|  |
| --- |
| **Candidate Assessment of Performance Form and Rubric** |
| **Section 1: General Information** (to be completed by the Candidate) |
| Candidate Information |
| First Name: | Paris | Last Name: | Booth |
| Street Address: | 10 Buick Street  |
| City/Town: | Boston | State: | MA | Zip: | 02215 |
| MEPID #: | 54516329 |
| Massachusetts license number(if applicable): | n/a |
| Program Information |
| Sponsoring Organization: | Boston University |
| Program Area & Grade Level: | Elementary Education (4th year/Senior) |
| Have any components of the approved program been waived? 603 CMR 7.03(1)(b) |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| **X** |

 |
| Yes |  No |
| Practicum Information |

|  |
| --- |
| **X** |

 | Practicum |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 | Practicum Equivalent  |
| Practicum/Equivalent Course Number: | CH555 | Credit hours: | 10 |
| Practicum/Equivalent Seminar Course Title: | Full Practicum / Student Teaching |
| Practicum/Equivalent Site: | Mason Rice Elementary School | Grade Level(s) of Students: | 5 |
| Total Number of Practicum Hours: | 300 | Number of hours assumed full responsibility in the role: | 60 |
| Supervising Practitioner Information *(to be completed by the Program Supervisor)* |
| Name:  |  |
| School District: |  | Position: |  |
| License Field(s): |  | MEPID or License # |  |
| # of years experience under license: |  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 | Initial |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 | Professional  |
| To the best of my knowledge (per the Supervising Practitioner’s Principal/Evaluator), the Supervising Practitioner has received a summative evaluation rating of proficient or higher in his most recent evaluation.  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 | Yes |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 | No  |

|  |
| --- |
| **I.A.4: Well-Structured Lessons**  |
| I-A-4.Well-Structured Lessons | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| Develops lessons with inappropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, resources, and/or grouping for the intended outcome or for the students in the class. | Develops lessons with only some elements of appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, resources, and grouping. | Develops well-structured lessons with challenging, measurable objectives and appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, resources, technologies, and grouping. | Develops well-structured and highly engaging lessons with challenging, measurable objectives and appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, resources, technologies, and grouping to attend to every student’s needs. Is able to model this element. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Formative Assessment** |
| Quality |  |  | \***X** |  |
| Scope |  | \***X** |  |  |
| Consistency |  |  | **X** |  |
| EvidenceParis taught a science lesson on building circuits, in which she expanded on students’ prior knowledge. The learning objectives were clearly stated to the students at the beginning of the lesson; she had a student volunteer to read them out loud, after which she restated what they were and how they would achieve the lesson goals. Paris’s lesson was well sequenced, and provided a gradual release of responsibility for how to set up the circuits. She accomplished this gradual release of responsibility two different ways: once with a visual image that accompanied verbal set-up directions, and again by modeling how to put the wires through the Fahnestock clips on the battery holders and bulb holders, both on the ELMO projector and in front of the students while walking through the rows. While her lessons have great momentum and keep students engaged while giving them time to process the material, she continues to work on effective time management. Paris is focusing on limiting the time students spend “in” a lesson to allow for more student-material interaction time, and finishing the whole lesson within the time parameters of the subject period block. She checks over student work to measure their learning and provides feedback where appropriate to give them extra “building blocks” that lead them to comprehension. Paris uses a variety of techniques such as turn and talks, think for 30 seconds then share with a partner, whisper-yell, choral read, volunteer read, and pulling number tiles to actively engage all students in each lesson. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Summative Assessment** |
| Quality |  |  | **\*X** |  |
| Scope |  | \* | **X** |  |
| Consistency |  | \* | **X** |  |
