

A. PLANNING AND PREPARATION

A1. KNOWLEDGE of STUDENTS *TPE 1, UDL*

Not Demonstrated – 1	Partially Demonstrated – 2	Demonstrated – 3	Demonstrated with Distinction – 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TC shows minimal understanding of how Ss learn—in their ways of learning, knowledge & skills, special needs, interests, and cultural identities and does not indicate that such knowledge is valuable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TC shows general knowledge and awareness of how Ss learn—in their ways of learning, knowledge, and skills, special needs, interests, & cultural identities—but tends to teach to the class as a whole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TC purposefully acquires knowledge about how the whole class AND groups of Ss learn—in their ways of learning, knowledge & skills, special needs, interests, & cultural identities—and plans lessons accordingly TC understands that Ss learn through developmentally appropriate & active intellectual engagement with content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TC purposefully acquires knowledge about how the whole class, groups, AND individual Ss learn—in their ways of learning, knowledge & skills, special needs, interests, & cultural identities—and plans lessons accordingly TC understands that Ss learn through developmentally appropriate & active intellectual engagement, AND that misconceptions & gaps in knowledge and experience may need to be uncovered
Possible Examples	Possible Examples	Possible Examples	Possible Examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No descriptions of Ss' interests, cultural heritages, or varied ability levels Learning activities and assignments lack any form of differentiation Ss are passive (e.g., Ss listen to a lesson as a uniform group for an entire 30-minute period) No description indicating extent of prior knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan references Ss' interests, cultural heritages, and/or varied ability levels Plan does not adequately differentiate learning (e.g., one activity is beyond reach for some Ss) Plan does not elicit higher level responses (e.g., Ss recite information & are not invited to generate their own questions) Minimal description of prior knowledge with vague connection to current learning (e.g., "Last week, Ss finished unit on ____") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan incorporates survey of Ss interests, cultural heritages, and abilities levels Lesson differentiates learning activities based on Ss survey (e.g., shared interest in a topic inspires standards-based options from which Ss may choose) Ss actively engaged (e.g., partner-shares & sharing out based on Ss' preference for partner work; Ss generate/answer their own & each other's questions) Prior knowledge referenced & tied to lesson outcome, but does not actively involve Ss (e.g., "I will describe how this lesson builds on the previous unit") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan includes multiple activity options based on identification of Ss' interests, culture, & ability levels Ss take active role in designing projects/ activities (e.g., Ss form interest-based groups, choose topic, determine how to present findings) Ss are actively engaged & plan anticipates Ss' misconceptions (e.g., listing possible guiding & follow-up questions) Prior knowledge extends current learning (e.g., "Ss will engage in 'before' discussions to reveal connections to current unit")

A2. SETTING INSTRUCTIONAL OUTCOMES *TPE 3, 4, UDL*

Not Demonstrated – 1	Partially Demonstrated – 2	Demonstrated – 3	Demonstrated with Distinction – 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcomes represent low expectations/ lack of rigor All outcomes are unclear Outcomes are not measurable Outcomes are poorly aligned with content standards All outcomes are not suitable for most Ss 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcomes represent moderate expectations/ rigor Some outcomes are unclear Some outcomes are not measurable Outcomes are somewhat aligned with content standards Some outcomes are suitable for most Ss 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most outcomes represent high expectations/ rigor Most outcomes are clear Most outcomes are measurable Most outcomes are aligned with content standards Most outcomes are suitable for most Ss 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All outcomes represent high expectations/ rigor All outcomes are clear All outcomes are measurable All outcomes are aligned with content standards All outcomes are suitable for Ss with differentiation/ flexibility for individual Ss
Possible Examples	Possible Examples	Possible Examples	Possible Examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcomes provide no cognitive challenge (e.g., Ss mostly passive during lesson; Ss are occasionally asked to recall facts) Outcomes are absent or vague (e.g., "Ss will listen or watch") Activities lack measurable outcomes & assessment (e.g., no end product to measure) No relevant standard identified that aligns with the outcome (e.g., reading outcomes for a writing standard) Outcomes too difficult/ too easy for most Ss (e.g., no flexibility for learning differences) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcomes provide minimal challenge (e.g., Ss do some explaining or summarizing; no peer: peer interaction) Over half of outcomes are vague (e.g., "Ss will learn about") Some activities have measurable outcomes, others do not (e.g., "Ss will discuss") Outcomes somewhat connected to content standards but lack relevance (e.g., focus on character arc for content standard related to plot) Outcomes are written with "middle achievers" in mind; few-options for learning differences (e.g., no brain breaks; no student input; no enrichment options) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nearly all outcomes provide appropriate challenge (e.g., Ss analyze & apply new information, discuss with peers) Most outcomes are <u>clear</u> (e.g., "Ss will list"), but some are not (e.g., "Ss will understand") Nearly all activities include measurable outcomes linked to assessment (e.g., "Ss will list at least 5 ways to") Most outcomes align with content standards (e.g., reading outcome clearly matches <u>focus</u> of standard) Nearly all outcomes suitable for most Ss, with some flexibility (e.g., presenting information in various forms; use of technology; time allotment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>All</u> outcomes provide appropriate challenge (e.g., Ss critique ideas; defend a position with peers) <u>All</u> outcomes clearly stated (e.g., "Ss will evaluate") <u>Every</u> activity has measurable outcomes & clearly defined assessments (e.g., "Ss will defend an opinion with 3 or more objective details") <u>Every</u> outcome directly aligns with standard (e.g., all outcomes clearly address the <u>focus</u> of identified standards) <u>All</u> outcomes differentiated to encourage individual Ss to take educational risks (e.g., TC provides materials to support independent learning)

