Guidelines for teacher candidates

All teacher candidates are required to design and implement innovative units in their student teaching and/or practicum experiences. As in the case of lesson plans, we believe it is important in at least one case to make explicit your thinking processes about design, implementation, and assessment. The following guidelines explain the minimum required components we expect in innovative unit papers. This assessment, in conjunction with final student teaching evaluations, will determine if a candidate will “pass” student teaching. Assessment of the continuous teaching cycle will occur on two levels: 1) Candidate ability to design, implement, and analyze the unit as described in these guidelines, and 2) Candidate ability to address in the unit the relevant standards set by their professional organization and Warner School proficiencies. The rubric is divided into three parts and is included in this packet. Content area faculty may provide additional rubrics specific to that specialization.

**Inclusion candidates:** Connected to your content area Innovative Unit Plan, you will implement a Continuous Teaching Cycle (CTC), to document how you utilize assessments to both inform and revise instruction. This is designed to support candidates to provide evidence of their ability to facilitate learning, be reflective practitioners who use assessment to inform instruction, and thoughtfully and systematically consider the impact of their instruction on P-12 students. The CTC guidelines follow the assignment rubric.

Required Unit Components:

1. **Introduction:** This section should provide a brief description of the unit that gives a context for the components of the unit, including an essential question and/or topic addressed if appropriate. Include a clear description of the context of implementation for the unit, including grade level, racial, ethnic and gender make-up of students and teachers, a description of the school and classroom, and whether the implementation occurred in the first or second student teaching/practicum experience. **Inclusion candidates:** See the Learning Environment Context guidelines. (CEC 1, 5, 6, 9)

2. **Theoretical framework:** Provide a clear, well thought out theoretical framework that both guides and provides a foundation for the unit, using course readings (and outside readings where appropriate). Candidates should state their definition of the content area addressed and their theory of learning. In other words, how does your definition of [literacy, language, science, math, English, social studies] and theory of learning frame the unit? This section should also include a clear rationale for the unit (e.g. why is this unit important? Why will student learning be meaningful and relevant in this unit?). **Inclusion candidates:** The theoretical framework should also address your definition of / theoretical approach towards inclusive practice (using outside readings where appropriate). Include a clear theoretical rationale for the instructional strategies you will employ during the unit. (CEC 1)

3. **Goals/Professional standards:** Describe the overarching goal/s of the unit and connect the goal/s to the larger curriculum in your class (e.g. an integrated curriculum in elementary or the specific content area in secondary). Discuss the professional and/or state standards this unit addresses. Make explicit the specific content addressed and connections to the theoretical framework, curriculum, and overarching unit goal/s. (CEC 2, 7, 8)
4. Objectives: Clearly articulate the specific unit objectives and connect these objectives to the unit goals and professional standards. **Inclusion candidates:** In addition, describe how the goals / objectives for the unit consider students’ working towards accomplishing their IEP goals and objectives. (CEC 2, 7, 8)

5. Assessment of student learning over time: Describe the multiple forms of assessment used across the unit. Include formative, summative, formal, and informal assessments. Explicitly connect your assessment to the theoretical framework, unit goals and objectives, and professional standards. In other words, how will your assessments help you scaffold student learning over time and how will you know you have accomplished your goals? How will your assessments inform instruction? **Inclusion candidates:** See the CTC Assessment Plan guidelines. In addition, describe the ways that the assessment will be differentiated, adapted, accommodated, and/or modified to address the strengths, interests, and diverse learning needs of all students, including English Language Learners and students with disability labels. Include pre- and post-tests. During this unit, you will identify 3 students (at least 2 of whom must have IEPs), demonstrating low, average, and high scores on their pre-assessments and on the post-assessments after lesson implementation. The Inclusion candidate will implement a well-planned CTC during which you plan and teach according to individual student needs based on an analysis of student work samples collected throughout the implementation of the unit plan. (CEC 8)

6. Pedagogy: Describe the series of connected lessons and/or experiences in the unit. Include your detailed lesson plans for selected lessons in this section using the lesson plan format given to you. Describe in detail how you will scaffold and support student learning over time and address any relevant safety considerations. **Inclusion candidates:** See CTC Pedagogy guidelines. In addition, describe how the lesson activities and strategies are differentiated through multiple means of representation, expression, and engagement that reflect high, appropriate expectations for all students, including English Language Learners and students with disabilities, (2) how accommodations and/or modifications and student language and communication needs indicated on IEP are incorporated into the lessons, and (3) how you collaborated with related services and para-professionals to meet IEP goals. (CEC 3, 4, 6, 7, 10)

7. Unit implementation: Describe what happened when you implemented this unit, with particular attention to students’ responses to its main activities. Reflect on what went well and what you would change in future implementations. **Inclusion candidates:** See the Unit Implementation Reflection guidelines. As part of the CTC, describe how you planned and revised your instruction based on student strengths, interests, needs, and performance and your assessment of the effectiveness of your instruction in previous lessons, highlighting in particular the 3 selected students. (CEC 9)

8. Analysis of student learning: Report the results of a systematic analysis of what your students learned as a result of the unit, making explicit references to goals and objectives, and using data from formal assessments and classroom observations (see number 5 above). Refer as appropriate to the assessment results and student work in an appendix to support your claims. **Inclusion candidates:** See the Analysis of Student Learning guidelines. (CEC 5, 8, 9)

9. Unit analysis: This section is a detailed analysis of the implementation of the unit that brings together content, theory, and practice. Describe how you have integrated the components of the unit into a coherent whole that produces meaningful and relevant student learning and addresses the goals articulated in Part 2 and 3 of the rubric. Connect the unit implementation with the larger curriculum and theoretical framework described in the introduction. **Inclusion candidates:** See Unit Analysis guidelines. In addition, make connections to inclusive practice. (CEC 9)
10. **Appendix:** Include: 1) text of key assignments and assessments, including rubrics or handouts given to students; 2) aggregate assessment data; 3) samples of student work with your comments.

