 12 errors in mechanics and/or usage	8–12 errors in mechanics and/or usage	5–7 errors in mechanics and/or usage	0–4 errors in mechanics and/or usage		
					Total	
						/110

Adapted from the University of South Florida, Department of Special Education and the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project, <http://www.uni.edu/itq/>