University of Rochester – NAEYC SPA Report (2014)
SECTION IV
Assessment 5: INNOVATIVE UNIT PROJECT

1. Narrative

Section a. Description of the assessment and its use in the program

As part of their first fall student teaching experience, and supported by the experiences taking place in their concurrent literacy methods course, our early childhood teacher candidates are required to develop, implement and evaluate a complete innovative literacy unit that reflects the kind of teaching and learning promoted by our program and by NAEYC. Their work on this project is also informed by detailed scoring rubrics (see Section f) which are intended to help them (as well as the instructor) evaluate the extent to which they have addressed (1) each key component of the project, (2) relevant NAEYC standards for teacher candidates and (3) relevant proficiencies among those identified as targets for all teacher candidates at the Warner School (referred to as “WS proficiencies”).

Section b. Alignment with NAEYC standards

This assignment is intended to assess our candidates’ ability not only to plan high quality lessons, but also to implement those lessons effectively so as to have an impact on their students’ learning. Part I of the evaluation form (see Section f) addresses whether specific elements we have identified as critical to plan, implement and evaluate a high quality instructional unit have been satisfactorily addressed by the candidate – including analyzing their students’ work and learning (see Unit Rubric #8); therefore, as it was the case with the Lesson Plan Assignment discussed earlier (see Assessment #3), while there is no one-to-one correlation of these rubrics with specific NAEYC indicators, when taken as a whole they help determine whether the candidate shows evidence for most of the elements within NAEYC standards 3, 4 and 5. To make this relation more explicit, in Part II of the evaluation form we ask the instructor to evaluate the extent to which the candidate’s work provides evidence that s/he has met specific elements within NAEYC standards 3, 4 and 5. Part III of the evaluation form instead requires the instructor to evaluate the extent to which the candidate has demonstrated proficiency with respect to relevant WS proficiencies – and given the correspondence between some of these proficiencies and specific NAEYC indicators listed in the narrative for Assessment 4, these scores also provide additional and relevant information about our candidates’ performance.

Section c. Data findings

All five candidates who took the literacy methods course during the three-year reporting period completed this assessment successfully, as they all scored a 3 or above on all rubrics in Part I; therefore, they were all able to pass their student teaching experience. As illustrated by average scores between 3.20 and 4 in the various rubrics within Parts I and II, over half of the candidates scored 3 or above in each of the rubrics, and several candidates had an outstanding performance in this assignment (i.e., received a score of 4) in many of the components of this assessment.

With respect to specific elements within NAEYC Standard #3 (Observing, Documenting and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families), all candidates demonstrated an upper level
of proficiency in the sub-components 3.a (understanding assessment) and 3.b (knowing and using assessment) as evidenced by the averages of 3.8; most candidates demonstrated basic proficiency with respect to sub-components 3.c (practicing responsible assessment), and outstanding proficiency in 3.d. (assessment partnerships).

With respect to specific elements within NAEYC Standard #4 (Using developmentally effective approaches), most candidates demonstrated outstanding proficiency with respect to sub-component 4.a (connecting with children and families), 4.b. (using effective approaches), and 4.d.(reflecting on own practice).

These results are consistent with the scores received with respect to the WS proficiencies relevant to this assessment, where candidates’ scores varied between 3 and 4, with average scores ranging from 3.20 to 4.

Section d. Data interpretation

These results show that, by the end of their student teaching in a K-2 setting, all our early childhood teacher candidates over this three-year reporting period demonstrated minimum proficiency and frequently an outstanding proficiency to plan, implement and analyze innovative ELA units. The innovative units our candidates produced also demonstrate basic and outstanding level of proficiency with respect to all the sub-components of NAEYC standards #3, #4, and #5, with all candidates achieving an outstanding level of proficiency with respect to many of the NAEYC sub-components (i.e., 3.a., 3.b., 4.b., 5.b).

It is worth noting that most candidates do this Innovative Unit Project in their first student teaching experience; therefore, a “basic proficiency” evaluation with respect to most standards and proficiencies can be considered sufficient progress. At the same time, assessment data from other key assessment (see, in particular, Assessment 4 and 6) suggest that candidates will eventually achieve at least basic proficiency with respect to all sub-components of NAEYC standards before graduation.
2. Assessment documentation

Section e. Information on the assessment tool

The following written information and guidelines are provided to all candidates, along with a copy of the rubrics used for their evaluation (see Section f).

Warner School of Education – University of Rochester
INNOVATIVE UNIT: EARLY CHILDHOOD

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 innovative unit paper 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.

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.

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?).

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.
4. **Objectives**: Clearly articulate the specific unit objectives and connect these objectives to the unit goals and professional standards.

