Phase 4 University Supervisor Guide

for the College of Education Portfolio



Department of Curriculum and Instruction Effective August, 2010

Guide Contents

Introduction and Purpose of University Supervisor Guide	3
Evaluation Directions	3
Brief Description of the Parts of the COE Portfolio	4
Organization of the Phase 4 College of Education Portfolio	4
Template for the Phase 4 College of Education Portfolio Cover Sheet	6
Student Directions for writing the Teaching Philosophy Statement	7
Philosophical Statement Rubric	8
Student Directions for Writing the Clinical Reflection/Narrative	9
Scoring Rubric for Clinical Reflection/Narrative	10
Scoring Directions for Artifacts or Performances	. 11
Wisconsin Standards for Teacher Development and Licensure (Brief form)	12
Scoring Rubric for Phase 4 Artifacts or Performances	.3-22
College of Education Portfolio Evaluation Record Sheet	23-24

Phase 4 Portfolio at a Glance

- Consist exclusively of work completed during student teaching
- Includes Philosophical Statement, Reflective Narrative, and 3 to 10 artifacts of your professional growth, in that order
- Covers all ten Wisconsin Standards for Teacher Development and Licensure
- Artifacts must be scored on a College of Education rubric
- Students can choose which artifacts to submit
- Submitted in a three-ring binder with identification outside, or in an approved e-portfolio format
- Must pass the Phase 4 Portfolio before applying for teaching licensure
- Detailed instructions available at http://academics.uww.edu/cni/portfolio.html

To the University Supervisor:

In 2003, the Ongoing Improvement of the Portfolio Committee initiated review and modification of the College of Education Portfolio (COEP). During the review process, the committee members became aware of the problem of keeping supervisors, particularly faculty and staff who do not attend Curriculum and Instruction Department meetings informed of changes, modifications, and interpretations of the portfolio development process. The purpose of this guide is to describe the portfolio process developed by this committee and approved for implementing beginning in the fall, 2005. The committee members hope that this structure for the Phase 4 College of Education Portfolio will help support the students in maximizing their development as professionals while in their field placements. As a university supervisor, you oversee what is probably one of the most vital experiences pre-service teachers will have in their professional lives. The Phase 4 portfolio is intended to support and provide documentation of this experience.

The implementation of the 2000 PI-34 legislation made significant changes in the development process and licensure. Before the pre-service teachers enter the field classroom for student teaching, they have earned passing scores on the appropriate Praxis II content knowledge test and received acceptable scores on their Phase 3 College of Education Portfolios (COEP).

As part of this final phase of their professional induction process prior to receiving their initial license, these pre-service teachers prepare a Phase 4 COEP. The student teacher you supervise will base his or her Phase 4 COEP on materials prepared for, and implemented with, the students, parents, community resources and supports, as well as interactions with professional colleagues in the field placement. To qualify for a recommendation for an initial teacher license, the pre-service teacher must present scores of acceptable (2) or better on all aspects of their Phase 4 COEP.

This guide provides you with a reference so that you may 1) understand what the student teacher is trying to do as he or she prepares the Phase 4 COEP, 2) have a basis for answering the student teacher's and cooperating teacher's questions, 3) identify additional experiences the student teacher may need to seek, 4) advise the student on the selection of artifacts and/or performances that are representative of his or her overall performance, 5) guide you in the assignment of artifact and/or performance scores if the cooperating teacher does not feel comfortable assigning them, and 6) maintain the COEP Evaluation Record Sheet. If the cooperating teacher does not feel comfortable assigning artifact scores, to the extent possible consult with the cooperating teacher when assigning the artifact and/or performance scores. University supervisors score the following items in the Phase 4 COEP:

- 1. Any (or all) artifacts that the cooperating teacher has not felt comfortable scoring;
- 2. The Teaching Philosophy Statement if the student did not receive a 3 or better score in the Phase 3 COEP:
- 3. The Clinical Reflection/Narrative: and
- 4. The Wisconsin Teaching Standard (WTS) 9 if the student does not submit and reference a separate artifact for this standard.

With input from the cooperating teacher, complete the portfolio review. When you have completed the College of Education Portfolio Evaluation Record Sheet, print 3 copies – one for the student, one for the C&I office and one for your records.

Evaluation Directions

For an interactive version of the College of Education Portfolio Evaluation Record Sheets ("the long form" and "the short form") please go to: http://academics.uww.edu/cni/portfolio.html. In addition, copies of the Phase 4 Forms can be downloaded at this same website. These Phase 4 documents include:

- Philosophy: Directions/Rubric
- Narrative: Directions/Rubric
- Composite Artifact/Rubric
- Cover Sheet
- Student Guide
- Cooperating Teacher Guide
- University Supervisor Guide
- Score Sheet ("the short form")
- Score Sheet with Sub-Narratives ("the long form")
- Artifact Rubrics (WTS 1-10)

For your reference, this guide (on pages 4-7, and 9) includes copies of the writing instructions for students and the appropriate scoring rubrics for both the philosophy of teaching statement and the Reflective Narrative statement. These instructions are provided to help you answer student questions about these documents. Also, use these instructions and rubrics to guide you as you review and assign scores to these two written documents. The last set of rubrics, the Phase 4 WTS Artifact Scoring Rubrics is for your reference if you find it necessary to score an artifact.

Brief Description of the Parts of the College of Education Portfolio

(From the *Phase 4 Student Guide for the College of Education Portfolio*, pp. 3-6, and 8)

Directions for Preparation of the Portfolio

Place all of the Phase 4 College of Education Portfolio (COEP) materials *immediately after the Phase 3 section of your COEP*. Insert a divider that clearly marks the beginning of the Phase 4 section. Immediately after the divider, place a completed copy of the cover sheet (see page 5 of the Phase 4 Student Guide) for the Phase 4 COEP. *Do not use plastic sheet protectors in the portfolio*.