A3. DESIGNING COHERENT INSTRUCTION *TPE 1, 2, 3*

Not Demonstrated – 1	Partially Demonstrated – 2	Demonstrated – 3	Demonstrated with Distinction – 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning activities are poorly aligned with learning outcomes and/or content standards Learning activities do not follow an organized progression Ss are not actively engaged in cognitive activities; no evidence of UDL No use of groupings Unrealistic time allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some learning activities are aligned with learning outcomes and/or content standards Some learning activities do not follow an organized progression Ss are minimally engaged in cognitive activities, with limited evidence of UDL Some use of groupings, but may be inappropriate Uneven time allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most learning activities aligned with learning outcomes & content standards Most learning activities follow an organized progression Ss are engaged in cognitive activities with evidence of UDL Most outcomes suitable for most Ss Appropriate time allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All learning activities are aligned with learning outcomes & content standards All learning activities follow an organized progression Ss are challenged in high-level cognitive activities with appropriate UDL Appropriate and varied groupings that include S choice Appropriate time allocations with flexibility for individual Ss
Possible Examples	Possible Examples	Possible Examples	Possible Example
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning activities not aligned with content standards or outcomes (e.g. Ss color in unlabeled worksheet for outcome of learning parts of a microscope) Ineffective sequence of instruction (e.g., opening activity relies on terminology not yet presented) No UDL to support Ss' cognitive learning needs (e.g., no intentional grouping to make learning outcome accessible to all) Time excessive for grade level attention span or covers insufficient content in time allocated (e.g., K Ss listen to instructions for 30 min.; HS Ss spend 40 min. reviewing word definitions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning activities not always aligned with standards/ outcomes (e.g., no writing activities for a writing outcome) Sequence of instruction disjointed (e.g., worksheet assigned before checking for understanding; follow-up activity requires skill not taught) UDL support is minimal (e.g., undifferentiated grouping) Timing allocations are uneven (e.g., HS Ss spend 20 minutes learning & practicing rules for using commas, but no time is allotted to check for understanding) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most lesson activities align with standards/outcomes (e.g., Ss draft topic sentences for standard/ outcome aligned with main ideas in writing) Most activities sequence with logical transitions (e.g., TC will assess prior knowledge, model, & check for understanding) Multiple activities scaffolded with UDL to support Ss' cognitive growth; evidence of intentional choices for strategic grouping (e.g., TC selects group members re: reading level) Time allocations mostly developmentally appropriate and designed for all students to achieve outcomes (e.g., TC plans some flexibility in appropriate pacing for whole class and/or groups, but not for individuals) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All activities align fully with standards/ outcomes (e.g., Ss choose to present a hip-hop song or write a poem in line with poetry content standards) All activities progress with logical transitions (e.g., sequence includes menu of student options to clarify, reinforce, or enrich) UDL equips Ss for challenge of high-level cognitive activities (e.g., Ss select groups based on learning needs, and/or choose roles/ responsibilities) Sufficient time & flexibility provided for both individuals & groups to achieve outcomes (e.g., group has time to reflect on learning & participation; TC allows flexibility in individual time allocations for rotating between stations)