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?

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.

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.

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.

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.

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. **Section f. Scoring guide (Limit: 5 pages)**

The following scoring rubrics are provided to both the candidate and the instructor evaluating this major assignment.

Warner School of Education – University of Rochester
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.
INNOVATIVE UNIT RUBRICS – PART I:

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

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**: 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 Innovative Unit report can be used as evidence that the candidate is able to plan, implement and evaluate worthwhile instructional units.

4. **Outstanding performance**: The unit 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>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction</td>
<td>The description of the unit does not provide a context for the components of the unit and does not include an essential question and/or topic addressed. The description of the context of implementation is inadequate.</td>
<td>The description of the unit gives some context for the components of the unit and includes an essential question and/or topic addressed where appropriate. The description of the context of implementation is partial or incomplete.</td>
<td>The description of the unit gives a sufficient context for the components of the unit and includes an essential question and/or topic addressed where appropriate. The description of the context of implementation is clear, but some specifics are not present.</td>
<td>The description of the unit gives a clear context for the components of the unit and includes an essential question and/or topic addressed where appropriate. The description of the context of implementation is clear and rich and includes grade level, racial, ethnic, and gender make-up of students and teachers, a description of the school and classroom, and indicated to which student teaching experience the unit applies.</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>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Goals/ Professional Standards</td>
<td>The overarching goal/s and/or larger curriculum are not adequately described and no connections are made. The specific goals for the unit are not adequately described. Few, if any, links to a discussion of the professional standards this unit addresses are provided. There are no connections to the content addressed, the theoretical framework, curriculum, theoretical framework and overarching unit goal/s.</td>
<td>The overarching goal/s and the larger curriculum are described but the connections are unclear. The specific goals for the unit are vaguely described. Some links to a discussion of the professional standards this unit addresses are provided. There are a few connections to the content addressed, the theoretical framework, curriculum, theoretical framework and overarching unit goal/s.</td>
<td>The overarching goal/s and connections to the larger curriculum are sufficiently described. The specific goals for the unit are sufficiently stated and are linked to a discussion of the professional standards this unit addresses. There are some connections to the content addressed, the theoretical framework, curriculum, theoretical framework and overarching unit goal/s.</td>
<td>The overarching goal/s and connections to the larger curriculum are clearly articulated. The specific goals for the unit are clearly stated and are explicitly linked to a thorough discussion of the professional standards this unit addresses. Explicit connections to the content addressed, the theoretical framework, curriculum, and overarching unit goal/s are richly described.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Objectives</td>
<td>Specific unit objectives are not clearly stated and connections between these objectives and the unit goals and professional standards are not described.</td>
<td>Some specific unit objectives are stated and connections between these objectives and the unit goals and professional standards are briefly described.</td>
<td>Specific unit objectives are articulated and connections between these objectives and the unit goals and professional standards are sufficiently discussed.</td>
<td>Specific unit objectives are clearly articulated and connections between these objectives and the unit goals and professional standards are thoroughly discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assessment</td>
<td>The multiple forms of assessment used across the unit are not described and do not include an appropriate range of assessments. Assessments are not connected to the theoretical framework, unit goals and objectives, and professional standards. How assessments will facilitate the scaffolding of student learning over time is not described, nor is how assessment will inform instruction.</td>
<td>The multiple forms of assessment used across the unit are described somewhat and include either formative/summative or formal/informal assessments. Assessments are loosely connected to the theoretical framework, unit goals and objectives, and professional standards. How assessments will facilitate the scaffolding of student learning over time is unclear, as is how assessment will inform instruction.</td>
<td>The multiple forms of assessment used across the unit are sufficiently described and include formative, summative, formal, and informal assessments. Assessments are connected to the theoretical framework, unit goals and objectives, and professional standards. How assessments will facilitate the scaffolding of student learning over time is stated, as is how assessment will inform instruction.</td>