What follows are the rubrics that will be used to evaluate this major assessment. You are expected to provide a self-evaluation of your work using these rubrics; your methods course instructor will do the same independently.
Warner School of Education – University of Rochester
CONTINUOUS TEACHING CYCLE / INNOVATIVE UNIT

Scoring guidelines and rubrics

There are three parts to this evaluation:

**Part I**: Designed to evaluate the extent to which the candidate has fulfilled the requirements of this project, as outlined in the detailed description of the assignment. Failing to do so may require the candidate to revise or redo the assignment before he/she can pass the course.

**Part II**: Designed to evaluate the extent to which the candidate has met some key standards about planning and implementing instruction set by his/her professional organization.

**Part III**: Designed to evaluate the extent to which the candidate has met some key proficiencies identified as target for all Warner teacher candidates.

Please remember to complete all three parts. Each part has different rubrics, so please carefully review the instructions provided at the beginning of each part before scoring.

We expect both the candidate and the instructor to independently complete this evaluation.

**Inclusion candidates**: Please note that for the CTC, you will be assessed on Parts I and II with a revised rubric that incorporates the requirements of the project and the CEC professional organization standards into ONE rubric. Thus, the student and instructor will complete two rubrics to evaluate this assignment instead of three.
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 # ______________________

Parts I and II: Common Rubric that incorporates CEC standards for INCLUSION teacher candidates

Based on the Continuous Teaching Cycle submitted and using the following rubric, evaluate the extent to which the candidate provided evidence of meeting the assignment criteria and the specific CEC standards incorporated into the rubric:

