

## RUBRICS FOR RATING CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE ON THE MSTEP TEACHER CANDIDATE OBSERVATION REPORT<sup>1</sup>

A. PLANNING AND PREPARATION			
1=Did Not Demonstrate	2=Partially Demonstrated	3=Demonstrated	4=Demonstrated with Distinction
<b>1. DEMONSTRATING KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS</b>			
Minimal understanding of how students learn; Limited knowledge of varied approaches to learning, special needs, interests, cultural identity.	Generally accurate knowledge of students learning, special needs, interests, cultural identity; Applies to class as a whole.	Understands active nature of students; Utilizes a variety of approaches to learning, special needs, interests, cultural identity; Applies to groups as well as whole class.	Understands active nature of students; Utilizes a variety of approaches to learning, special needs, interests, cultural identity; Applies to individuals, groups and whole class.
<b>2. SETTING INSTRUCTIONAL OUTCOMES</b>			
Low expectations for students; Lack of rigor; Outcomes reflect one type of learning; Suitable for only some students.	Moderately high expectations/rigor; Outcomes reflect several types of learning; Global assessments are suitable for most students.	Most outcomes high; Reflect different types of learning; Flexible learning goals inclusive of a variety of groups of students.	All outcomes reflect high level of learning; Clear, well written in form of student learning; Flexible learning goals inclusive of a variety of groups of students.
<b>3. DESIGNING COHERENT INSTRUCTION</b>			
Lessons do not follow an organized progression; Does not engage students in active participation; Unrealistic time allocations; Lacks variety; Content and/or instruction not developmentally and/or conceptually appropriate.	Some activities aligned with instructional outcomes; Moderate cognitive challenge; No evidence of Universal Design for Learning; Some use of grouping; Uneven time allocation; Content and/or instruction is not consistently developmentally and/or conceptually appropriate.	Most activities aligned with instructional outcomes; Significant cognitive challenges; Some evidence of Universal Design for Learning; Varied groups; Reasonable time allocation; Content and instruction consistently developmentally and conceptually appropriate.	Learning activities follow coherent sequence; Aligned to instructional goals; Lessons are universally designed; Content and instruction are consistently developmentally appropriate and conceptually powerful.
<b>4. DESIGNING STUDENT ASSESSMENTS</b>			
Assessments do not match instructional outcomes; Lack of criteria for expectations; No formative assessment.	Assessment partially matches instructional outcomes; Criteria available but unclear; Rudimentary use of formative assessment.	Assessments match instructional outcomes/criteria; Standards clear; Well-developed formative assessments.	Assessments match instructional goals with clear criteria; Students contribute to the assessment process.
<b>5. SUPPORTING EMERGENT BILINGUALS</b>			
Planning lacks appropriate ELD Standards; No EL/EB scaffolding and support.	Includes ELD standards, but does not align with curriculum or lesson objectives; Includes general scaffolds that don't support EL/EB language production and content engagement.	ELD standards align with and support curriculum standards and lesson objectives; Scaffolds specific and targeted to support ELs/EBs academic language production and content engagement.	ELD standards align with and support curriculum standards and lesson objectives; Standards selected to meet specific needs of ELs/EBs; Scaffolds specific and targeted to support individual ELs/EBs academic language production and to build on prior knowledge and language proficiency.

<sup>1</sup> These rubrics are drawn from the Evaluation Instrument (2013 ed.) by Charlotte Danielson and published by the Danielson Group (<https://www.danielsongroup.org/framework/>).

<b>B. CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT</b>			
<b>1=Did Not Demonstrate</b>	<b>2=Partially Demonstrated</b>	<b>3=Demonstrated</b>	<b>4=Demonstrated with Distinction</b>

### **1. CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT OF RESPECT/RAPPORT**

Interactions mostly negative/inappropriate/insensitive; Use of sarcasm/put-downs; Ignores disrespectful behavior	Interactions generally appropriate; Some inconsistencies and favoritism; Response to disrespectful behavior met with uneven results; Warmth lacking	Teacher-Student interactions friendly and respectful; Student interactions with one another generally polite and respectful; Response to misbehavior is effective	Teacher-student interactions highly respectful; Reflects genuine warmth and sensitivity to students as individuals; Students feel valued and are comfortable taking intellectual risks
--	---	---	--

### **2. MANAGING CLASSROOM PROCEDURES**

Inefficient routines/procedures; Loss of instructional time; Lack of management for transitions/groups	Partially inefficient routines/procedures; Loss of some instructional time; Transitions/material distribution are inconsistent leading to some disruption in learning	Effective routines; Little loss of instructional time; Management of groups, transitions, and materials consistently successful; Students understand and follow procedures	Efficient routines maximize instructional time; Students contribute to transitions and material distribution
--	---	--	--

### **3. MANAGING STUDENT BEHAVIOR**

No established standard of conduct; Little or no teacher monitoring of behavior; Disrespectful to students	Standards of conduct are established but implementation inconsistent; Uneven teacher response to misbehavior	Standards of conduct are established; Behavior is generally appropriate; Teacher response is consistent and respectful to students	Student behavior is entirely appropriate and they take an active role in monitoring their own behavior as well as others; Response to misbehavior is sensitive to individual needs and respect for dignity
--	--	--	--