| EvidenceParis’s lessons are consistently well structured, with a beginning, middle, and end. She always begins lessons by introducing the topic of content and calling on volunteers to read the lesson’s goals and objectives. Typically, she does this by calling on two different students and asks for “one lady and one gentleman” to read the bullet-pointed objectives. Paris includes multiple opportunities for student interaction with material during her lessons, including “turn and talk” and having the students make predictions. In a social studies lesson on the Middle Colonies taught on April 1st, 2016, Paris gives the students opportunities at many different points to think about the information and talk through their ideas with the student sitting next to them. Getting the students to talk through their ideas with a partner not only encourages different points of view, but also allows for more participation from students within the lesson. Paris has good pacing in her lessons, and keeps things moving at a quick-but-thorough pace. Paris knows that the pace and momentum are important to the structure and participation of a lesson, and she does not take too much time reviewing previously known material. Paris will often have extra review questions in case there is need for review to clear up any misconceptions, but she does not always use them in order to keep the pace of the lesson. In a math lesson on Area of Irregular Rectangles on April 14th, 2016, Paris skipped through some of the review section of her lesson once it was evident that the students had a firm grasp on previously learned content. Having the extra scaffolding ensures that Paris’s lessons are thorough and well structured. Paris utilizes different involvement strategies, materials, and resources when teaching lessons to keep students engaged in the learning process. |

|  |
| --- |
| **I.B.2: Adjustment to Practice** |
| I-B-2.Adjustment to Practice | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| Makes few adjustments to practice based on formal and informal assessments. | May organize and analyze some assessment results but only occasionally adjusts practice or modifies future instruction based on the findings. | Organizes and analyzes results from a variety of assessments to determine progress toward intended outcomes and uses these findings to adjust practice and identify and/or implement appropriate differentiated interventions and enhancements for students.  | Organizes and analyzes results from a comprehensive system of assessments to determine progress toward intended outcomes and frequently uses these findings to adjust practice and identify and/or implement appropriate differentiated interventions and enhancements for individuals and groups of students and appropriate modifications of lessons and units. Is able to model this element. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Formative Assessment** |
| Quality |  | **X** | \* |  |
| Scope |  | \***X** |  |  |
| Consistency |  | \***X** |  |  |
| EvidenceParis adjusts her practice as needed when the students show they need additional time or support with a concept. Similarly, if students understand the concept and Paris feels too many practice problems will slow the pace and cause students to lose momentum, she will skip over them and on to the next concept. In Paris’s Character Education lesson on responsibility, she realized that she needed to eliminate some of her plan so that there would be enough time for the students to write. She adjusted the lesson without losing critical content knowledge to ensure they would have time to work on the activity. On the Student Feedback Survey, most students answered “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to the questions “Ms. Booth uses our mistakes as a chance for us all to learn” and “Ms. Booth shows us how to respect different opinions in class.” In her science lesson on building circuits, she encouraged students to share the claims/evidence they gathered from their individual work with circuits from the day before. When students disagreed about the claims and evidence that one student shared, Paris introduced the idea that “good scientists test theories multiple times.” Paris also adjusted her practice by pausing the lesson and having a mini-discussion about “scientific variables,” and how there are certain things that may cause different results in one student’s experiment compared to another student’s. While the student’s claim/evidence was not wrong, Paris used the student’s different answer as a science learning opportunity. Paris is still working on letting go of a “script” and adjusting a lesson in the moment based on what students need, and not becoming frazzled when a student gives an answer that was not anticipated. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Summative Assessment** |
| Quality |  |  | **\*X** |  |
| Scope |  | \* | **X** |  |
| Consistency |  | \* | **X** |  |
| EvidenceParis has greatly improved her adjustment to practice, and feels confident adjusting lessons both before and during the teaching process. Paris often adjusts her lessons based on in-the-moment feedback from the students. In a math lesson on Area of Irregular Rectangles taught on April 14th, 2016, one student was confused about how to fill in the missing lengths to find the perimeter of irregular rectangles. After explaining the concept and doing two examples with the students in a gradual release of responsibility, the student raised his hand and still didn’t “get it.” Paris then redid part of the problem herself, modeling the steps while thinking out loud, and stopping after every step to check in with the student. When it seemed like the student was understanding the concept, she invited him to finish the rest of the problem while she continued thinking out loud, again, checking in with the student after every step to check for understanding. Paris also adjusts her practice based on the statements that the students make during a lesson. Often she finds that the students have questions that are on-topic, but do not completely match the objective of the lesson. For example, in a social studies lesson on the New England Colonies taught on April 4th, 2016, one student asked, “Was Long Island settled