1. **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 unit as directed by the course professor.
2. **Emergent/needs improvement**: There is only partial evidence that the criteria described are addressed. Minor revisions in the unit are called for / more evidence is needed to address the shortcomings identified and should be completed before determining proficiency and the candidate can “pass” this assignment.
3. **Basic proficiency**: There is evidence that the candidate demonstrated the criteria described at the minimally acceptable level. 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 Continuous Teaching Cycle fully meets the criteria described and provides an outstanding example that the candidate is able to plan, implement and evaluate worthwhile and innovative instructional units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>(1) Unacceptable/Insufficient</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement/Emerging</th>
<th>(3) Basic Proficiency</th>
<th>(4) Outstanding Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Introduction / Student Learning Environment  
CEC: 1, 5, 6, 9 | Candidate does not describe the unit with a context for the components of the unit and does not include an essential question and/or topic. Candidate 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 | Candidate describes the unit with some context for the components of the unit and includes an essential question and/or topic. Candidate 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 | Candidate describes the unit with sufficient context for the components of the unit and includes an essential question and/or topic. Candidate 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 | Candidate describes the unit with a clear context for the components of the unit and includes an essential question and/or topic. Candidate 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 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>(1) Unacceptable/Insufficient</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement/Emerging</th>
<th>(3) Basic Proficiency</th>
<th>(4) Outstanding Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Candidate does not articulate a theoretical framework. Candidate does not adequately use course readings. Candidate does not clearly define content area and does not address the theory of learning. Candidate demonstrates little understanding of theory and research relevant to special education and how this influences instructional design; does not clearly state the rationale for the unit or the importance of the unit to meaningful and relevant student learning and inclusive practice.</td>
<td>Candidate somewhat articulates a theoretical framework. Candidate uses some course readings where appropriate. Candidate defines the content area and minimally addresses the theory of learning. Candidate demonstrates some understanding of theory and research related to special education and how this influences instructional design; articulates somewhat the rationale for the unit and the importance of the unit to meaningful and relevant student learning and inclusive practice.</td>
<td>Candidate articulates a theoretical framework that sufficiently guides and provides a foundation for the unit. Candidate uses course readings where appropriate. Candidate defines the content area and addresses and a theory of learning. Candidate demonstrates an understanding of evidence-based principles and theories related to special education and how these influence the design of assessment, instructional planning, and implementation; articulates the rationale for the unit and sufficiently explains the importance of the unit to meaningful and relevant student learning and inclusive practice.</td>
<td>Candidate articulates a clear and well thought out theoretical framework that clearly guides and provides a foundation for the unit. Candidate uses course readings and includes outside research where appropriate. Candidate defines the content area and a theory of learning. Candidate demonstrates superior understanding of philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories relevant to special education and how these influence the design of assessment, instructional planning, and implementation; articulates a rationale for the unit that clearly explains the importance of the unit to meaningful and relevant student learning and inclusive practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Goals / Professional Standards</td>
<td>Candidate does not adequately describe the overarching goal/s and/or larger curriculum and makes no connections to the content, theoretical framework, curriculum, and overarching unit goal/s; does not adequately describe specific goals or discuss the links to professional / state standards addressed in the unit. Candidate provides goals that reflect only one level of learning.</td>
<td>Candidate describes the overarching goal/s and/or larger curriculum but the connections to the content, theoretical framework, curriculum, and overarching unit goal/s is not clear; vaguely describes specific goals for the unit and discusses some links to professional / state standards addressed in the unit. Candidate provides goals that 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.</td>
<td>Candidate sufficiently describes the overarching goal/s and/or larger curriculum and makes some connections to the content, theoretical framework, curriculum, and overarching unit goal/s; describes specific goals for the unit and sufficiently discusses links to professional / state standards addressed in the unit. Candidate provides goals that are developmentally appropriate and address pre-requisite knowledge, skills, and other student needs, are appropriately challenging, and reflect 3 levels of learning.</td>
<td>Candidate clearly articulates the overarching goal/s and/or larger curriculum and makes rich connections to the content, theoretical framework, curriculum, and overarching unit goal/s; clearly states specific goals that are explicitly linked to a thorough discussion of the professional /state standards this unit addresses. Candidate provides goals that 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC: 2, 7, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Objectives</td>
<td>Candidate provides no or unclear specific unit objectives and does not describe connections between these objectives and the unit goals and professional / state standards. Candidate does not address objectives in relation to IEPs goals.</td>
<td>Candidate provides some specific unit objectives and briefly describes connections between these objectives and the unit goals and professional / state standards. Candidate minimally addresses objectives in relation to IEPs goals—it is unclear how lesson objectives are related to students’ working toward accomplishing IEP goals/objectives.</td>
<td>Candidate articulates specific unit objectives and sufficiently discusses connections between these objectives and the unit goals and professional / state standards. Candidate describes how lesson objectives are related to students’ working toward accomplishing IEP goals/objectives.</td>
<td>Candidate clearly articulates specific unit objectives and thoroughly discusses connections between these objectives and the unit goals and professional / state standards. Candidate clearly articulates how objectives are related to students’ working toward accomplishing IEP goals/objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC: 2, 7, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>(1) Unacceptable/Insufficient</td>
<td>(2) Needs Improvement/Emerging</td>
<td>(3) Basic Proficiency</td>
<td>(4) Outstanding Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Assessment Plan / Student Learning Over Time CEC: 8</td>
<td>Candidate does not or minimally links assessment criteria to learning goals, objectives, theoretical framework, and standards. Candidate plans only one assessment mode and does not describe how assessments will inform instruction. Candidate displays limited knowledge of summative, formative, and formal/informal assessments; does not design assessments to meet the individual needs of students.</td>
<td>Candidate loosely links assessment criteria to learning goals, objectives, theoretical framework, and standards. Candidate plans multiple modes of assessment, but assessments are not performance based and/or do not require integration of knowledge, skills, and critical thinking and do not describe how assessment will inform instruction. Candidate includes either summative/formative or formal/informal assessments; designs assessments to meet the individual needs of some students.</td>
<td>Candidate connects assessment criteria to learning goals, objectives, theoretical framework, and standards. Candidate provides an adequate assessment plan that includes pre-/post-, summative/formative, informal/formal, multiple assessment modes that integrate knowledge, skills, and some critical thinking to document student performance, strengths and needs, the effectiveness of instruction, and how assessment will inform instruction; designs and differentiates assessments to meet the individual needs of most students.</td>
<td>Candidate clearly connects assessment criteria to learning goals, objectives, theoretical framework, and standards. Candidate provides a detailed assessment plan that uses pre-/post-, summative/formative, informal/formal, multiple assessment modes that integrate knowledge, problem-solving skills, and critical thinking to document student performance, strengths and needs, the effectiveness of instruction, and how assessment will inform instruction; designs and differentiates assessments to meet the individual needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Pedagogy CEC: 3, 4, 6, 7, 10</td>
<td>Candidate plans lessons that are not linked to learning goals, provide little or no adaptation for individual learning needs and no levels of support appropriate to the individual (developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests). Candidate plans activities and assignments that are not appropriate for each student, minimally or not connected to previous lessons, and do not incorporate technology; Candidate does not describe collaboration with other school professionals.</td>
<td>Candidate plans lessons that are linked to some learning goals, provide some adaptation for individual learning needs and some support appropriate to the individual (developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests). Candidate plans activities and assignments that are appropriate for few students, minimally connected to previous lessons, and incorporate technology that is inappropriately used. Candidate minimally describes collaboration with other school professionals.</td>