<td>The multiple forms of assessment used across the unit are described in detail and include formative, summative, formal, and informal assessments. Assessments are explicitly connected to the theoretical framework, unit goals and objectives, and professional standards. How assessments will facilitate the scaffolding of student learning over time is described in detail, as is how assessment will inform instruction.</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>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pedagogy</td>
<td>The series of connected lessons and/or experiences in the unit are poorly described. Some lesson plans are included (with few relevant materials, e.g. rubrics, handouts, etc.) and are not consistent with the lesson plan format given. Strategies for scaffolding and supporting student learning over time are not mentioned, and relevant safety considerations are not addressed.</td>
<td>The series of connected lessons and/or experiences in the unit are vaguely described. Selected lesson plans are included (with most relevant materials, e.g. rubrics, handouts, etc.) and are somewhat consistent with the lesson plan format given. Strategies for scaffolding and supporting student learning over time are unclear, and relevant safety considerations are minimally addressed.</td>
<td>The series of connected lessons and/or experiences in the unit are described. Sufficiently detailed lesson plans of selected lessons are included (with some relevant materials, e.g. rubrics, handouts, etc.) and are consistent with the lesson plan format given. Strategies for scaffolding and supporting student learning over time are described, and relevant safety considerations are addressed.</td>
<td>The series of connected lessons and/or experiences in the unit are thoroughly described. Detailed lesson plans of selected lessons are included (with all relevant materials, e.g. rubrics, handouts, etc.) and use the lesson plan format given. Strategies for scaffolding and supporting student learning over time are richly detailed, and relevant safety considerations are addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Unit Implementation</td>
<td>Unclear description of what happened when the unit was implemented, with little attention to students’ responses to its main activities. Includes no reflection on what went well and what he/she would change in future implementations.</td>
<td>Some description of what happened when the unit was implemented, with particular attention to students’ responses to its main activities. Includes some reflection on what went well and what he/she would change in future implementations.</td>
<td>Good description of what happened when the unit was implemented, with particular attention to students’ responses to its main activities. Candidate reflected on what went well and what he/she would change in future implementations.</td>
<td>Clearly describes what happened when the unit was implemented, with particular attention to students’ responses to its main activities. Candidate reflected in detail on what went well and what he/she would change in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Analysis of Student Learning</td>
<td>Analysis of student learning is absent and there is no reference to unit goals and objectives. There is little or no supporting evidence in student work.</td>
<td>Analysis of student learning is present but not systematic or complete and there is little reference to unit goals and objectives. Supporting evidence in student work is inconsistent.</td>
<td>Systematic analysis of student learning with sufficient reference to unit goals and objectives. Includes sufficient analysis of assessments that is supported by evidence in student work.</td>
<td>A thorough systematic analysis of student learning with explicit reference to unit goals and objectives. Includes clear and succinct analysis of multiple forms of assessment that is supported by evidence in student work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unit Analysis</td>
<td>Analysis of the implementation of the unit that brings together content, theory, and practice is not articulated. How the candidate integrated the components of the unit into a coherent whole that produces meaningful and relevant student learning is not described. Connections between the unit implementation and the larger curriculum and theoretical framework are not mentioned.</td>
<td>Analysis of the implementation of the unit that brings together content, theory, and practice is somewhat articulated. How the candidate integrated the components of the unit into a coherent whole that produces meaningful and relevant student learning is unclear. Connections between the unit implementation and the larger curriculum and theoretical framework are mentioned with some detail.</td>
<td>Analysis of the implementation of the unit that brings together content, theory, and practice is sufficiently articulated. How the candidate integrated the components of the unit into a coherent whole that produces meaningful and relevant student learning is described. Connections between the unit implementation and the larger curriculum and theoretical framework are adequately described.</td>
<td>A richly detailed analysis of the implementation of the unit that brings together content, theory, and practice is clearly articulated. How the candidate integrated the components of the unit into a coherent whole that produces meaningful and relevant student learning is thoroughly described. Connections between the unit implementation and the larger curriculum and theoretical framework are clearly described.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Appendix</td>
<td>Few of the suggested items are included.</td>
<td>Most suggested items are included.</td>
<td>All suggested items are included.</td>
<td>All suggested items are included and some additional evidence added.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WARNER INNOVATIVE UNIT EVALUATION FORM