A4. DESIGNING STUDENT ASSESSMENT *TPE 5*

Not Demonstrated – 1	Partially Demonstrated – 2	Demonstrated – 3	Demonstrated with Distinction – 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formative assessments do not match learning outcomes and/or content standards Lack of criteria for expectations Minimal formative assessment <p>Re: A1 & A2 Formatted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formative assessments partially match learning outcomes and/or content standards Criteria available, but unclear Rudimentary use of formative assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formative assessments match learning outcomes and content standards Criteria clear Appropriately-designed formative assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formative assessments clearly match learning outcomes & content standards Well-developed criteria Well-designed formative assessment adapted to individuals as needed Ss contribute to assessment process
Possible Examples	Possible Examples	Possible Examples	Possible Examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formative assessments are not aligned with standards (e.g., Ss are asked to distinguish between fact and opinion when the standard relates to story mapping) No criteria to evaluate S learning (e.g., Ss will be required to submit a paragraph, but no criteria are provided for assessment) Little or no evidence of formative assessment (e.g., planned questions are superficial and will not yield useful feedback for ongoing instruction) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formative assessments partially connected to content standards (e.g., for a standard relating to story sequence, conflict is assessed, but resolution is not) Unclear how Ss will be informed of expectations, or how Ss will demonstrate understanding (e.g., a rubric is posted without explanation or examples) Plan includes formative assessment but no clear connection to ongoing instruction (e.g., no indication of possible adjustments) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All learning outcomes have a clear method for formative assessment (e.g., outcome-focused questions drive ongoing instruction) Criteria communicated to Ss (e.g., clear expectations; lesson plan imbeds elaboration & clarification of the criteria) Plan indicates formative assessments with connections to ongoing instruction (e.g., TC will create workshop groups based on Ss' responses) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus is on achieving learning outcomes & content standards (e.g., assessment of outcomes is continuous) Criteria clearly communicated through S-friendly learning target/s (e.g., Ss will view exemplary samples & describe what makes them exemplary) Individualized formative assessment (e.g., adaptations are planned for specific learning needs) Ss design intentional self-assessments (e.g., Ss assist in creating rubric based on learning outcomes.)

A5. SUPPORTING EMERGENT BILINGUALS *TPE 1*

Not Demonstrated – 1	Partially Demonstrated – 2	Demonstrated – 3	Demonstrated with Distinction – 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing or inappropriate ELD standards • No attempt to draw on home language, culture, and/or funds of knowledge • Missing or inappropriate language supports or instructional scaffolds to engage EBs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELD standards not aligned with learning outcomes, assessments, and/or instructional activities • Limited or superficial attempts to draw on home language, culture, and/or funds of knowledge • Few language supports & instructional scaffolds to engage EBs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELD standards aligned with & support learning outcomes, assessments, & instructional activities • Some attempt to draw on home language, culture, and/or funds of knowledge • Whole-class language supports and instructional scaffolds that adequately support EBs' academic language production & content engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELD standards aligned with & support learning outcomes, assessments, & instructional activities AND meet specific needs of individual EL/EBs • Tasks draw on home language, culture, AND funds of knowledge • Targeted language supports & instructional scaffolds that support individual EBs' academic language production & content engagement
Possible Examples	Possible Examples	Possible Examples	Possible Examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELD standard not listed or not accurate (e.g., ELD “standard” is not in CA framework or does not correlate to relevant content area standard) • No evidence of pre-planning for culturally responsive teaching (e.g., no evidence of attempt to ascertain home languages or cultural practices which could impact learning) • No scaffolding specific to needs of EB Ss (e.g., no pairing with another S; no visual supports or graphic organizers; no meaningful practice of academic vocabulary) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELD standards & activities do not support learning outcomes (e.g., Ss will practice cloze reading for objective of offering opinion) • Few ties to Ss' cultural background (e.g., no use of home language/ translanguaging; few S-friendly definitions/visuals for unique cultural vocabulary; few culturally relevant characters/ themes/topics) • Few/ ineffective scaffolds to address specific needs of EB Ss (e.g., limited use of graphic organizers; limited use of academic vocabulary in multiple contexts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELD standards align with learning outcomes & encourage EB Ss' inclusion (e.g., graphic organizers & pre-teaching will facilitate active participation) • Plan integrates content with Ss' home language and/or culture (e.g., Ss will write about a favorite family activity; lesson will connect to maps/community speakers) • Structured sharing promotes EB Ss' language production & content engagement, with evidence of language supports (e.g., demonstration of procedures; choral reading; collaborative dialogues) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELD standards align with all lesson aspects <u>and</u> meet individual EB Ss' needs (e.g., EB Ss will use sentence frames to participate in/ lead group discussions; will be assessed using an oral language rubric) • Culturally/linguistically relevant materials support EB Ss' independence (e.g., dual language texts; characters, themes, or topics reflect cultural/ linguistic background of Ss) • Visual/verbal supports modeled & targeted to EB Ss' levels, fostering independence (e.g., pre-teaching academic vocabulary, Google translate, tiered sentence starters)