C. INSTRUCTION			
1=Did Not Demonstrate	2=Partially Demonstrated	3=Demonstrated	4=Demonstrated with Distinction
<b>1. COMMUNICATING WITH STUDENTS</b>			
Purpose of lesson unclear; Directions/procedures confusing; Major content errors; Errors in grammar/syntax; Inappropriate academic language.	Limited understanding of purpose; Directions/procedures need clarification; Minor content errors; Limited or inappropriate vocabulary for age of students; Academic vocabulary not clarified.	Instructional purpose clear; Directions/procedures clear and may be modeled; Content scaffolded and represented in multiple ways; Strategies suggested invite intellectual engagement; Appropriate use of oral and written language; Precise academic language extends understanding.	Links instructional purpose to larger curriculum; Directions/procedures clear, possible confusion anticipated; Content thorough/clear; Students contribute by describing strategies to peers; Teacher language expressive and extends students' vocabularies.
<b>2. USING QUESTIONING AND DISCUSSION TECHNIQUES</b>			
Questions of low cognitive level; Single correct response; No expectation of reasoning; Few participate.	Single path of inquiry; Some higher level questions but few participate; Attempts to engage all in discussion; Uneven results.	Some low-level questions; Purposeful discussion among students; Justification of thinking; Engages most students.	Variety of questions to challenge and create high level thinking; Students create questions and topics and ensure that all are heard.
<b>3. ENGAGING STUDENTS IN LEARNING</b>			
Tasks/activities poorly aligned with instructional outcomes; Rote responses; Groupings unsuitable; Lesson has no structure; Poor pacing (too slow or rushed).	Tasks/activities partially aligned with instructional outcomes; Minimal student thinking required; Groupings moderately suitable; Lesson has recognizable structure; Pacing may be too slow or rushed; Teacher allows multiple options for engagement.	Tasks/activities fully aligned with instructional outcomes; Challenges student thinking with appropriate scaffolds/support; Groupings suitable to activities; Lesson has clearly defined structure; Pacing appropriate; Teacher articulates multiple options for engagement.	All students engaged in challenging content; Well designed and scaffolded tasks and activities encourage complex thinking; Clearly defined structure; Pacing appropriate and allows time for student reflection on learning.
<b>4. USING ASSESSMENT IN INSTRUCTION</b>			
Students unaware of assessment criteria; Little or no monitoring; Feedback absent or poor quality; No self/peer assessment.	Students partially aware of assessment criteria; Monitors class as a whole; Lack of questions to diagnose evidence of learning; Teacher allows multiple means for action/expression of learning; Few students assess own work.	Students aware of assessment criteria; Teacher monitors groups; Questions diagnose evidence of learning; Teacher feedback to groups is accurate and specific; Teacher articulates options for action/expression of learning; Some self-assessment.	Assessment fully integrated into instruction; Students aware of criteria; Questions diagnose individual learning; Variety of accurate/specific feedback; Students self-assess to monitor progress; Differentiated instruction.
<b>5. SUPPORTING EMERGENT BILINGUALS</b>			
No opportunity for ELs/EBs to use academic language or demonstrate understanding; ELs/EBs seem off-task, confused or aren't active participants; No attempt to draw on home language, culture or prior knowledge.	Few opportunities for ELs/EBs to use academic language or demonstrate understanding orally or in writing; Some EL/EB active participation; Little to no attempt to draw on home language, culture or prior knowledge.	Multiple opportunities for ELs/EBs to use academic language or demonstrate understanding orally or in writing; ELs/EBs are active participants in most tasks; Some attempt to draw on home language, culture or prior knowledge.	Multiple opportunities for ELs/EBs to use academic language or demonstrate understanding orally or in writing; ELs/EBs are active participants in all activities; Tasks draw on home language, culture or prior knowledge.

D. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES - REFLECTION			
1=Did Not Demonstrate	2=Partially Demonstrated	3=Demonstrated	4=Demonstrated with Distinction

### 1. REFLECTING ON TEACHING

Unsure if lesson was effective; Lesson's success misjudged; No suggestions for improvement.	Generally accurate impression of lesson's effectiveness; General suggestions for lesson improvement.	Accurate assessment of lesson's effectiveness; A few specific suggestions for lesson improvement.	Thoughtful/Accurate assessment of lesson's effectiveness citing specific examples; Specific suggestions for lesson improvement with rationale.
---	--	---	--

### 2. PROFESSIONALISM

Inappropriate/Distracting attire; Not present for entire lesson; Interactions with students or other adults overly confident or overly timid.	Potentially distracting attire; Present for entire lesson; Interactions with students or other adults occasionally too confident or too timid.	Appropriate attire; Present and engaged for entire lesson; Interactions with students and adults appropriately confident.	Appropriate attire; Present and engaged for entire lesson; Availability before and after lesson; Interactions with students and adults appropriately confident; Actively pursues constructive feedback.
---	--	---	---