<td>Candidate plans lessons that are linked to some learning goals and incorporate student interests and previous knowledge while adapting for individual learning needs through differentiation, and provides levels of support appropriate to the individual (developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests) grounded in research-based instructional strategies (accommodations, modifications, adaptation, UDL). Candidate plans activities and assignments that are connected to previous lessons and incorporate technology and/or appropriate materials to provide opportunities for critical thinking. Candidate generally describes collaboration with other school professionals.</td>
<td>Candidate plans lessons that are explicitly linked to learning goals and incorporate student interests and previous knowledge while adapting for individual learning needs through differentiation; provides levels of support appropriate to the individual (developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests) grounded in research-based instructional strategies (accommodations, modifications, adaptation, UDL). Candidates plan activities and assignments that are clearly connected to previous lessons and incorporate technology and/or appropriate materials to promote critical thinking and reflection. Candidates specifically describe collaboration with other school professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Unit Implementation CEC: 5, 8, 9</td>
<td>Candidate provides an unclear description of what happened when the unit was implemented, with no attention to students’ responses to the unit’s main activities. Candidate includes no reflection on what went well and what he/she would change in future implementations. Candidate does not provide reflection on 3 target students’ responses to instruction or examples of instructional decisionmaking.</td>
<td>Candidate provides some description of what happened when the unit was implemented, with particular attention to students’ responses to the unit’s main activities. Candidate provides some reflection on what went well and what he/she would change in future implementations. Candidate provides some reflection on 3 target students’ responses to instruction and 1 example of instructional decisionmaking.</td>
<td>Candidate provides a good description of what happened when the unit was implemented, with particular attention to students’ responses to the unit’s main activities. Candidate reflects on what went well and what he/she would change in future implementations. Candidate reflects on 3 target students’ responses to instruction and includes 2 examples of instructional decisionmaking.</td>
<td>Candidate clearly describes what happened when the unit was implemented, with particular attention to students’ responses to the unit’s main activities. Candidate reflects in detail on what went well and what he/she would change in future implementations. Candidate provides an in-depth reflection on 3 target students’ responses to instruction and 2 comprehensive examples of instructional decisionmaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Self Score</td>
<td>Faculty Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **8: Analysis of Student Learning**  
CEC: 5, 8, 9           |       |            |               |
| Candidate does not use assessment data to monitor and document student progress. Candidate provides minimal or no analysis of whole class and fails to include evidence of impact on student learning, achievement, and progress; minimal or no summary, analysis, or reflection of the 3 students’ performance after instruction, comparing pre-/post-results. Candidate does not use visuals to support narrative summaries. | (1) Unacceptable/Insufficient |               |               |
| Candidate uses assessment data to monitor and document student progress. Candidate provides an analysis of whole class and class and includes evidence of impact on student learning, achievement, and progress; provides some summary, analysis, or reflection of the 3 students’ performance after instruction, comparing pre-/post-results. Candidate does not use visuals to support narrative summaries. | (2) Needs Improvement/Emerging |               |               |
| Candidate uses assessment data to monitor and document student progress. Candidate provides an analysis of whole class, including evidence of impact on student learning, achievement, and progress; summarizes, analyzes, and reflects on the 3 students’ performance after instruction, using pre-/post-results. Candidate uses visual and narrative summaries to demonstrate the extent of student progress. | (3) Basic Proficiency |               |               |
| Candidate uses assessment data to monitor and document student progress. Candidate provides a thorough analysis of whole class, including evidence of impact on student learning, achievement, and progress with implications for further instruction; accurately summarizes, analyzes, and reflects on the 3 students’ performance after instruction, using pre-/post-results. Candidate uses visual and narrative summaries to demonstrate the extent of student progress. | (4) Outstanding Performance |               |               |
| **9: Unit Analysis**  
CEC: 9                 |       |            |               |
| Candidate articulates an analysis of the implementation of the unit that brings together content, theory, and practice. Candidate describes how s/he integrated the learning goals, effective instruction, and assessment data into a coherent whole that produced meaningful and relevant student learning. Candidate does not make connections to the unit implementation and the larger curriculum and theoretical framework. Candidate demonstrates minimal insight into his/her role in improving instruction; provides no ideas for redesigning goals, instruction, and assessment. | (1) Unacceptable/Insufficient |               |               |
| Candidate somewhat articulates an analysis of the implementation of the unit that brings together content, theory, and practice. Candidate provides unclear description of how s/he integrated the learning goals, effective instruction, and assessment data into a coherent whole that produced meaningful and relevant student learning. Candidate makes some connections to the unit implementation and the larger curriculum and theoretical framework. Candidate demonstrates some insight into his/her role in improving instruction; provides some ideas for redesigning goals, instruction, and assessment. | (2) Needs Improvement/Emerging |               |               |
| Candidate sufficiently articulates an analysis of the implementation of the unit that brings together content, theory, and practice. Candidate describes how s/he integrated the learning goals, effective instruction, and assessment data into a coherent whole that produced meaningful and relevant student learning. Candidate adequately connects the unit implementation and the larger curriculum and theoretical framework. Candidate demonstrates insight into his/her role in improving instruction—including timing, instructional strategies, use of groupings and effectiveness of technology/materials; provides implications for future teaching, including ideas for redesigning goals, instruction, and assessment. | (3) Basic Proficiency |               |               |
| Candidate articulates a richly detailed analysis of the implementation of the unit that brings together content, theory, and practice. Candidate thoroughly describes how s/he integrated the learning goals, effective instruction, and assessment data into a coherent whole that produced meaningful and relevant student learning. Candidate clearly connects the unit implementation and the larger curriculum and theoretical framework. Candidate demonstrates insight into his/her role in improving instruction—including timing, instructional strategies, use of groupings and effectiveness of technology/materials; provides implications for future teaching, including specific alternative actions for redesigning goals, instruction, and assessment; current research findings are incorporated as supportive documentation. | (4) Outstanding Performance |               |               |
| **10. Appendix**      |       |            |               |
| Candidate includes no or few unit assignment/activity texts, handout, rubrics, aggregate assessment data, or samples of student work with candidate comments; does not differentiate or adapt materials. | (1) Unacceptable/Insufficient |               |               |
| Candidate includes most unit assignment/activity texts, rubrics, handouts, aggregate assessment data, and samples of student work with candidate comments; differentiates/adapts some materials. | (2) Needs Improvement/Emerging |               |               |
| Candidate includes all unit assignment/activity texts, handouts, rubrics, aggregate assessment data, and samples of student work with candidate comments; differentiates/adapts materials for main activities. | (3) Basic Proficiency |               |               |
| Candidate includes all unit assignment/activity texts, handouts, rubrics, aggregate assessment data, and samples of student work with candidate comments; differentiates/adapts materials for main activities; provides additional evidence. | (4) Outstanding Performance |               |               |
| **11. References and Citations**  
CEC: 9                  |       |            |               |
| Candidate does not use proper APA format. | (1) Unacceptable/Insufficient |               |               |
| Candidate demonstrates many errors in proper APA format. | (2) Needs Improvement/Emerging |               |               |
| Candidate demonstrates some errors in proper APA format. | (3) Basic Proficiency |               |               |
| Candidate uses proper APA format. | (4) Outstanding Performance |               |               |
| **12. Mechanics and Usage**  
CEC: 9                  |       |            |               |
| Candidate makes more than 12 errors in mechanics and/or usage. | (1) Unacceptable/Insufficient |               |               |
| Candidate makes 8–12 errors in mechanics and/or usage. | (2) Needs Improvement/Emerging |               |               |
| Candidate makes 5–7 errors in mechanics and/or usage. | (3) Basic Proficiency |               |               |
| Candidate makes 0–4 errors in mechanics and/or usage. | (4) Outstanding Performance |               |               |