as well, or was it just an unsettled island?” While New York was not a New England colony – it was a Middle colony – Paris addressed the question and answered it, only after asking the student to remind the class which colonial region the New York colony belonged to to clarify any confusion about why this question was being asked/answered during the New England colonies lesson. Additionally, Paris adjusts her practice well when technology fails and she must figure out a different way to deliver content in a different format than she originally had planned for. On Monday, April 11th, 2016, the school had a power-outage before she was set to teach a social studies lesson on Slavery and The Middle Passage that integrated technology and used both the internet and interactive projector. Paris adjusted her practice calmly, and decided to teach the lesson “old-school,” by simply talking her way through the lesson and providing plenty of time for student-to-student interaction and individual student interaction with the materials. While it seemed as though there was a lot of “teacher talk,” it was clear that Paris was highly knowledgeable of the content and could continue teaching the lesson without the aid of the Power Point presentation. When placed in a situation that could have potentially been very stressful if she was not as prepared as she was, Paris proved that she could calmly and easily adjust her practice to meet the needs of the students and the availability of classroom resources.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **II.A.3: Meeting Diverse Needs** |
| II-A-3.Meeting Diverse Needs | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| Uses limited and/or inappropriate practices to accommodate differences. | May use some appropriate practices to accommodate differences, but fails to address an adequate range of differences. | Uses appropriate practices, including tiered instruction and scaffolds, to accommodate differences in learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness, including those of students with disabilities and English learners. | Uses a varied repertoire of practices to create structured opportunities for each student to meet or exceed state standards/local curriculum and behavioral expectations. Is able to model this element. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Formative Assessment** |
| Quality |  | **X** | \* |  |
| Scope |  | \***X** |  |  |
| Consistency |  | \***X** |  |  |
| EvidenceMeeting Diverse Needs is Paris’s CAP goal for her student teaching practicum. She utilizes the three other teachers in the classroom (2 co-teachers and 1 aide) as a resource when differentiating instruction. This often happens by having students who need additional hands-on support sit within close proximity to one of the other teachers. She provides a “To-Do” at the end of each lesson that lists each step of what students need to do during their individual work time. The visual reminder accommodates students in executive functioning. During a math lesson on strategies for adding fractions and mixed numbers, she had an anchor chart defining and explaining how to use fraction complements. The anchor chart remained at the front of the class as the students worked individually to serve as a reference for students who needed extra support on the new concept. Paris always circulates through the room as the students work independently. In relation to her CAP goal, Paris is working on differentiating instruction for the “high flyers” and providing more challenging extension activities for the students who are working above grade level. She typically uses a Universal Design for Learners approach when teaching lessons and providing handouts, but feels she could differentiate classwork materials even more for students who need additional support or accommodations/modifications. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Summative Assessment** |
| Quality |  |  | **\*X** |  |
| Scope |  | \* | **X** |  |
| Consistency |  | \* | **X** |  |
| EvidenceParis continued to work on her CAP goal of Meeting Diverse Needs and has proved that she is proficient in quality, scope, and consistency. Paris utilizes many different strategies to meet the diverse needs of the students in her practicum classroom, including thinking out loud, providing reference sheets, accommodating handouts for UDL, providing extension activities and challenge activities for early finishers, creating anchor charts for continual reference, and posting both “to-do” directions and “clean up” directions on the board where all students can see them. The most common way that Paris meets diverse needs of students in the classroom is through the re-working and re-designing of (or originally designing) handouts. She often finds that there is not adequate whitespace in a handout for the students to show their work or get their thoughts down before answering a questions, so she will re-do the handout so there is ample work space. She will also hand-write in “thought bubbles” with reminders of important information and do one example on a handout so the students are clear exactly what it is they should be doing and what it should look like. Paris accommodates these handouts for almost every single lesson she teaches. Paris also accommodates those working above grade level by providing them with challenge activities. Often the challenges are very difficult, but not so difficult that students