Organization of the Phase 4 College of Education Portfolio

After the cover sheet (see page 5 of the Phase 4 Student Guide), the pre-service teacher will use the following organization for the Phase 4 COEP.

- 1. Teaching Philosophy Statement If the student's teaching philosophy statement scored a 3 or higher in the Phase 3 portfolio review, be sure to include a copy of the Phase 3 Teaching Philosophy Statement and a copy of the scored Phase 3 Philosophical Statement Rubric.
- 2. Clinical Reflection/Narrative comprised of the following subsections:
 - WTS 1 (Subject Matter Competency)
 - WTS 2 (Growth and Development)
 - WTS 3 (Diverse Learners)
 - WTS 4 (Instructional Strategies)
 - WTS 5 (Classroom Management and Climate)
 - WTS 6 (Communication)
 - WTS 7 (Instructional Planning)
 - WTS 8 (Assessment Strategies)
 - WTS 9 (Reflective Practitioner)
 - WTS 10 (Positive Relationships)
- 3. Artifact Appendix In an organized fashion, include each of the three to ten artifacts discussed in the Phase 4 Clinical Reflection/Narrative.
 - a. Along with each artifact, include the Phase 4 WTS Rubric (see pages 11-20 of the Phase 4 Student Guide) on which either the cooperating teacher or the university supervisor has scored the artifact.
 - b. For some standards, particularly standards which lend themselves to a performance demonstration, e.g., WTS 1 (Subject Matter Competency), WTS 5 (Classroom Management and Climate), instead of scoring an artifact, the University Supervisor may use the Phase 4 WTS Rubric to score your performance directly, as observed during a visit to your classroom. This evaluation, along with optional comments the supervisor may provide about the performance, would serve as an artifact in your portfolio. The evaluation should signify a consistent attitude, disposition, or long-term quality of your performance.

- c. For Standard 9 (Reflective Practitioner), at the supervisor/program coordinator's discretion, you may either:
 - insert a page indicating that you would like to have the score you anticipate receiving on the Assessment/Reflection on Learning dimension of the Phase 4: Reflective Narrative Rubric (see page 9 of the Phase 4 Student Guide) counted as your score to represent an artifact for WTS 9, or
 - use another artifact or performance you choose which you think directly addresses WTS 9, and include the Phase 4 WTS Rubric on which either your cooperating teacher or university supervisor scored the artifact.

In either case, the score should refer to a consistent attitude, disposition, or long-term quality of your performance.

- 4. University Supervisor's Observation Reports
- 5. Copy(ies) of the Cooperating Teacher's evaluation(s) submitted to the Office of Field Experiences
- 6. Letters of recommendation, if these are available.

Copies of the following evaluation forms may be accessed at

http://academics.uww.edu/cni/portfolio.html

1. Interim Cooperating Teacher Evaluation—Teacher

For cooperating teachers to fill out and share with their student teachers at the mid point in the semester. After completing a consultation on the two forms, one form should be sent to the Office of Field Experiences.

2. Interim Student Teaching Evaluation—Student

For student teachers to fill out and share with their cooperating teachers at the mid point in the semester.

3. Final Cooperating Teacher Evaluation—Teacher

For cooperating teachers to fill out and share with their student teachers at the end of the semester. One copy of this form should be sent to the Office of Field Experiences.

4. Final Student Teaching Evaluation—Student (Optional)

For student teachers to fill out and share with their cooperating teachers at the end of the semester.

5. Phase 4 Portfolio Guides and Rubrics

Phase 4 Student Guide

Phase 4 Cooperating Teacher's Guide

Phase 4 Supervisor's Guide

Philosophical Statement Directions and Rubric

Phase 4 Clinical Reflective Narrative Directions and Rubric

PHASE 4 COLLEG	SE OF EDUCATION PORTFOLIO)
Department	of Curriculum and Instruction	
	Name:	
S	Student ID Number:	
-	Major:	
	Minor:	
performance this semester. (Your signal not the only factor used in determining the reservations about signing this form or do	rtfolio and it is consistent with the studenture reflecting your review of this portfolio e final evaluation of the Phase 4 Portfolio. It is not wish to participate in scoring the stude ther's University Supervisor is aware of you	is valuable but If you have nt teacher's
Cooperating Teacher Signature		

Student Directions for Writing the Teaching Philosophy Statement

(From the Phase 4 Student Guide, p. 6)

Begin this section of your portfolio with a philosophical statement that will give the reader a good idea of who you are and what you value as a professional. The statement should reveal how you think about teaching and help the reader envision how you will teach.

In a unified composition of about 1,000-1,250 words:

- 1. identify the 2-3 most important purposes of teaching:
- 2. address the educational principles that guide you as an educator;
- 3. explain what it means for someone truly to learn something; and
- 4. based on these purposes, guiding principles, and understanding of learning, describe what you think are the most appropriate strategies for teaching.

Suggestions:

- Introduce your statement with a single image, incident, quotation, or metaphor that encapsulates your philosophy and that can serve to unify your essay.
- While using an appropriate academic style, write in a way that reflects your own voice and personality.
- Seek to inspire the reader. Identify what you believe are the primary purposes of education, and explain your mission as an educator.
- Discuss the most important principles that will guide your actions as a teacher. Emphasize principles as well as knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are referred to elsewhere in the portfolio.
- Include specific examples from your experience to illustrate and support your ideas.
- Logically develop your ideas. While being careful to provide specific examples, relate ideas and examples to sound ethical or psychological arguments.
- Read the rubric before you write your philosophy statement. After you have written your philosophy statement use the rubric to score the draft as if you were an evaluator.