Total
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WARNER INNOVATIVE UNIT EVALUATION FORM

Candidate’s name: ___________________ Evaluator’s name: ___________________
Evaluator’s role: __ cooperating teacher; __ university supervisor; __ faculty advisor
Student teaching experience: __ first; __ second
Semester: ___________________________ Course # _____________________________

CTC/INNOVATIVE UNIT RUBRICS PART III: Warner proficiencies for all teacher candidates

Please evaluate the extent to which the unit plan and its implementation provides evidence that the candidate has achieved the following proficiencies set by the Warner School as targets for all teacher candidates, using the following rubrics:

1. Insufficient – i.e., this proficiency was not met.
2. Emergent/needs improvement – i.e., you found some evidence that the candidate demonstrated this proficiency, but it was only partial or inconsistent.
3. Basic proficiency – i.e., you found evidence that the candidate demonstrated this proficiency at the minimum acceptable level.
4. Outstanding performance – i.e., the unit provided an excellent example that the candidate has achieved proficiency in this area.

We realize that in some cases you may not have had the opportunity to gather pertinent information for all proficiencies listed below. Therefore, we have given the option, whenever appropriate, for you to indicate “n/o” (“not observed”) to clearly distinguish this situation from the one where you had the opportunity to observed relevant behavior and found it lacking. There are some proficiencies, however, for which this is not an option since, your evaluation is critical to assessing the candidate on that particular dimension – as indicated by a shaded cell corresponding to the “n/o” option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Warner School proficiencies as they could be observed in the unit:</th>
<th>n/o</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(WS 1.2) The design of the unit reflects a good understanding of the key concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the subject matter(s) addressed in the unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 1.3) The goals set for the unit and their discussion address some important principles and concepts delineated in professional, New York State, and Warner School Teaching and Curriculum standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 1.4) The unit included learning experiences that made the subject matter meaningful and relevant for all students in the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 2.2) The unit design and its analysis demonstrate that the candidate understands that all students construct knowledge through active engagement in culturally valued activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 2.3) The unit included learning experiences that took into consideration the students’ developmental level and drew on the strengths and resources available in students’ prior experiences, as well as the school, family, and community contexts in which they live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 3.4) The unit included learning experiences that were culturally relevant and addressed the strengths and needs of all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 4.2) The design and implementation of the unit included a selection or innovative teaching and learning strategies and classroom structures, appropriate to achieving the learning goals set for this unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 4.4) The unit took advantage of the potential of technology to support student learning, as appropriate to the goals set for the students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(WS 5.3) The activities in the unit and the classroom environment fostered student motivation and learning and the creation of a “community of learners.”

(WS 6.3) The design and implementation of the unit employed appropriate and effective modes of communication to make the ideas accessible to all students and foster inquiry.

(WS 6.4) The unit activities incorporated oral, written, visual, and electronic texts as appropriate to facilitate interaction and communication, and provide support for all students’ critical analysis of such texts.

(WS 7.1) The unit’s activities are appropriate to pursue the learning goals identified (which in turn are consistent with professional and New York State standards).