avoid them. Paris usually lets the students work together on the challenge to encourage teamwork and collaboration within the classroom. Paris’s lessons always end with a “to-do” list, so that students who need a visual reminder of what to do next have exactly what they need. During her second week of full responsibility in the classroom, Paris discovered that posting a “clean up” list significantly shortens the amount of time it takes for students to transition out of one subject and into the next. She only states the clean up directions one time, but students can reference the list at any point. With explicit and specific directions written on the front board, the students know exactly what to do and are not wondering which step of clean up they forgot to do. The visual aids of “to-do” and “clean up” lists meet the diverse needs of all students in the classroom. |

|  |
| --- |
| **II.B.1: Safe Learning Environment** |
| II-B-1.Safe Learning Environment | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| Maintains a physical environment that is unsafe or does not support student learning. Uses inappropriate or ineffective rituals, routines, and/or responses to reinforce positive behavior or respond to behaviors that interfere with students’ learning. | May create and maintain a safe physical environment but inconsistently maintains rituals, routines, and responses needed to prevent and/or stop behaviors that interfere with all students’ learning. | Uses rituals, routines, and appropriate responses that create and maintain a safe physical and intellectual environment where students take academic risks and most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented. | Uses rituals, routines, and proactive responses that create and maintain a safe physical and intellectual environment where students take academic risks and play an active role—individually and collectively—in preventing behaviors that interfere with learning. Is able to model this element. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Formative Assessment** |
| Quality |  |  | \***X** |  |
| Scope |  | \* | **X** |  |
| Consistency |  | \* | **X** |  |
| EvidenceParis provides a Safe Learning Environment for her students by always reviewing expectations before starting a lesson. In her Character Education Lesson on Responsibility, she incorporated Safe Learning Environment into the Morning Work for the day by asking students what they think “responsible” behavior would be when students are sitting at the rug. The answers were collected and then posted along the white board sill, eye-level with the students. At the start of the lesson Paris reviewed responsible rug behavior and reminded students that since they clearly know what responsible rug behavior looks like, it is expected they follow though with their actions. Paris uses the class attention grabber “5LA Students…” and counts down from 5 in order to regroup student attention with a ritual they are familiar with. Paris posts a to-do list at the end of each lesson to provide a visual accommodation of what is expected of the students. She calls on a variety of students, and when a student who doesn’t typically raise their hand does so, she is sure to call on that student to share, promoting their academic risk-taking. She gives feedback to students in her persuasive writing group by highlighting the student’s strengths and phrasing the feedback as a collaborative suggestion. For example, she wrote in one student’s essay planner, “This is a great appeal to emotion! Involving parents’ feelings make your argument more convincing. What would you think about including a quote from your own family, so we can see a real life example of how homework has affected your family life?” Paris is working on ensuring that all students follow the instructions and expectations of behavior to manage behaviors that interfere with student learning. In the Student Feedback Surveys, 9 students agreed with the statement “My classmates behave the way Ms. Booth wants them to.” 15 students disagreed. Paris always reminds students of expected behaviors, but she is working on reinforcing the behaviors before they become disruptive.  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Summative Assessment** |
| Quality |  |  | **\*X** |  |
| Scope |  | \* | **X** |  |
| Consistency |  | \* | **X** |  |
| EvidenceParis continues to be proficient in providing a safe learning environment for the students in her classroom by encouraging the students to take risks during her lessons. During her lessons she often will call on volunteers with raised hands, but when the same students keep their hands raised to answer every question, she states, “If I’ve already called on you, please put your hand down. Let’s see some new hands!” She will also pull number tiles that indicate the student’s number, and always gives them the choice on whether or not they want to answer. The majority of the time the student takes the risk and answers the question, but sometimes they “phone a friend” or pass the question on to someone else. If they do this, Paris encourages them to take the risk and offers to walk them through the steps as they do the problem. If they still say no, she obliges, but makes sure to check in with the student after the lesson to see if they still need additional help. Additionally, if a student is being disruptive in the classroom, Paris is quick to respond to the student’s behavior and remind them that their actions impact the learning of their classmates. She continues to use classroom norms and directives from the Responsive Classroom model to direct the students. She says “Good Morning” to each student as they enter the door in the morning and “Good Bye” to each student as they leave the class at the end of the school day. She values building relationships with her students and has built strong relationships with all. Students frequently come up to Paris with questions and problems, and they seem to enjoy her presence in the classroom because of the safe learning environment she has set up for them. |