Criteria for evaluating Teaching Philosophy Statements

1. Idea Development:

- Relies on sound assumptions.
- Logically develop views about the purposes of education.
- Clarifies guiding educational principles.
- Discusses what it means to learn.
- Explains the best strategies for teaching and describes why these are the most appropriate ways to teach
- Employs both practical arguments and ethical or psychological arguments.

2. Illustrative Examples:

- Provides specific examples from experience, academic work, or field experience.
- Illustrates points in a vivid or memorable way.

3. Quality of Writing:

- Clear
- Organized
- Free from errors of mechanics and usage
- Written in appropriate academic style
- Unifying theme
- Suggestive of the writer's voice

Philosophical Statement Rubric

Criterion	Undocumented 0 Unacceptable	Minimal 1 Unacceptable	Basic 2 Acceptable	Proficient 3 Acceptable	Advanced 4 Acceptable	Score
Idea Development	The statement does not address the author's views about the purposes of education, guiding educational principles, understanding of learning, and/or the most appropriate strategies for teaching. The statement is incoherent or extremely brief or contains major logical inconsistencies.	Statement expresses the author's views about the purpose of education, guiding educational principles, understanding of learning, and/or the most appropriate strategies for teaching, but is ambiguous or not connected.	Statement logically develops the author's views about the purposes of education, guiding educational principles, understanding of learning, and/or the most appropriate strategies for teaching. However, the statement is not always consistent and/or convincing.	Using generally sound assumptions and arguments, based in practical experience, the statement logically develops the author's views about the purposes of education, guiding educational principles, understanding of learning, and/or the most appropriate strategies for teaching.	Using sound assumptions and arguments, the statement logically develops the author's views about the purposes of education, guiding educational principles, understanding of learning, and/or the most appropriate strategies for teaching. Statement includes sound ethical or psychological arguments and not just practical ones.	Score:
Illustrative Examples	No illustrative examples are included.	Supporting examples are inadequate or of unclear relevance.	Examples in support of points are relevant but general or not based in experience.	Supporting examples from the writer's experience are specific and pertinent.	Specific examples from the writer's personal experience, academic work, or field experience illustrate points in a vivid or memorable way.	Score:
Quality of Writing	The statement is very difficult to read because of its style, usage, mechanics, or organization.	The statement, though comprehensible, has obvious problems in two of the following areas: style, usage and mechanics, or organization.	The statement is understandable plus two of the following: 1) organized, 2) free from errors of mechanics and usage, 3) in an appropriate academic style.	The statement is clear, well organized, free from errors of mechanics and usage, and written in an appropriate academic style.	In addition to being clear, well organized, free from errors of mechanics and usage, and written in an appropriate academic style, the statement 1) has a single, unifying theme and 2) is strongly suggestive of the writer's voice.	Score:

	The statement is	The statement,	The statement is	The statement is	In addition to being	
	very difficult to	though	understandable	clear, well	clear, well	
	read because of	comprehensible,	plus two of the	organized, free	organized, free from	
	its style, usage,	has obvious	following:	from errors of	errors of mechanics	
	mechanics, or	problems in two	1) organized,	mechanics and	and usage, and	
	organization.	of the following	2) free from errors	usage, and	written in an	
		areas: style,	of mechanics	written in an	appropriate	Score:
Duality of		usage and	and usage,	appropriate	academic style, the	
Vriting		mechanics, or	3) in an	academic style.	statement 1) has a	
8		organization.	appropriate		single, unifying	
			academic style.		theme and 2) is	
					strongly suggestive	
<u> </u>					of the writer's voice.	
Comments:					Total:	
					Mean:	
		Ex	aluator:		Date:	
		L,	<u> </u>		Butc	
						8
ev. 8/16/2010 1	:48 PM					

Phase 4 Clinical Reflection/Narrative (WTS 1-10) Directions

(From the Phase 4 Student Guide, p.8)

Divide the Clinical Reflection/Narrative into a series of subsections. In each subsection, address one WTS and answer three general sets of questions. These sets of questions correspond directly to the assessment criteria in the rubric and are intended to prompt your thinking, not to structure your narrative. Write the Clinical Reflection/Narrative in paragraph form, not as a list of answers to questions or replies to sub-prompts.

1. What is the relationship of the Artifact or Performance to the Standards?

Identify and describe the artifact or performance and the context in which it was used or observed.

State the connection between the artifact or performance and specific WTS(s). Discuss evidence this artifact or performance provides that you have made progress in fulfilling this/these WTS(s).

2. What did you learn about your teaching and learning as well as the students' learning via this artifact or performance?

Discuss what you learned by creating or implementing this artifact or performance. Present and discuss evidence of a connection between the artifact or performance and student learning or achievement.

3. What professional goals have you set for yourself? What actions might you take to fulfill these goals?

State personal goals related to this/these WTS(s) your have set for yourself. Provide rationale for selecting specific means of reaching these goals.

Tips that may help you organize your Clinical Reflection/Narrative

Before writing the Reflective Narrative, refer to the Narrative Rubric and to the Phase 4 Artifact or Performance Rubric.

Describe each artifact or performance in an educational context, for example as part of a lesson, unit, or curriculum. Consider the "W" questions journalists use as mental prompts: who, what, when, where, and why.

It may be helpful to think of the artifact or performance as a case or aspect of something larger and broader.

Share your thoughts on any larger educational issues that you have encountered relevant to each standard.