(WS 7.2) The unit has a well-defined and high quality plan, which was adequately implemented with appropriate modifications as suggested by the feedback received during the implementation.

(WS 8.2) Appropriate assessment and evaluation strategies were used to monitor, assess and provide guidance to student learning, including some that are embedded in authentic learning activities and have real audiences and purposes.

(WS 8.3) The candidate was able to use assessment data to inform instruction by making explicit links in the unit analysis between his/her teaching and student performance, and by either making immediate adjustments in the unit or suggesting changes for future implementations.

(WS 8.4) Positive effect on the students’ learning is demonstrated through the aggregated data and samples of student work included in the unit report.

(WS 9.2) The unit analysis demonstrates the candidate’s ability to reflect on his/her practices, constructively use critiques of his/her practice, and draw from theories and research results, in order to make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning.

(WS 10.1) The unit design sought out and built on parental and community involvement as appropriate.

Comments:
Continuous Teaching Cycle Guidelines
(Inclusion Innovative Unit)

Adapted from the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project,
http://www.uni.edu/itq/
Introduction / Learning Environment Contexts Guidelines

This section should provide a brief description of the unit that gives a context for the components of the unit, including an essential question and/or topic addressed if appropriate. Include a clear description of the context of implementation for the unit. Please use the following list to collect information about the potentially relevant contextual factors of the learning environment of your placement. You should only address the factors that directly impact your teaching and student learning and how these factors impact the teaching of your unit plan and your student learning. This list is not exhaustive; rather, it provides suggestions to help you describe the context of the school, classroom, and students. This information should be incorporated into your narrative for the Introduction section of your CTC/Innovative Unit. Target students: In this section, you should also identify (using pseudonyms) and sketch the three target students for this unit: three students who are performing at, above, and below grade level, at least two of whom must have IEPs and receive special education services. You will follow these students closely during the implementation of your CTC/Innovative Unit.

Community, School System, and School Factors

Geographic Location
- Rural/Urban
- Describe the unique features of community
- Describe the contributions of community to school

School System
- Name of school system (please provide a pseudonym)
- Number of students in school system
- Number of students in school system on free or reduced lunch
- Has the district met AYP? Any other school report card data about the district?

School (please see the New York State School Report Card at http://emsc33.nysed.gov/irts/reportcard/)
- Name of school (please provide a pseudonym)
- Grades served
- Student enrollment
- Has the school met AYP? Any other school report card data about the school?

Classroom Characteristics

Students
- Number of boys/girls
- Age range
- Ethnicity (give numbers)
- Socio-Economic profile (% Students in classroom on free or reduced lunch)

Reading Achievement
- Based on: ____________________________
  o % above average or advanced skill level
  o % average or intermediate level
  o % below average skill level
Mathematics Achievement
• Based on:
  o % above average or advanced skill level
  o % average or intermediate level
  o % below average skill level

Classroom Organization
• Homogeneous
• Heterogeneous
• Self-Contained
• Team Teaching
• Departmentalized
• Parallel Block
• Other programs

Resources
• Television
• Classroom library (estimate number of books)
• Number of computers in classroom
• SMART Board/Interactive whiteboard
• Other resources (such as math and science manipulative materials)

Individual Differences
Students Attending Pull-Out (or Push-In) or Supplementary Programs
• Title I
• Reading
• Gifted
• Early Intervention Program
• Safety Net
• Other programs (including therapies)

Language Proficiency
• English Language
• Bilingual
• Other Languages

Students with IEPs
• IEP review: Identify students’ strengths and needs

Other student factors
• Culture
• Interests
• Learning styles / modalities
• Skill levels and prior learning on lesson subject

Instructional Implications
• Address how you will use this information in the development of your learning goals, instructional planning, and assessment in the unit.
Assessment Plan Guidelines

In the **Assessment of Student Learning Over Time** section of your CTC/Innovative Unit, you must describe your design of an assessment plan used to monitor student progress toward the learning goals. Describe the multiple forms of assessment used across the unit. Include formative, summative, formal, and informal assessments. Explicitly connect your assessment to the theoretical framework, unit goals and objectives, and professional standards. You should include assessment measures for assessing student content understanding before instruction (pre-assessments), during instruction, and after instruction (post- or summative assessments). These assessments should correlate to the developmental levels and individual needs of all students in your classroom, reflect sound practice with clear, high expectations for performance, and authentically measure student learning. How will your assessments help you scaffold student learning over time and how will you know you have accomplished your goals? How will your assessments inform instruction? Please summarize your plan in a chart. Your chart should list each goal; the assessment(s) used to describe student performance and criteria for satisfactory performance; and any differentiation, adaptations, accommodations, and/or modifications used to address the individual differences and special needs of the students in your classroom. In your narrative, you should provide a rationale for each assessment that explains why you chose or developed the assessment. You should plan to provide multiple examples from your target students to include in your **Analysis of Student Learning** section.

