ENL Impact on Student Learning-Culminating Project (TESOL) 2022

You may wish to change your printer settings to "landscape" mode if you have a rubric with many performance columns.

	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	MEET EXPECTATIONS	NEARING EXPECTATIONS	BELOW EXPECTATIONS
3A: CANDIDATES PLAN FOR CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY RELEVANT, SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENTS THAT PROMOTE ELL'S LEARNING. CANDIDATES DESIGN SCAFFOLDED INSTRUCTION OF LANGUAGE AND LITERACIES TO SUPPORT STANDARDS AND CURRICULAR OBJECTIVES FOR ELLS IN THE CONTENT AREAS	Includes All of Meets Expectations, plus: Candidates systematically design ESL instruction that is aligned with a content standards across the curriculum, student-centered and differentiated across individual student linguistic and academic needs.	Candidates implement standards-based programs and instructional models appropriate to individual student needs in a supportive environment. Instruction promotes literacies and language acquisition across the content areas.	Candidates design instruction that supports language and literacies, but may not directly connect to standards-based instruction in specific content areas.	Candidates do not plan for culturally, linguistically, and academically relevant instruction.
3B. CANDIDATES INSTRUCT ELLS USING EVIDENCE-BASED, STUDENT-	Includes ALL of Meets Expectations, plus: Candidates design ways to motivate	Instructional plans are based on best-practices as informed by research for ELL	Instructional plans are based on best-practices, but may not consistently be	Evidence-base for instructional plans is not clear or may not be appropriate for the setting.

	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	MEET EXPECTATIONS	NEARING EXPECTATIONS	BELOW EXPECTATIONS
CENTERED, DEVELOPMENTALLY APPROPRIATE, INTERACTIVE APPROACHES.	and guide students to successful academic experiences.	learning and language acquisition, set at an appropriate developmental level for students, and provide opportunities for students to actively engage in the learning process.	student-centered or fully interactive.	Instruction is often teacher-centered.
3C. CANDIDATES ADJUST INSTRUCTIONAL DECISIONS AFTER CRITICAL REFLECTION ON INDIVIDUAL ELLS LEARNING OUTCOMES IN BOTH LANGUAGE AND CONTENT.	Includes All of Meets Expectations, at a level of consistency and with intentionality across the entire culminating project. Reflections in the project are insightful and decisions made as a result of the data are directly connected to theories of student learning and language acquisition.	Candidates continually monitor students' progress toward learning objectives (linguistic and content) with formal and informal assessments. Following reflection on the data from formal and informal assessments, candidates reteach, using alternate materials, techniques, and assessments for students who need additional time and	Candidates plan lessons and design formative assessments to ascertain where re-teaching may be necessary, but may not be consistent or effective with their re-teaching or re-assessment strategies. Assessment data may only consider language acquisition or content learning, but not consistently both.	Candidates do not monitor student progress during learning and/or do not reflect on or revise instruction based on formative assessment data.

	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	MEET EXPECTATIONS	NEARING EXPECTATIONS	BELOW EXPECTATIONS
		approaches to master learning objectives.		
3D. CANDIDATES PLAN STRATEGIES TO COLLABORATE WITH OTHER EDUCATORS, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, AND FAMILIES IN ORDER TO SUPPORT THEIR ELLS' LEARNING OF LANGUAGE AND LITERACIES IN THE CONTENT AREAS.	Includes All of Meets Expectations, plus: Candidates take a leadership role in these collaborations, planning meetings, developing communication protocols and ensuring outreach to families in linguistic formats that are accessible.	Candidates collaborate with general and specialist school staff and families to establish an instructional program appropriate for ELLs at a variety of English proficiency levels and to support language and literacies.	Candidates collaborate with a limited number of other professionals in the schools for instructional planning, but may be missing the involvement of key stakeholders. The result may be more similar to consultation, rather than collaboration.	Candidates typically approach instruction and instructional planning independently without consultation or collaboration with others.
3E. CANDIDATES USE AND ADAPT RELEVANT MATERIALS AND RESOURCES, INCLUDING DIGITAL RESOURCES, TO PLAN LESSONS FOR ELLS, SUPPORT	Includes All of Meets Expectations, plus: Candidates design visually supportive, text-rich environments using appropriate materials that include students'	Candidates are proficient at appropriately adapting materials and resources from a variety of sources for communication and instruction. Materials as	Candidates adapt some materials for instruction, but may select from limited pools for resource type or origin. Adaptations may not consistently be rendered to	Candidates do not adapt materials or consistently adapt in ways that are not supportive to learning and language acquisition.