Keep in mind the mark of a good teacher is the ability to think deeply and honestly about his/her practice in order to become an even more effective educator. The reflection section should demonstrate your ability to engage in that kind of thinking.

For each artifact or performance, consider using the following or similar format:

This <name the artifact or performance> shows that

I have at least partially demonstrated WTS(s) < name the WTS(s) > by < creating, doing, implementing, planning, etc.> . . .

Clinical Reflection/Narrative Rubric

Areas Assessed	Undocumented 0 Unacceptable	Minimal 1 Unacceptable	Basic 2 Acceptable	Proficient 3 Acceptable	Advanced 4 Acceptable	Score
Relationship of the Artifact or Performance to the Standards	No discussion of how the artifact relates to the WTS standards or specialty organization Standards.	The discussion is inadequate to clearly understand (or the discussion misjudges) how the artifact/ or performance relates to the WTS and/or specialty organization standards.	Briefly describes the artifact or performance. Discusses in general, impersonal terms how the artifact or performance relates to the WTS and/or specialty organization standards.	Briefly describes the artifact or performance and its context of use. Discusses in specific, personal terms how the artifact or performance relates to the WTS and/or specialty organization standards.	Briefly, yet perceptively describes the artifact or performance and its context of use. Discusses how the artifact or performance offers a personal and original insight into the WTS and/or specialty organization standards.	Score:
Reflection on Learning	Provides no self assessment of one's learning or impact of one's teaching on student achievement.	Provides very limited or confusing assessment of one's learning and the impact of one's teaching on student achievement.	Provides vague or incomplete assessment of one's learning with only a limited statement of the impact of one's teaching on student achievement.	Provides assessment of one's learning with some statement of impact of one's teaching on student achievement.	Provides a careful and detailed assessment of one's learning and the impact of one's teaching on student achievement.	Score:
Reflection on Professional Goals	Provides no reflection about future goals.	The discussion is inadequate to clearly understand what general or specific goals have resulted from the experience and how they can be reached.	Discusses general directions for future growth in the WTS in general impersonal terms OR gives specific goals out of context.	Discusses general directions OR specific goals for future growth in the WTS with examples of how they can be reached.	Discusses general directions AND specific goals for future growth in the WTS. Explains reasons for choosing specific means of reaching these goals. Recognition of the interconnectedness of the WTS evident.	Score:
Quality of Writing	The narrative is very difficult to read because of its style, usage, mechanics, or organization	Two of the following apply: Organized, Unified, Free from errors of mechanics and usage, Appropriate academic style, Strongly suggestive of voice	Three of the following apply: Organized, Unified, Free from errors of mechanics and usage, Appropriate academic style, Strongly suggestive of voice	Four of the following apply: Organized, Unified, Free from errors of mechanics and usage, Appropriate academic style, Strongly suggestive of voice	Writing is clear, well organized, unified, free from errors of mechanics and usage, an appropriate academic style, with a strong suggestion of the author's individual voice	Score:

suggestive of voice			
		Mean:	
Evalı	nator's Signature		Date
			10

Artifact and/or Performance Scoring Directions for the University Supervisor

If the cooperating teacher does not score an artifact, then consult with the cooperating teacher to help provide you with a basis for assigning the artifact score. When you make one of your observational visits to the field site, the student may wish to have you score an artifact or performance on one or more of the standards while you are present. In such a case, the student teacher should indicate which WTS(s) he or she thinks the artifact or performance represents well and wishes you to discuss and/or evaluate and score. The student teacher also should provide you with a copy of the Phase 4 WTS Artifact Scoring Rubric (see pages 13-22 of this guide) on which he or she has marked the WTS to be scored. After consulting with the cooperating teacher and the student teacher, record the artifact score on a copy of the WTS Artifact Scoring Rubric that the student teacher supplies to you and on a copy of the COEP Record Sheet. If the cooperating teacher provides the artifact score, have him or her record and initial the appropriate box on the scoring rubric supplied by the student and the COEP Record Sheet. Keep this record sheet in your file for the student teacher. By the end of the Directed Teaching semester, the student needs to have acceptable scores for all of the WTS. (You may want to make this a bit more open for supervisors who would rather score artifacts via an assignment, as opposed to doing so during the observation visit)

When you think that a student teacher's overall performance in relation to one of the WTS does not approach the expectations for the basic level, i.e., a score of 2, review the standard and rubric with the student teacher. In consultation with the cooperating teacher, ask the student teacher to design a remediation plan. If the student teacher's remediation plan appears to be sound, the cooperating teacher will assist the student with the plan's implementation and re-evaluation of the WTS. You should remain in close contact with the cooperating teacher to monitor the student teacher's progress on his/her remediation plan.

If you find it necessary to score an artifact, the Phase 4 WTS Artifact Scoring Rubrics is provided on pages 13-22 for your reference. Ultimately, it is the University Supervisor's responsibility to enter a score for each of the ten Wisconsin Teacher Standards.

Wisconsin Teaching Standards

1. Teachers know the subjects they are teaching.

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the disciplines she or he teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for pupils.

2. Teachers know how children grow.

The teacher understands how children with broad ranges of ability learn and provides instruction that supports their intellectual, social, and personal development.

3. Teachers understand that children learn differently.

The teacher understands how pupils differ in their approaches to learning and the barriers that impede learning and can adapt instruction to meet the diverse needs of pupils, including those with disabilities and exceptionalities.

4. Teachers know how to teach.

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies, including the use of technology, to encourage children's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

5. Teachers know how to manage a classroom.

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

6. Teachers communicate well.

The teacher uses effective verbal and nonverbal communication techniques as well as instructional media and technology to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

7. Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons.