**Your assessment plan must include:**

- An overview of the assessment plan in chart format (sample chart found at the end of these guidelines): For each learning goal include
  - Assessments used to measure student performance
  - The format of each assessment
  - Differentiation, adaptations, accommodations and/or modifications of the assessments for the individual needs of students based on pre-assessment and learning environment contextual factors

- In your narrative, discuss the assessments that are aligned with your learning goals. Clearly explain how you will evaluate or score pre- and post-assessments, including criteria you will use to determine if the students’ performance meets the learning goals. Include copies of assessments, prompts, and/or student directions and criteria for judging student performance (e.g., scoring rubrics, observation checklist, rating scales, item weights, test blueprint, answer key).

- Discuss your plan for formative assessment that will help you determine student progress during the unit. Describe the assessments you plan to use to check on student progress and comment on the importance of collecting that particular evidence. Although formative assessment may change as you are teaching the unit, your task here is to predict at what points in your teaching it will be important to assess students’ progress toward learning goals.

- You must include copies (in an appendix or in your lesson plans) of the assessments and/or prompts and student directions for the assessments for each entry in the table.
• In your narrative, identify and describe in-depth **two assessments** that you intend to collect from your students and analyze as evidence of student achievement. You should plan to record scores on pre- and post-tests from at least one class (minimum of 15-20 students) to make reasonable inferences about student learning. You must collect data on your three target students.
  
  o One assessment must be a pre-and post-assessment of student learning relative to one of your content objectives.
  
  o The other assessment should measure performance on one of your higher-order thinking skill objectives. Give a brief rationale for why you chose this second assessment.

**Sample Assessment Plan Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Format of Assessment</th>
<th>Adaptations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 1</td>
<td>Pre-Assessment</td>
<td>Bell ringer: describe the rate of change of a quadratic model based on predictions using the quadratic model equation</td>
<td>Provide more time. Guide students with questions. Sketch graph on the board. Allow students to complete the bell ringer as a group. Pair high achieving students with low achieving students. Provide help for writing. Typed response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative Assessment</td>
<td>Calculator activities, worksheets, LearningCheck</td>
<td>Provide more time. Guide students with questions. Sketch graph on the board. Pair high achieving students with low achieving students. Typed response. Project calculator screen on the board. Provide notes and handouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 2</td>
<td>Pre-Assessment</td>
<td>Bell ringer: What is the importance of limiting factors on a population? Tor F: Logistic growth occurs when the population’s growth slows or stops following exponential growth, at the population’s carrying capacity.</td>
<td>Provide verbal cues and extra time as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative Assessment</td>
<td>Virtual Lab: How does competition affect population growth? Students will conduct an experiment and grow two species of the protozoan Paramecium, alone and together. They will then</td>
<td>Allow some students that need extra help to pair up with a classmate. On task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 3</td>
<td>Pre-assessment</td>
<td>Formative Assessment</td>
<td>Post-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can evaluate proposed solutions from multiple perspectives to environmental problems caused by human interaction.</td>
<td>Bell Ringer assignment, short answer question.</td>
<td>Lecture notes on human population, computer lab internet activity, write in lab journal.</td>
<td>Common exam: Multiple choice and one open response question. (questions: 11-18, ORQ 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-Assessment**
Post-assessment questions and graphs. Common exam (questions: 1-10, ORQ 2)

Allow extra time to answer the questions at the end of lab, or only answer half of the questions, or allow them to answer verbally instead of written.

Sample Assessment Plan chart from Hellem, S., Ping, M., & Baker, J. (n.d.).
Teacher Work Sample, University of Kentucky
Pedagogy Guidelines

Describe the series of connected lessons and/or experiences in the unit. Describe how you will design your unit instruction related to unit goals/objectives, students’ characteristics and needs, and the specific learning context. Include your detailed lesson plans for selected lessons in this section using the lesson plan format given to you. Describe in detail how you will scaffold and support student learning over time and address any relevant safety considerations. In addition, describe how the lesson activities and strategies are differentiated through multiple means of representation, expression, and engagement that reflect high, appropriate expectations for all students, including English Language Learners and students with disabilities, (2) how accommodations and/or modifications and student language and communication needs indicated on IEP are incorporated into the lessons, and (3) how you collaborated with related services and para-professionals to meet IEP goals. Specifically discuss your three target students in this section.

Include in the Pedagogy section:

• Results of pre-assessment
  o After administering the pre-assessment, analyze student performance relative to the learning goals/objectives. Depict the results of the pre-assessment in a format that allows you to find patterns of student performance relative to each learning goal/objective. You may use a table, graph, or chart.
  o Provide a narrative description of the pattern you found that guided your instruction or modification of the objectives.

• Unit overview
  o Use a visual organizer such as a block plan or outline to make your unit plan overview clear. Include the topic or activity you are planning for each day/period.
  o Also indicate the goal or goals (coded from your Goals/Professional Standards section) that you are addressing in each activity. Make sure that every goal/objective is addressed by at least one activity and that every activity relates to at least one goal/objective.

