



<b>0:</b> No evidence of culturally responsive or age-appropriate activities. No differentiation or scaffolding provided.	<b>1:</b> Significantly below standard. Limited cultural responsiveness, age-appropriateness, or linguistic accessibility. Minimal scaffolding or differentiation.	<b>2:</b> Progressing toward standard. Activities are somewhat culturally responsive and age-appropriate, with some scaffolding and differentiation.	<b>3:</b> Meets standard. Activities are culturally responsive, age-appropriate, and linguistically accessible. Scaffolding and differentiation are effectively utilized.	<b>4:</b> Exceeds standard. Activities are highly culturally responsive, age-appropriate, and linguistically accessible. Provides exceptional scaffolding and differentiation, fostering authentic language use.
Evidence:				
<b>II. Instruction</b>				
<b>CONTENT:</b> How did the candidate demonstrate knowledge in the content area? Were the materials used appropriately for the content area and the students, including ELLs? Was the candidate able to bring in multiple resources/perspectives?				
<b>0:</b> No evidence of content knowledge. Materials are inappropriate or not used effectively. Little to no use of multiple resources.	<b>1:</b> Significantly below standard. Limited demonstration of content knowledge. Materials are somewhat inappropriate or inadequately used.	<b>2:</b> Progressing toward standard. Demonstrates basic content knowledge. Materials are appropriate with some use of multiple resources.	<b>3:</b> Meets standard. Shows strong content knowledge. Materials are appropriate and well-utilized, with effective use of multiple resources.	<b>4:</b> Exceeds standard. Demonstrates exceptional content knowledge. Materials are highly appropriate and enhance learning, with extensive use of multiple resources and perspectives.
Evidence:				
<b>ACTIVITIES:</b> Was the effectiveness of learning activities monitored? Was the pace and/or content of instruction modified as needed to achieve lesson objectives? Were the activities student-centered? Did students, including ELLs, interact with each other? Was available technology used to enhance learning?				
<b>0:</b> No evidence of monitoring or modifying activities. Activities are not student-centered and technology is not used.	<b>1:</b> Significantly below standard. Limited monitoring of activities. Some activities are not student-centered, with minimal interaction and technology use.	<b>2:</b> Progressing toward standard. Some monitoring and modification of activities. Activities are somewhat student-centered, with occasional use of technology and interaction.	<b>3:</b> Meets standard. Effectively monitors and modifies activities. Student-centered activities with good interaction and appropriate use of technology.	<b>4:</b> Exceeds standard. Continuously monitors and skillfully modifies activities. Highly student-centered with rich interaction and innovative use of technology.
Evidence:				
<b>LANGUAGE:</b> How were academic language demands (vocabulary, syntax, discourse) addressed during the lesson? Were targeted supports used appropriately for ELLs, including differentiation for ELP levels? Did the candidate serve as a good language model for students?				
<b>0:</b> No evidence of addressing language demands. Supports for ELLs are absent, and language modeling is ineffective.	<b>1:</b> Significantly below standard. Minimal addressing of language demands. Limited supports for ELLs and inadequate language modeling.	<b>2:</b> Progressing toward standard. Basic addressing of language demands with some targeted supports for ELLs and adequate language modeling.	<b>3:</b> Meets standard. Effectively addresses academic language demands with appropriate supports for ELLs. Serves as a good language model.	<b>4:</b> Exceeds standard. Skillfully addresses academic language demands with exceptional supports for ELLs. Exemplifies excellent language modeling.
Evidence:				

**ENGAGEMENT:** How did the candidate initially engage the learners in the lesson? How did the candidate engage all learners at higher-level thinking? Were all students, including ELLs, able to fully participate and focus on tasks to be accomplished?