A6. SUPPORTING STUDENTS with DISABILITIES *TPE 1*

Not Demonstrated – 1	Partially Demonstrated – 2	Demonstrated – 3	Demonstrated with Distinction – 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack appropriate instructional methods and/or supports for providing instruction to Ss with disabilities • Demonstrate no evidence of providing accommodations or modifications as stated on student IEPs or 504 plans • Do not allow Ss with disabilities access to grade-aligned and standards-based instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include instructional methods and/or supports that do not consistently address the individualized needs of Ss with disabilities • Include non-individualized accommodations or modifications OR do not include all relevant accommodations or modifications as stated on Ss' IEPs or 504 plans • All Ss with disabilities inconsistent access to grade-aligned and standards-based instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include research or evidence-based instructional methods and/or supports, including assistive technology as needed to support individualized needs of Ss with disabilities • Fully address accommodations & modifications as indicated on Ss' IEPs or 504 plans • Allow Ss with disabilities access to grade-aligned and standards- based instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include opportunities for Ss with disabilities to manage their own scaffolds & supports, including assistive technology as needed • Fully address accommodations & modifications as indicated on Ss' IEPs & 504 plans, and provide opportunities for Ss to understand and advocate for strategies that meet their individual learning needs • Allow Ss with disabilities meaningful & consistent access to grade-aligned & standards-based instruction
• Possible Examples	• Possible Examples	• Possible Examples	• Possible Example
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No indication of explicit or systematic, individual or small group instruction for Ss with IEPs/ 504s (e.g., no corrective or specific feedback, no modeling) • No evidence of planning for specific modifications or accommodations described in the IEP (e.g., plan identifies students with IEPs or 504 plans but does not include specific information about necessary individualized support) • Materials & learning objectives for Ss with IEPs/504s do not align to grade level (e.g., Ss will not have access to a text that represents grade-level content at their reading ability) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent evidence of explicit, systematic instruction (e.g., inconsistent evidence of modeling, scaffolds, feedback, priming, or strategy instruction) • Plans for instruction lack descriptions of mandated IEP/504 modifications and/or accommodations (e.g., supports are targeted broadly at all Ss with IEPs/504s rather than planning small group and individualized supports) • Some materials align with grade level standards, but expectations have been lowered for Ss with IEPs/504s (e.g., Ss will be asked to recall character actions when standard calls for Ss to analyze character intentions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of explicit, systematic instruction to ensure that all Ss with IEPs/504s successfully complete academic tasks (e.g., TC will provide clear instructional models, guided practice, & opportunities to respond independently with feedback) • Evidence that individual accommodations and/or modifications will be provided during instruction AND assessment (e.g., S is provided extra time, audio books, etc.) • Ss with IEPs/504s will work toward the same grade-aligned standards as rest of class (e.g., TC will provide materials which allow Ss to achieve grade-level standards, such as a task analysis with pictures and vocabulary for solving word problems) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that concepts will be taught explicitly & systematically so all Ss with IEPs/504s can be leaders in academic activities (e.g., TC supports the use of communication boards to enable Ss to lead a small group discussion) • Accommodations and/or modifications fully addressed as mandated on IEP/504 plans; Ss given opportunities to advocate for strategies which meet individual needs (e.g., choosing to use text-to-speech or to read directions on an iPad) • Ss with IEPs/504s will have consistent access to grade-aligned & standards-based instruction (e.g., evidence that Ss will be encouraged to identify & self-advocate for materials to support problem solving)