The teacher organizes and plans systematic instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, pupils, the community, and curriculum goals.

8. Teachers know how to test for student progress.

The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the pupil.

9. Teachers are able to evaluate themselves.

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on pupils, parents, professionals in the learning community and others and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

10. Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community.

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support pupil learning and well-being and acts with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner.

Standard	Incomplete	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
	0	1	2	3	4
	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
WTS 1 Subject matter Competency Score:	□ Frequent content errors or mistakes compromise instruction. □ Serious gaps in knowledge of core ideas and procedures of the discipline. □ Instruction depends on a single method of representation and viewpoint or perspective; however, there is little indication of knowledge of the existence of alternative perspectives. □ Appears to assume that students have no prior knowledge in the discipline. □ Opinion or convenience used as a basis for curriculum evaluation.	☐ Frequent content errors or mistakes; textbook used as only resource. ☐ Appears to conceive of the discipline as an additive accumulation of facts, standard procedures, and tasks to be performed. ☐ Most instruction depends on a single method of representation and viewpoint or perspective. ☐ Little apparent concern for students' prior knowledge or questioning. ☐ Opinion or convenience used as a basis for curriculum evaluation.	□ Occasional content errors; limited use of resources beyond textbook. □ Instruction suggests a concept of the discipline as an additive accumulation of facts; standard arguments, study, and inquiry procedures; and central concepts. □ Instruction restricted to two or three representation methods. □ Occasionally engages students in consideration of different viewpoints and perspectives associated with the discipline(s). □ Tends to reference authority as a basis for curriculum evaluation.	□ Instruction exhibits careful study of content and use of resources □ Engages students in consideration of the complexity, core assumptions, and inquiry methods associated with the discipline(s). □ Instruction fosters student questioning of viewpoints, theories, and interpretation of inquiries. □ Instruction occasionally shows creativity. □ Reason used as a basis for curriculum evaluation.	□ Instruction exhibits a solid understanding of the content, culture, resources,and complexity of the discipline(s). □ Instruction shows recognition of the impact on the discipline(s) of the representation methods, core assumptions, and inquiry methods. □ Instruction engages students in considering, questioning, and interpreting inquiries, viewpoints, and theories related to their learning and the discipline(s). □ Instruction often shows and supports creativity. □ Reason used as a basis for curriculum evaluation.

	evaluation.		curriculum evaluation.	
Comments:				
Comments.				
		 Evaluator	 Date	
Rev. 8/16/2010	1:48 PM			1

Standard	Incomplete	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
	0	1	2	3	4
	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
WTS 2 Growth and Development Score:	☐ Instruction shows little if any concern for the developmental needs of students. ☐ Appears to assume that students have no prior knowledge. ☐ Tends to implement curricular materials as given with no opportunities for students to influence the direction of their learning even when the curricular materials grant such an opportunity. ☐ No concern for student thinking, growth, and experiences.	□ Instruction shows only superficial effort to address the developmental needs of students and □ little apparent concern for students' prior knowledge. □ Tends to implement curricular materials exactly giving students the opportunity to influence the direction of their learning only when materials explicitly grant such an opportunity. □ Devotes little attention to accessing student thinking, growth, and experiences.	☐ Instruction occasionally shows a concern for the students' developmental needs, but ☐ makes only vague connections with students' prior knowledge. ☐ Students given minimal opportunities to decide the direction or nature of their study. ☐ Instruction provides some opportunities for accessing student thinking, growth, and experiences.	☐ Instruction consistently shows attention to student developmental needs and ☐ makes connections with students' prior knowledge. ☐ Students given occasional opportunities to influence the scope and direction of their study and to assume responsibility for designing and implementing their learning alternatives. ☐ Instruction provides multiple opportunities for accessing student thinking, growth, and experiences	☐ Instruction shows deliberate, well-grounded attention to students' developmental needs and ☐ engages students in making connections with their prior knowledge. ☐ Students given multiple opportunities for students to influence the scope and direction of their study and to assume responsibility for designing and implementing their learning alternatives. ☐ Instruction provides extensive opportunities for accessing student thinking, growth, and experiences.

C	on	nm	ien	ts:

Evaluator	Date
	14

Standard	Incomplete	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
	0	1	2	3	4
	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
WTS 3 Diverse Learners Score:	□ No evidence of differentiation in instruction for students based on variations in cultural background, learning style, ability, developmental level, and language. □ Only a single perspective drives instruction and student participation which is limited to recitation. □ No efforts made to access and work with appropriate support services and resources.	□ Little evidence of differentiation in instruction for students based on variations in cultural background, learning style, ability, developmental level, and language. □ Typically only a single perspective drives instruction and discussion. □ No efforts made to access and work with appropriate support services and resources.	□ Differentiates instruction for students based on variations in two of the following aspects: ○ cultural background, ○ language, ○ learning style, ○ ability, ○ developmental level. □ Instruction and discussion occasionally incorporate more than one perspective. □ Limited effort made to access and work with appropriate support services and resources; however, when contacts are made, tends to show a tentative follow-up on suggestions.	□ Differentiates instruction for students based on variations in three of the following aspects: ○ cultural background, ○ language, ○ learning style, ○ ability, ○ developmental level. □ Instruction and discussion typically incorporate at least one alternative perspective. □ Occasional efforts made to access and work with appropriate support services and resources and tends to make an effort to follow up on suggestions and/or further contacts.	□ Differentiates instruction for students based on variations in four of the following aspects: ○ cultural background, ○ language, ○ learning style, ○ ability, ○ developmental level. □ Instruction and discussion incorporate several alternative perspectives. □ Frequent efforts made to access and work with appropriate support services and resources; consistently shows appropriate follow-up on suggestions and/or further contacts.

