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Top of Form

|  | **Unacceptable  value: 0.00** | **Developing value: 1.00** | **Proficient  value: 2.00** | **Score/Level** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Contextual Factors (1)  Knowledge of District and School, Factors | Teacher does not demonstrate knowledge of the characteristics of the district and school. | Teacher demonstrates a general knowledge of the characteristics of the district, and school. | Teacher demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge of the characteristics of the district and school. |  |
| Contextual Factors (2)  Knowledge of Characteristics of Students | Teacher displays minimal knowledge of student differences (i.e., development, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning. | Teacher displays general knowledge of student differences (i.e., development, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning. | Teacher displays general and specific knowledge of student differences (i.e., development, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning. |  |
| Contextual Factors (3)  Classroom Features | Teacher displays little knowledge about grouping, scheduling and classroom arrangement. | Teacher displays general knowledge about grouping, scheduling and classroom arrangement. | Teacher displays general and specific knowledge about grouping, scheduling and classroom arrangement. |  |
| Contextual Factors: (4)  Implications for Instructional Planning | Teacher does not provide implications for instruction based on individual student differences and any other factors that will influence planning. | Teacher provides general implications for instruction based on individual student differences and any other factors that will influence planning. | Teacher provides specific implications for instruction based on individual student differences and any other factors that will influence planning. |  |
| Contextual Factors (5)  Communication with Families | Teacher displays minimal knowledge of how he/she and the school would communicate with families. | Teacher has a basic knowledge how he/she and the school communicate with families using at least three (3) specific examples. | Teacher demonstrates an extensive knowledge of how he/she communicate with families citing more than three (3) specific examples. |  |
| Unit Objectives: (1)  Listing of Objectives | Unit objectives are not clearly stated and objectives and/or objectives are not appropriate for the development of student needs. | The majority of the unit objectives are clearly stated and are appropriate for the development of student needs. | All of the unit objectives are clearly stated and are significant, challenging, varied and appropriate. |  |
| Unit Objectives: (2)  Alignment with National, State, or Local Standards | The majority of the unit objectives are not correctly aligned with national, state or local standards. | The majority of the unit objectives are correctly aligned with national, state or local standards. | All of the unit objectives are correctly aligned with national, state or local standards. |  |
| Assessment Plan: (1)  Overview | Content and methods of assessment lack congruence with learning objectives or lack cognitive complexity. | Some of the learning objectives are measured through the assessment plan, but some do not include prompts, directions or criteria for measuring student performance. | Each of the learning objectives is measured through the assessment plan. Assessments are congruent with the learning objectives in content and cognitive complexity. |  |
| Assessment Plan: (2)   Assessment Adaptations | Assessment adaptation(s) are not existent or do not meet the needs of the individual student(s). | Assessment adaptation(s) meet the individual needs of the student(s) and include the integration of knowledge, skills and reasoning ability. | Assessment adaptation(s) include multiple and creative assessment modes that meet the needs of the individual student(s). |  |
| Design for Instruction: (1)  Results of Pre-Assessment | The results of the pre-assessment do not clearly determine patterns of student performance relative to each learning objective or do not indicate any misconceptions students may have about the unit of instruction. | The results of the pre-assessment show a pattern of student performance relative to each learning objective and indicate some misconceptions students may have about the unit of instruction. | The results of the pre-assessment clearly demonstrate a pattern of student performance relative to each learning objective and student misconceptions about the unit of instruction are clearly explained. |  |
| Design for Instruction: (2)  Unit Overview | The lessons within the unit are not logically organized  (i.e., sequenced) and the strategies/techniques listed do not move the students toward achieving the unit learning objectives. | The lessons within the unit have some logical organization and the strategies/techniques listed appear to be somewhat useful in moving students toward achieving the unit learning objectives. | All lessons within the unit are logically organized and the strategies/techniques listed are creative and useful in moving students toward achieving the unit learning objectives. |  |
| Design for Instruction: (3)  Instructional Strategy/Techniques | Little variety of instruction,  activities, assignments, and resources. Heavy reliance on textbook or single resource  (i.e., work sheets). | Some variety in instruction,  activities, assignments, or resources but with limited contribution to student learning. | Significant variety of instruction, that includes activities,  assignments, and/or resources. This variety makes a clear contribution to student learning. |  |