|  |
| --- |
| **II.D.2: High Expectations** |
| II-D-2.High Expectations | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| Gives up on some students or communicates that some cannot master challenging material. | May tell students that the subject or assignment is challenging and that they need to work hard but does little to counteract student misconceptions about innate ability. | Effectively models and reinforces ways that students can master challenging material through effective effort, rather than having to depend on innate ability. | Effectively models and reinforces ways that students can consistently master challenging material through effective effort. Successfully challenges students’ misconceptions about innate ability. Is able to model this element. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Formative Assessment** |
| Quality |  | **X** | \* |  |
| Scope |  | \* **X** |  |  |
| Consistency |  | \* **X** |  |  |
| EvidenceParis sets high expectations for her lessons and the students. She encourages all students to participate. In every lesson taught so far, Paris has used a variety of techniques to encourage active participation, including turn and talks, having students think for 30 seconds to themselves before turning to share with a partner, pulling number tiles, and asking the students who have already been called on to put their hands down, eliciting participation from those who were not engaging with the material. Paris uses wonderful questioning and asks great follow-up questions. For example, during her Character Education lesson, Paris asked students to think deeper about the material. She presented them with responsibility scenarios and asked them if the student was showing responsibility in the scenario, but then she went further and asked them to think about and explain what the student should have done in order to change their actions and make them more responsible. Paris took the lesson beyond “what is responsibility” and encouraged students to think of how to reverse irresponsible behavior, and how to make sure they could hold themselves accountable for their responsible behaviors. In the Student Feedback Surveys, 10 students disagreed with the statement, “Ms. Booth asks me to improve my work when she knows I can do better.” The other 14 students agreed with the statement. Paris provides written feedback to students who are in her persuasive writing small group; verbal feedback to her guided reading group small group, and a mixture of written/verbal when checking and grading science journals, classwork, and homework for all students. Paris is working on using things that interest individual students as a bridge to help them understand content they do not learn. In response to the question “Ms. Booth uses things that interest me to explain hard ideas” on the Student Feedback Survey, 9 students agrees while 15 students disagreed. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Summative Assessment** |
| Quality |  |  | **\*X** |  |
| Scope |  | \* | **X** |  |
| Consistency |  | \* | **X** |  |
| EvidenceParis holds students to high expectations by reviewing expectations of students before and even during lessons. In a social studies lesson she taught on April 4th, 2016, she had to stop the lesson several times through in order to remind students of the expectations for what proper behavior looks like when sitting on the rug. She invited students to model what exemplary rug behavior looks like, and asked many different students to repeat the expectation. When there is a student facing away from the board, she uses the phrase “shoulders facing forward” to have them turn their bodies to face the front. She will occasionally simply say a student’s name mid-sentence and then continue with the sentence to quickly get their attention and get them to self-evaluate their behaviors. She will often start student’s independent work time as an “ultimate zero,” which means that for five minutes, the students are working in complete silence with no teacher help. After 5 minutes of ultimate zero, students can evaluate if they would like help. She sets the ultimate zero with the purpose of students getting started independently so they can see what they know and what they still need clarification on. She uses the ultimate zero to encourage the students to hold themselves to their own high expectations and try to complete the work without the aid of a teacher. Paris models how to do problems in her lessons and shows her work, demonstrating for the students exactly what she expects of them. In her handouts, she also usually provides an example that shows exactly what “showing your work” looks like. |

|  |
| --- |
| **IV.A.1: Reflective Practice** |