 Evaluator	Date
Evaluatoi	Date 15

Standard	Incomplete 0 Unacceptable	0 1		Proficient 3 Acceptable	Advanced 4 Acceptable
WTS 4 Instructional Strategies Score:	□ Instruction shows a singular, expository approach to content coverage. □ Little evidence of attention to learner feedback. □ When students do not get an assigned task or concept, tends to blame the students. □ No opportunities for students to develop critical thinking, problem solving, and/or performance capabilities.	□ Instruction shows a singular, probably expository approach to content coverage. □ Little evidence of adjustment of instruction in response to learner feedback. □ When students do not get an assigned task or concept, tends to repeat the explanation or directions over and over frequently with increasing volume. □ Few opportunities for students to develop critical thinking, problem solving, and/or performance capabilities.	☐ Uses at least two instructional methods, but relies dominantly on an expository approach. ☐ Makes minimal, but recognizable adjustment of instruction in response to learner feedback. ☐ When students do not get an assigned task or concept, tells the students to listen carefully and repeats the directions or explanation. ☐ Provides some opportunities for students to develop critical thinking, problem solving, and/or performance capabilities.	☐ Uses a variety of instructional methods and representations but has some difficulty connecting with the concepts to be learned. ☐ Struggles some in making adjustments of the methods based on student feedback. ☐ When students do not get an assigned task or concept, repeats the directions or explanation and then asks a student to explain it using his or her own words. ☐ Provides occasional opportunities for students to develop critical thinking, problem solving, and/or performance capabilities.	☐ Uses a wide variety of instructional methods and representations showing careful coordination with the concepts to be learned. ☐ Readily adjusts methods based on student feedback. ☐ When students do not get an assigned task or concept, seeks information from the students about what they do understand and builds on that information frequently using a different representation of the concept or task. ☐ Provides multiple opportunities for students to develop critical thinking, problem solving, and/or performance capabilities.

Evaluator	Date

Standard	Incomplete	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
	0	1	2	3	4
	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
WTS 5 Classroom Management And Climate Score:	□ Does not appear to consider the organization, allocation, and management of time, space, equipment, and attention to be part of instructional planning. □ When management difficulties arise, tends to blame the students for the problem. □ Punishment is the dominant mode used to seek behavioral change. □ Uses only one organization of students for learning. □ No evidence of any concern for building a sense community in the classroom.	☐ Has difficulty simultaneously thinking through the organization, allocation, and management of time, space, equipment, and attention to support student learning. ☐ Tends to show a negative, blaming perspective when management difficulties arise. ☐ Appears to view punishment as a classroom necessity. ☐ Tends to use a single organization of students for learning. ☐ Little apparent concern for the classroom as a learning community.	□ Has mixed success organizing, allocating, and managing the resources of time, space, equipment, and attention to support student learning. □ Shows some inconsistency; however, generally takes a positive problem- solving perspective when management difficulties arise. □ Organizes students to work in cooperative learning groups; □ however, convenience rather than intended learning outcomes tends to drive the organizational decision. □ Makes recognizable attempt to build a sense of the classroom as a learning community.	☐ Generally successfully organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, equipment, and attention to maximize student learning. ☐ Works to maintain a positive, productive classroom climate in which students recognize some level of responsibility for the learning of others. ☐ Takes a problem-solving approach to classroom difficulties. ☐ Engages the students in both individual and cooperative learning. ☐ Works to establish a sense of the classroom as a learning community.	□ Shows assurance and ease in simultaneously organizing, allocating, and managing the resources of time, space, equipment, and attention to maximize student learning. □ Maintains a positive, proactive climate of shared responsibility for learner progress both as individuals and as groups in an interactive learning community. □ Takes a problem-solving approach to classroom issues. □ Engages the students in individual and cooperative learning using varied sizes of cooperative sets closely tied to the tasks to be completed. □ Cultivates a strong sense of the classroom as a community of learners.

Evaluator	Date
	1.5

Standard	Incomplete 0 Unacceptable	0 1		Proficient 3 Acceptable	Advanced 4 Acceptable		
WTS 6 Communication Score:	□ Non-verbal messages frequently contradict verbal messages and confound student learning. □ Usually misses or ignores student cues indicating their level of understanding of classroom dialogue. □ Relies exclusively on spoken or written language for communication. □ Appears to assume that classroom dialogue is unbiased and free of embedded cultural messages. □ Generally does not comprehend student questions and often does not try to answer them.	□ Shows limited appreciation of the impact of both verbal and nonverbal language on student learning. Frequently misses student cues indicating both understanding or misunderstanding of classroom dialogue. □ Relies exclusively on spoken or written language for communication □ Does not consider the possibility that classroom use of language may carry embedded cultural messages. □ Shows difficulty in comprehending students' questions and constructing clear answers or probing questions to extend student thinking. □ Does not understand the concept of "teachable moments.	☐ Tends to be uncertain of how to coordinate use of both verbal and non-verbal language to support learning. Frequently recognizes student cues indicating their level or understanding of classroom dialogue. ☐ Tends to rely exclusively on spoken language or reading written text. ☐ Generally appears to appreciate the possibility that classroom use of language may carry embedded cultural messages. ☐ Appears to comprehend students' questions, but often struggles to provide needed information or a question supporting extension of student thinking. ☐ When "teachable moments" have been identified by others, can appreciate them.	□ Verbal and nonverbal language coordinated and attentive to the cues given and received. □ Uses at least one communication strategy in addition to spoken or written language. □ Shows sensitivity to the possibility that classroom use of language may carry embedded cultural messages. □ Comprehends students' questions; gives targeted, verbally efficient information, but often misses opportunities to extend student thinking by asking a question rather than giving information. □ Often recognizes "teachable moments" without prompting, but makes hesitant efforts to build on them as they occur.	□ Verbal and nonverbal language shows consistency, fluidity, and sensitivity to cues. □ Uses effective communication strategies including visual, aural, and kinesthetic cues in addition to written or spoken language. □ Generally shows a keen understanding that while language is used for different purposes in the classroom, its usage style may carry cultural messages in addition to the discipline specific content being considered. □ Comprehends students' questions; gives targeted, verbally efficient information, usually takes advantage of opportunities to extend student thinking by asking a question rather than giving information. □ Recognizes and capitalizes on "teachable moments."		
Comments:			Evaluator		Date		