| Design for Instruction: (4)  Use of Available Technology | Available technology is inappropriately used OR the teacher proposes the use of technology but does not explain how the technology could improve student learning. | Teacher uses available technology and explains how it makes a significant contribution to student learning OR the teacher proposes the use of technology and explains how it can improve student learning. | Teacher integrates appropriate, available technology that makes a significant contribution to student learning ORthe teacher proposes a comprehensive technology plan that could be incorporated in the unit plan and explains how it would contribute to greater student learning. |  |
| Instructional Decision Making: (1)  Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning | Teacher describes the class as “one plan fits all” with no modifications. | Some modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs, but these are not based on the analysis of student learning, best practice, or contextual factors. | Appropriate modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs. These modifications are informed by the analysis of student learning/performance, best practice, or contextual factors. An explanation of why the modifications would improve student progress is included. |  |
| Analysis of Student Learning: (1)  Whole Class | Analysis of student learning fails to include any evidence of impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward mastering the unit learning objectives. | Analysis of student learning includes some evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward unit learning objectives. | Analysis of student learning includes clear evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each unit learning objective. |  |
| Analysis of Student Learning: (2)  Individuals | Ineffective analysis of the students’ post assessment that resulted in a poor remedial plan. | Satisfactory analysis of the students’ post assessment that resulted in a good remedial plan. | An excellent analysis of the students’ post assessment that resulted in individual remediation plans. |  |
| Reflection and Self-Evaluation: (1)  Student Success | Simplistic or superficial reasons provided to explain why students were successful in achieving the unit learning objective. | Two insightful reasons were provided to explain why students were successful in achieving the unit learning objective. | More than two insightful reasons were provided to explain why students were successful in achieving the unit learning objective. |  |
| Reflection and Self-Evaluation:  (2)  Student Difficulty | Simplistic or superficial reasons were provided to explain why students were not successful in achieving the learning objective and/or no simplistic or superficial ideas as to what could be done to improve students’ performance. | Two insightful reasons were provided to explain why students were not successful in achieving the learning objective and a good plan was provided to improve students’ performance. | More than two insightful reasons were provided to explain why students were not successful in achieving the learning objective and comprehensive plan was provided to improve students’ performance. |  |
| Reflection and Self-Evaluation: (3)  Professional Development | Provides one or two simplistic professional learning goals that are related to the insights and experiences drawn from the TWS experience and/or does not provide a well thought out plan for meeting the goals. | Provides two achievable professional learning goals that emerged from the insights and experiences drawn from the TWS experience and provides a well thought out plan for meeting  the goals. | Provides more than two well thought out learning goals that emerged from the insights and experiences drawn from the TWS experience and provides a well thought out plan for meeting the goals. |  |
| Conventions:  Sentences | Many (3+) incomplete sentences and/or run ons or fragments. | Few (1-2) incomplete sentences and/or run ons or fragments. | Complete sentences: no run-ons or fragments; variety in length and sentence type to ensure good flow of ideas. |  |
| Conventions:  Appropriate Word Choice | Many (3+) errors in using educational and related terms in document correctly. | Few (1-2) errors in using educational and related terms in document correctly. | Uses educational and/or related terms correctly; varies language. |  |
| Conventions:  Grammar | Many (3+) errors in agreement, number or tense. | Few (1-2) errors in agreement, number or tense. | No errors in agreement, number or tense. |  |
| Conventions:  Accurate Spelling/Correct Punctuation | Many (3+) spelling and/or punctuation errors. | Few (1-2) spelling and/or punctuation errors. | No spelling and/or punctuation errors. |  |
| Typed document using 12 font AND double spaced. | None of the two tasks were accomplished. | One of the tasks was accomplished. | Both tasks were accomplished. |  |
| Conventions:  Overall appearance of TWS | Poorly organized; sections not labeled; difficult to find supporting materials | Appearance and organization good, but a bit more effort in putting the binder together was needed. Somewhat difficult to find supporting evidence. | Overall appearance and organization excellent; cover on binder contained all necessary information; section dividers helped to locate topics and supporting evidence. |  |
| **TOTAL POINTS**………………………………………………………………………………………….. | | | | |

Bottom of Form

Grading:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Percentage Score** | **Grade** |
| **96-100%** | **A** |
| **92-95** | **A-** |
| **89-91** | **B+** |
| **85-88** | **B** |
| **82-84** | **B-** |
| **81-79** | **C+** |
| **75-78** | **C** |
| **72-74** | **C-** |
| **70-71** | **D** |
| **Below 70** | **F** |