| IV-A-1.Reflective Practice | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| Demonstrates limited reflection on practice and/or use of insights gained to improve practice.  | May reflect on the effectiveness of lessons/ units and interactions with students but not with colleagues and/or rarely uses insights to improve practice. | Regularly reflects on the effectiveness of lessons, units, and interactions with students, both individually and with colleagues, and uses insights gained to improve practice and student learning. | Regularly reflects on the effectiveness of lessons, units, and interactions with students, both individually and with colleagues; and uses and shares with colleagues, insights gained to improve practice and student learning. Is able to model this element. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Formative Assessment** |
| Quality |  |  | \***X** |  |
| Scope |  | \* | **X** |  |
| Consistency |  | \* | **X** |  |
| EvidenceParis is very reflective of her practice. After teaching a lesson she assesses whether or not the students met the goal/objective of the lesson, and then goes though the lesson and thinks about what worked well and what should be changed for next time. In her math lesson on using the “tripling and thirding” strategy to multiply fractions and mixed numbers, she noted that she should have had students come up to the board more often and “show what they know.” During this lesson, a student shared an alternate way to solve the equation, which resulted in a correct answer but took many, many extra steps and was logically confusing. Paris reflected that she was glad the student shared the alternate way to solve the problem, but noted that the way she notated the student’s dictation was visually confusing for the other students. Paris made a point to add into the lesson a note to share this alternate strategy in the future, but to organize the problem clearly for students so they could follow along. When meeting with her supervisor after observed lessons, Paris suggests ways she could have improved the lesson plan itself or ways that she could have had a different response to a student or used a different technique to manage behavior or elicit active participation. Often her reflections contain statements such as, “I should have pulled number tiles for that question” or “I had them turn and talk but forgot to have them share out after. What was then the point of the turn and talk?” or “I didn’t phrase this definition is a way that way accessible to all students. I will have to change the wording of that in the slide presentation.” |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Summative Assessment** |
| Quality |  |  | **\*X** |  |
| Scope |  | \* | **X** |  |
| Consistency |  | \* | **X** |  |
| EvidenceParis is highly reflective of her practice. When meeting with her Supervising Practitioner after lessons, Paris always is aware of how to make her lessons better for the future, and is aware of the lesson’s strengths and weaknesses. In her 10-lesson integrated social studies unit on Colonial America, Paris was reflective of every lesson and how to make the next lesson more interactive and engaging for students based on the previous lesson. She had three “sets” of similar lessons – Lessons 3, 5, and 7 were all mini-informational lessons and expert research, and lessons 4, 6, and 8 were “town meetings” wherein the students discuss and present their information. Because of the nature of these repeated-structure lessons, Paris could greatly and dramatically improve the structure of the upcoming lesson plans based on the strengths and weaknesses of the current lesson. Paris realized that after Lesson 3 – New England Colonies Expert Research, she needed to make the lesson for 5 and 7 much more interactive and engaging with student participation. She re-worked the lesson plan, and Lesson 5 – Middle Colonies Expert Research was much more interactive and engaging. The difference in the two lessons was immediate and noticeable, and the students were more interested in the material. Paris’s changes to this lesson were a direct result of her reflective practice, and she knew exactly how to change the lesson to make it better.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Candidate Assessment of Performance Form and Rubric** |
| **Section 3: Summary and Signatures** |

|  |
| --- |
| Three-Way Meetings |
| 1st Three-Way Meeting**Date**:  | Candidate |  |
| Supervising Practitioner |  |
| Program Supervisor |  |
| 2nd Three-Way Meeting**Date**: March 9, 2016 | Candidate |  |
| Supervising Practitioner |  |
| Program Supervisor |  |
| Final Three-Way Meeting**Date**:  | Candidate |  |
| Supervising Practitioner |  |
| Program Supervisor |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary Ratings** |
| Element | Quality | Consistency | Scope | Readiness Thresholds Met? |
| 1.A.4: Well-Structured Lessons | P | P | P | Yes |
| 1.B.2: Adjustment to Practice | P | P | P | Yes |
| 2.A.3: Meeting Diverse Needs | P | P | P | Yes |
| 2.B.1: Safe Learning Environment | P | P | P | Yes |
| 2.D.2: High Expectations | P | P | P | Yes |
| 4.A.1: Reflective Practice | P | P | P | Yes |
|  |
| Based on the candidate’s performance as measured on the CAP Rubric, we have determined this candidate to be: | Ready to Teach |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 | Not Yet Ready |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 |
| Supervising Practitioner |  Date:  |
| Program Supervisor |  Date: |
| Mediator (if necessary see: 603 CMR 7.04(4)) |  Date: |