Standard	Incomplete 0 Unacceptable	Minimal 1 Unacceptable	Basic 2 Acceptable	Proficient 3 Acceptable	Advanced 4 Acceptable	
WTS 7 Instructional Planning Score:	□ No long-term plans evident. □ Short-term plans tend to be vague or sketchy when present. □ There is no evidence of a concern for students' prior knowledge or skills, learning style differences, or needs. □ Logical connections among and within lessons not evident. □ No or little evidence of having considered the state academic standards as a part of instructional planning.	□ Long-term plan-ning tends to be vague and lacking connections to assessments □ Short-term plans are cursory or rushed showing little forethought of student needs or subject matter parameters. □ Instructional plan tends to be the same every day. No or little evidence of a connection with differences among students. □ Lessons appear fragmented rather than following a logical progression. □ Connection to state academic standards is tenuous.	□ Long-term and short term plans tend to be more of an academic exercise than a focused learning plan connected to assessments □ Plans include a few instructional variations; however, they do not appear to be connected to specific differences among the students. □ Generally plans follow a logical progression, but with little connection to student prior knowledge and skills. □ Plans tend to be thorough, but relatively inflexible. Rarely do plans engage students in problem-solving and/or critical thinking. □ Lesson plans show a clear connection to relevant state academic standards.	□ Long-term and short-term plans show reasoned connections among and within lessons and are tied to assessments. Planning format tends to be difficult to adjust to meet emerging needs or contingencies. □ While plans include instructtional variations, these approaches do not appear to be connected to specific differences among the students. □ Plans follow a logical progression with a clear connection to student prior knowledge and skills. □ Lessons show a clear connection to relevant state academic standards. □ Frequently lessons engage students in problem-solving and some critical thinking. Often have elements of creative thinking evident.	□ Constructs both long-term and short-term plans based on an initial assessment of student needs and prior knowledge. Uses a planning format that may be readily adjusted to meet emerging student needs and contingencies. □ Plans include instructional variations consistent with student differences among the students. □ Plans build systematically on student prior knowledge and skills. □ Instruction shows a clear, deliberate connection to relevant state academic standards. □ Plans reflect and invite problem-solving, critical thinking, and creativity.	

Standard	Incomplete	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced		
	0	1	2	3	4		
	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable		
WTS 8 Assessment Strategies Score:	□ Sporadically plans and implements assessments of student progress. □ Only assessment of any consequence is a set of informal pencil and paper quizzes. □ Tends to view weak student performance and progress as an indictment of students and an indication that there is need for greater discipline. □ No student self-assessment used. □ Records of assessments are absent, incomplete, and/or scattered.	☐ Uses a single approach to assessment of student progress. ☐ Typically assessments are brief pencil and paper tests with short or forced answer items. ☐ Tends to view weak student performance and progress as an indictment of students rather than a challenge to adjust or adapt the instructional approach. ☐ Limited use of informal assessments; no concern for engaging students in self-assessment; ☐ Records of student assessments and progress tend to be unsystematic and scattered.	☐ Uses a limited number of formal and informal assessment methods. ☐ Formal assessments tend to be traditional pencil and paper tests, typically short answer or forced-choice items. ☐ Limited use of assessments for monitoring and reflecting on effectiveness of instructional approach. ☐ Informal assessments tend to be superficial and weakly structured, rarely involves students in self-assessment. ☐ Maintains careful records of assessments to determine grades at the end of the grading period	□ Incorporates both formal and informal assessment methods and tools as a basis for monitoring both student progress and effectiveness of instructional approach. □ While formal assessments include some traditional pencil and paper tests, alternative formats also are used. □ Uses information from the assessments to make minor adjustments in instruction. □ Maintains careful records of assessments for use when communica-ting with parents and students. □ Occasionally engages students in informal self-assessment activities.	☐ Incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessment methods and tools as a basis for monitoring both student progress and effectiveness of instructional approach. ☐ Formal assessments show an intentional balance between traditional pencil and papers tests including constructed response items and alternative assessment formats. ☐ Use assessments as a basis for making reasoned adjustments and adaptations in planning and instruction. ☐ Maintains careful records to support knowledgeable and responsible communication about student progress. ☐ Engages students in self-assessment activities, often blurring the distinction between instruction and assessment.		