• Lesson plans
  o Provide a minimum of five lessons following the Warner School lesson plan format.
  o Indicate the learning goals/objectives that are aligned with the lesson activities in your plans. Make sure that every goal is addressed by at least one activity and that every activity relates to at least one goal.
  o Include the ways that the lesson activities and strategies are differentiated through multiple means of representation, expression, and engagement that reflect high, appropriate expectations for all students, including English Language Learners and students with disabilities.
  o Include how accommodations and/or modifications and student language and communication needs indicated on IEP are incorporated into the lessons.
  o Include information on how you collaborated with related services and para-professionals to meet IEP goals.
• Activities
  o From your lesson plans, describe at least three unit activities that reflect a variety of instructional strategies/techniques and explain why you are planning those specific activities. In your explanation for each activity, include:
    ▪ how the content relates to your instructional goal(s),
    ▪ how the activity stems from your pre-assessment information and contextual factors,
    ▪ how the activity is differentiated / adapted and includes accommodations and/or modifications to meet the instructional needs of all learners, including your three target students.
    ▪ what materials/technology you will need to implement the activity, and
    ▪ how you plan to assess student learning during and/or following the activity (i.e., formative assessment).

• Technology. Describe how you will use technology in your planning and/or instruction. If you do not plan to use any form of technology, provide your clear rationale for its omission.
Unit Implementation Reflection Guidelines

Describe what happened when you implemented this unit, with particular attention to students’ responses to its main activities. Reflect on what went well and what you would change in future implementations. Describe how you planned and revised your instruction based on student strengths, interests, needs, and performance and your assessment of the effectiveness of your instruction in previous lessons, highlighting in particular your three target students.

- **Reflection**
  - Provide your daily reflections about your students’ responses your instruction
  - Provide evidence of student learning
  - Include a description of how you will respond to your students’ needs through adapting / revising the next day’s lesson. You **MUST** include specific reflections for your three target students.
  - Include this reflection at the end of your lesson plan each day after teaching the lesson, as indicated on the Warner School lesson plan format.

- **Provide at least two specific examples of instructional decision-making based on your target students’ learning or responses.**
  - Describe the students’ learning or response that caused you to adapt or revise your original design for instruction; this may come from a planned formative assessment or another source
  - Describe what you did next and why you thought this would improve student progress toward the learning goal and/or objective
  - Cite specific evidence to support your responses
**Analysis of Student Learning guidelines**

Report the results of a systematic analysis of what your students learned as a result of the unit, making explicit references to goals and objectives, and using data from formal assessments and classroom observations (see the *Assessment of student learning over time* section). Refer as appropriate to the assessment results and student work in an appendix to support your claims. Include student work samples and any charts/graphs/tables created to support your analysis. In addition, you must provide specific analysis of the learning of your three target students. Your analysis should provide data for *at least two of the learning goals/objectives* addressed in your unit. You must analyze your data to report the performance of the whole class and your three target students.

- **Whole Class Analysis**
  - Create a table that shows pre- and post-assessment data on every student on every learning goal
  - Create a graphic summary that presents data for all students in the class to draw conclusions about the extent to which your students made progress (from pre- to post-) toward at least one content objective addressed in the unit
  - Describe and analyze student performance on one of your higher-order thinking objectives.
  - Include representative examples of student work to support your analysis.
  - Summarize what the graphs tell you about your students' learning in this unit (e.g., the number of students met the criterion).

- **Target student analysis**
  - Explain why it is important to understand the learning of your target students
  - Use pre-, formative, and post-assessment data with examples of student work to draw conclusions about the extent to which these students attained the two learning goals
  - Explain what the data for the target students illustrate about their learning in comparison to the whole class

- Use visual representations and narrative to communicate the performance of the whole class and the three target students.

*Note:* Conclusions drawn from this analysis (i.e., possible reasons for why your students learned [or did not learn]) should be provided in the **Unit Analysis** section.
Unit Analysis Guidelines

Provide a detailed analysis of the implementation of the unit that brings together content, theory, and practice. Describe how you have integrated the components of the unit into a coherent whole that produces meaningful and relevant student learning and addresses the goals articulated in Parts 2 and 3 of the rubric. Reflect on and evaluate your performance as a teacher and you’re your performance to student learning results. Connect the unit implementation with the larger curriculum and theoretical framework described in the introduction, making specific connections to special education and inclusive practice.

- Select the learning goal where your students as a whole were most successful.
  - Provide two or more possible reasons for this success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other learning environment contextual factors under your control.

- Select the learning goal where each of your target students was most successful.
  - Provide two or more possible reasons for this success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other learning environment contextual factors under your control.

- Select the learning goal where your students as a whole were least successful.
  - Provide two or more possible reasons for this lack of success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other learning environment contextual factors under your control.
  - Discuss what you could do differently or better in the future to improve your students’ performance.

- Select the learning goal where each of your target students was least successful.
  - Provide two or more possible reasons for this lack of success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other learning environment contextual factors under your control.
  - Discuss what you could do differently or better in the future to improve your students’ performance.

- Reflect on and evaluate the effectiveness of your instructional sequence and reflect on your teaching practice and its impact on student learning. It might be helpful to address the following questions:
  - Were the goals for your instructional sequence met? Provide evidence for your response.
  - How did you change your planned instructional sequence as the lessons were actually taught? Why?
  - What questions or issues does this instructional sequence reveal about your teaching or the students in your classroom?
  - Were you able to implement the principles of culturally-relevant teaching in your instructional sequence? Provide examples where you think you (1) were particularly successful and (2) could enhance this aspect of your teaching in the future.
  - What aspects of your instructional sequence were especially successful or effective? Why?
  - How might you teach this instructional sequence differently if you were to do it again? Why?