<b>0:</b> No evidence of engaging learners. Little to no focus on higher-level thinking or participation.	<b>1:</b> Significantly below standard. Limited engagement with students. Minimal focus on higher-level thinking or participation.	<b>2:</b> Progressing toward standard. Some initial engagement and higher-level thinking. Most students, including ELLs, participate and focus.	<b>3:</b> Meets standard. Effectively engages learners and promotes higher-level thinking. Most students, including ELLs, fully participate and stay focused.	<b>4:</b> Exceeds standard. Exceptionally engages all learners and fosters high-level thinking. All students, including ELLs, are fully engaged, participating, and focused.
---	--	---	---	--

Evidence:

**LEARNING ENVIRONMENT:** Was a classroom climate of equity maintained? Were routines clearly established and followed, in ways that were appropriate for ELLs? Did the candidate take appropriate action if misbehavior occurred?

<b>0:</b> No evidence of maintaining equity or established routines. Misbehavior is not addressed.	<b>1:</b> Significantly below standard. Equity is not well-maintained, routines are unclear or inconsistent, and misbehavior management is ineffective.	<b>2:</b> Progressing toward standard. Basic maintenance of equity and established routines with some action taken for misbehavior.	<b>3:</b> Meets standard. Maintains a fair classroom climate with clear routines and appropriate action for misbehavior.	<b>4:</b> Exceeds standard. Exemplifies a strong climate of equity with well-established routines and proactive, effective management of misbehavior.
--	---	---	--	---

Evidence:

**III. Assessment**

**OBJECTIVES:** Were the assessments aligned with the objectives and standards? Were the assessments accessible and appropriate for all students, including ELLs? Did the candidate have clear evidence that the objectives were met?

<b>0:</b> No evidence of aligned or appropriate assessments. No clear evidence of objective attainment.	<b>1:</b> Significantly below standard. Assessments are poorly aligned and inappropriate for some students. Limited evidence of meeting objectives.	<b>2:</b> Progressing toward standard. Basic alignment of assessments with objectives. Some accessibility and appropriateness for students with clear evidence of meeting objectives.	<b>3:</b> Meets standard. Assessments are well-aligned with objectives and standards, accessible, and appropriate. Clear evidence of objectives being met.	<b>4:</b> Exceeds standard. Assessments are excellently aligned with objectives and standards, highly accessible, and appropriately differentiated. Provides comprehensive evidence of objectives being met.
---	---	---	--	--

Evidence:

**SELF-ASSESSMENT:** Did the candidate guide students toward meaningful self-assessment? Were all learners, including ELLs, able to assess their progress based on learning objectives?

<b>0:</b> No evidence of guiding students in self-assessment.	<b>1:</b> Significantly below standard. Minimal guidance for self-	<b>2:</b> Progressing toward standard. Some guidance	<b>3:</b> Meets standard. Provides effective guidance for	<b>4:</b> Exceeds standard. Skillfully guides students in
---	--	--	---	---

Students, including ELLs, are not able to assess their progress.	assessment with limited ability for students to assess their progress.	provided for self-assessment. Most students, including ELLs, are able to assess their progress.	meaningful self-assessment. All students, including ELLs, can assess their progress based on objectives.	meaningful self-assessment. All learners, including ELLs, are able to comprehensively assess their progress and understand their learning objectives.
Evidence:				
FEEDBACK: Did learners receive specific feedback that indicated what they did well and where they need progress? Was the feedback applicable to future assignments? Was the feedback appropriate and helpful for ELLs?				
<b>0:</b> No evidence of providing feedback. Feedback is not given or is unclear and unhelpful.	<b>1:</b> Significantly below standard. Feedback is minimal or not specific. Feedback is not useful for future assignments.	<b>2:</b> Progressing toward standard. Provides basic feedback on performance. Feedback is somewhat helpful and applicable to future assignments.	<b>3:</b> Meets standard. Gives specific, clear feedback indicating strengths & areas for improvement. Feedback is applicable for future assignments and appropriate for emergent bilingual learners.	<b>4:</b> Exceeds standard. Delivers detailed, constructive feedback that clearly indicates strengths & areas for improvement. Feedback is highly applicable & useful for future assignments, & tailored to the needs of ELLs.
Evidence:				

**General Comments:**