Standard	Incomplete Minimal 1 Unacceptable Unacceptable		2 Acceptable	3 Acceptable	Advanced 4 Acceptable		
WTS 9 Reflective Practitioner Score:	□ Rejects systematic use of inquiry tools as a means of improving teaching. □ Little evidence of reflection on classroom practice or concern with professional development. □ Problems in the classroom are defined exclusively in terms of students; reflection on the teacher's role in problem situations does not occur. □ Concern for educational philosophy and learning theory absent □ Shows no interest in continuing professional development.	□ No evidence of systematic use of inquiry tools to support change in instructional approach. □ Rarely takes time to reflect on classroom practice. □ Typically defines all problems in terms of the students rather than as an interdependent function of instructional choices and student needs and prior knowledge, skills, and experiences. □ Does not consider the existence of a connection between teaching practice, educational philosophy, and learning theory. □ Does not seek information about professional organizations, conferences, or workshops as a means of sustaining professional development	□ Takes time to use at least one inquiry tool to support analysis of and reflection on classroom practice. □ With support from others, is able to participate in a problem-solving approach to adjust or adapt instruction. □ Holds a superficial conception of the link between teaching practice, educational philosophy, and learning theory. □ Does not acknowledge the role of reading professional literature, reflection, and discussion with colleagues as a means of improving classroom practice. □ Somewhat reluctant to participate in opportunities for professional development beyond the local district.	□ Takes time to use at least two tools of inquiry to support analysis of and reflection on classroom practice. □ Generally takes a problemsolving approach to adjust or adapt instruction to support student growth, learning, and development. □ Gives evidence of recognizing a link between teaching practice, educational philosophy, and learning theory. □ Sporadically reads professional literature and occasionally engages colleagues in reflection on classroom practice as a means of supporting professional development of self and others. □ Attended a professional association conference or workshop beyond the local district.	□ Takes time to use various inquiry tools to support analysis of and reflection of classroom practice. □ With colleagues, initiates problemsolving strategies to analyze and adjust or adapt classroom practice to maximize student growth, development, learning, and achievement. □ Has an articulate concept of the connection between teaching practice, educational philosophy, and learning theory. □ Regularly reads professional literature and frequently interacts with colleagues to enhance reflection supporting professional development of self and others. □ Actively seeks opportunities to attend professional association conferences and workshops outside the local district to sustain professional development.		

Evaluator Date

Standard	Incomplete	Minimal	Basic	Proficient	Advanced		
	0	1	2	3	4		
	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable		
WTS 10 Positive Relationships Score:	□ Participates in collegial activities with school personnel when administrators require participation. □ Communicates with parents only during formal school functions such as parent-teacher conferences and open houses. □ Does not link with colleagues or other professionals. □ Distant relationship with students.	□ Rarely participates in collegial activities with school personnel. □ Communicates with parents only during formal school functions such as parent-teacher conferences and open houses. □ Occasionally seeks help from colleagues and counselors in working with students who are having or causing problems in class. □ Tenuous relationship with students.	☐ Occasionally participates in collegial activities with school personnel. ☐ Usually seeks to make links with parents. ☐ Initiates linking with counselors, and colleagues to seek help in working with students who are having or causing problems in class. ☐ Generally maintains respectful rapport with students.	□ Participates in some collegial activities to help make the school a productive learning environment. □ Frequently seeks to make links with parents. □ Initiates linking with counselors, colleagues, and professionals in the community to advocate for student rights, learning, and well-being. □ Generally maintains a good, responsive rapport with students.	□ Participates in collegial activities to help make the school a productive leaning environment. □ Consistently seeks to make links with parents. □ Engages actively with counselors, colleagues, and professionals in the community to advocate for student rights, learning, and wellbeing. □ Maintains positive, productive, responsive rapport with students.		

Evalı	uator	 Date	
			22

Student Name:				ID#:				Majo	r:		
Phase 3 Phase 4			Colle	ge of l	Educa	tion P	ortfoli	io Eva	luatio	n Rec	ord Sheet
PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT	Scores	Evalu	ıator:	(Dlagge		e clearly)					
Idea Development		Evalu	ıator:						Date: _		
Illustrative Examples		Stude	ent:			e read and	l understo		Date: _		
Quality of Writing		C&I	Office:	(Initials	: I have re	eceived th	e scoring		Date: _		
Final Philosphy Score (Mean)											
NARRATIVE STATEMENTS	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9*	WTS 10	Narrative Subscores
Relationship of the Artifact or Performance to the Standards											
Reflection on Learning*											
Reflection on Professional Goals											
Quality of Writing											
											Final Narrative Score
Composite Reflective Narrative Scores											
ARTIFACTS	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS	WTS 8	WTS 9*	WTS 10	
Artifact Final Scores	_	_		-			-				
*Student's Narrati	ve Subsco	ore for Re	eflection of	on Learnii	ng may bo	e used as	Artifact F	inal Scor	e for WT	S 9.	
Summative evaluation (chec	k one)	:	Accep	otable	1	Unacce	eptable	2			
Comments: (Optional):											

Student Name:				ID#:				Majo	r:			
Phase 3 Phase 4		•	Colle	_						n Reco		eet
PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT	Scores	Evaluator: Evaluator: Student:		(Please:	nrint nam	o oloorky)						
Idea Development				(Please print name clearly) Date:								
Illustrative Examples				Date: (Signature: I have read and understood the evaluation)								
Quality of Writing		C&I O	ffice:	(Initials	I have re	eceived th	ne scoring	sheet)	Date: _			
Final Philosphy Score (Mean)												
Relationship of the Artifact or Performance to the Standards	Narrati Subsco											
Reflection on Learning*												
Reflection on Professional Goals												
Quality of Writing												
	Final Narrati Score	ive										
ARTIFACTS	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9*	WTS 10		
Artifact Final Scores												
*Student's Narrati	ive Subsco	ore for Refl	lection o	on Learnii	ng may be	e used as	Artifact F	inal Scor	e for WT	S 9.		
Summative evaluation (chec	k one)	:	Accep	table	1	Unacce	eptable	2				
Comments: (Optional):												