Candidate’s name: ___________________________ Evaluator’s name: ________________________________
Semester: ________________________ Course #: ____________________

Part II: NAEYC Standards for EARLY CHILDHOOD teacher candidates

Based on the innovative unit paper submitted, evaluate the extent to which the candidate provided evidence of meeting the each of the specific NAEYC standards and related key elements listed below, using the following rubrics:

1. **Insufficient** – i.e., this standard/element was not met.
2. **Emergent** – i.e., there is only partial evidence that this standard/element was addressed or the standard/element was only partially addressed; more evidence is needed before determining proficiency with respect to this standard/element.
3. **Basic proficiency** – i.e., the unit provide sufficient evidence of addressing this standard/element at least at the minimum acceptable level
4. **Outstanding performance** – i.e., the unit provides an excellent example of addressing this standard/element.

To arrive to this evaluation, please refer to the more detailed explanations and rubrics provided by the NAEYC association for each specific standard and related key elements (included in the “Early Childhood Teacher Candidates Standards and Rubrics” document you received from the Warner School and also available at [http://www.naeyc.org/faculty/college.asp#2001](http://www.naeyc.org/faculty/college.asp#2001)). Please note that we are asking you to provide both an evaluation of the extent to which the candidate met each key element AND an overall evaluation of how the candidate met each standard. And, while your overall evaluation of each standard should be based on and consistent with your evaluation of the candidate’s performance with respect to the related key elements, it does not need to be the “average” of the scores assigned to each related element, but rather represent a more qualitative “overall” evaluation of how the candidate meets that standard as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAEYC Standards</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Observing, Documenting, and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families.</strong> Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs understand that child observation, documentation, and other forms of assessment are central to the practice of all early childhood professionals. They know about and understand the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment. They know about and use systematic observations, documentation, and other effective assessment strategies in a responsible way, in partnership with families and other professionals, to positively influence the development of every child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key elements:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Understanding the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment – including its use in development of appropriate goals, curriculum, and teaching strategies for young children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Knowing about and using observation, documentation, and other appropriate assessment tools and approaches, including the use of technology in documentation, assessment and data collection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Understanding and practicing responsible assessment to promote positive outcomes for each child, including the use of assistive technology for children with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Knowing about assessment partnerships with families and with professional colleagues to build effective learning environments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NAEYC Standards

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4. **Using Developmentally Effective Approaches.** Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs understand that teaching and learning with young children is a complex enterprise, and its details vary depending on children’s ages, characteristics, and the settings within which teaching and learning occur. They understand and use positive relationships and supportive interactions as the foundation for their work with young children and families. Candidates know, understand, and use a wide array of developmentally appropriate approaches, instructional strategies, and tools to connect with children and families and positively influence each child’s development and learning. 

**Key elements:**

- **4a.** Understanding positive relationships and supportive interactions as the foundation of their work with young children.
- **4b.** Knowing and understanding effective strategies and tools for early education, including appropriate uses of technology.
- **4c.** Using a broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate teaching/learning approaches.
- **4d.** Reflecting on own practice to promote positive outcomes for each child.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. **Using Content Knowledge To Build Meaningful Curriculum.** Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs use their knowledge of academic disciplines to design, implement, and evaluate experiences that promote positive development and learning for each and every young child. Candidates understand the importance of developmental domains and academic (or content) disciplines in early childhood curriculum. They know the essential concepts, inquiry tools, and structure of content areas, including academic subjects, and can identify resources to deepen their understanding. Candidates use their own knowledge and other resources to design, implement, and evaluate meaningful, challenging curriculum that promotes comprehensive developmental and learning outcomes for every young child.

**Key elements:**

- **5a.** Understanding content knowledge and resources in academic disciplines: language and literacy; the arts—music, creative movement, dance, drama, visual arts; mathematics; science, physical activity, physical education, health and safety; and social studies.
- **5b.** Knowing and using the central concepts, inquiry tools, and structures of content areas or academic disciplines.
- **5c.** Using own knowledge, appropriate early learning standards, and other resources to design, implement, and evaluate developmentally meaningful and challenging curriculum for each child.
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 # ___________________________

INNOVATIVE UNIT RUBRICS PART III: Warner proficiencies

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 do 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 blackened cell corresponding to the “n/o” option.

| **Selected Warner School proficiencies as they could be observed in the unit:** | n/o | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| (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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| (WS 1.4) The unit included learning experiences that made the subject matter meaningful and relevant for all students in the class. |  |  |  |  |  |
| (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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| (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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| (WS 3.4) The unit included learning experiences that were culturally relevant and addressed the strengths and needs of all students. |  |  |  |  |  |
| (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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| (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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| (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:
Section g. Candidates’ data

The following table reports aggregate scores for Warner candidates who completed their Innovative Unit assignment in the academic years 2011-12 (i.e., Summer 2011 to Spring 2012), 2012-13 and 2013-14. As candidates may start their program in different semesters, and some take the program part-time, the number of candidates taking this assessment in any given year is different and much smaller than the number of students enrolled in the program that year. In the case of this assessment, none of the early childhood candidates happened to take the course in which the assessment is administered in Fall 2012, so no data could be reported for this assessment in 2012-13. Instead, we had 3 candidates taking the course and the assessment in Fall 2011, and 2 candidates taking the course in Fall 2013.

In the table that follows, for each element of the rubric we have reported in bold the cumulative average score across candidates in that rubrics, the number of candidates for whom we have assessment data in the three year period we are reporting on, and the total number of candidates who received a score of 1, 2, 3 or 4, or “non-observable” (n/o) in this three year period. The three lines that follow provide the same information, but broken down by year.