	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	MEET EXPECTATIONS	NEARING EXPECTATIONS	BELOW EXPECTATIONS
COMMUNICATION WITH OTHER EDUCATORS, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, AND ELLS TO FOSTER STUDENT LEARNING OF LANGUAGE AND LITERACIES IN THE CONTENT AREAS.	personal and shared experiences, language, and culture.	adapted effectively support language acquisition and content learning.	support student language acquisition or content learning.	
4A. CANDIDATES APPLY KNOWLEDGE OF VALIDITY, RELIABILITY, AND ASSESSMENT PURPOSES TO ANALYZE AND INTERPRET STUDENT DATA FROM MULTIPLE SOURCES, INCLUDING NORM-REFERENCED AND CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS. CANDIDATES MAKE INFORMED INSTRUCTIONAL DECISIONS THAT	Includes All of Meets Expectations, plus Within the bounds of FERPA, candidates share and interpret assessment data with other education professionals, students, and families to help them understand student learning and instructional goals.	Candidates can evaluate and explain why assessments are valid and reliable and use this knowledge in making assessment-related decisions Candidates are able to understand and interpret student data from norm- and criterion-referenced assessments, and use that knowledge to plan instruction	Candidates demonstrate knowledge of various purposes of assessment and types of assessment, but may not consistently use data from norm- and criterion-referenced assessments for planning and instruction.	Candidates are not able to accurately interpret, or do not use data from norm- and criterion-referenced assessments during instructional planning.

	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	MEET EXPECTATIONS	NEARING EXPECTATIONS	BELOW EXPECTATIONS
SUPPORT LANGUAGE LEARNING.		and set learning goals.		
4B. CANDIDATES DEMONSTRATE UNDERSTANDING OF CLASSROOM-BASED FORMATIVE, SUMMATIVE, AND DIAGNOSTIC ASSESSMENTS SCAFFOLDED FOR BOTH ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND CONTENT ASSESSMENT. CANDIDATES DETERMINES LANGUAGE AND CONTENT LEARNING GOALS BASED ON ASSESSMENT DATA.	Includes All of Meets Expectations, plus: Assessment from a variety of sources is embedded throughout instruction and evidence of instructional revision (incremental and long-range) as a result of on-going data collection and progress monitoring is provided.	Candidates use multiple and appropriate formative and summative assessments to establish and evaluate language and content goals. A backward planning model and student progress monitoring are evident in instructional design.	Candidates apply both formative and summative assessment during instruction, but may not consistently adjust teaching as suggested by the data, or monitor student progress to a useful degree.	Candidates limit their assessment practices and/or do not appear to use data to establish, monitor, or evaluate instructional practice.
4C. CANDIDATES DEMONSTRATE KNOWLEDGE OF STATE-APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVE	Includes All of Meets Expectations, plus: Candidates evaluate formal and informal	Candidates articulate obstacles ELLs commonly face with standardized assessment and	Candidates can articulate state-approved administrative considerations for standardized	Candidates do not demonstrate knowledge of assessment accommodations

	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	MEET EXPECTATIONS	NEARING EXPECTATIONS	BELOW EXPECTATIONS
CONSIDERATIONS, ACCESSIBILITY FEATURES, AND ACCOMMODATIONS APPROPRIATE TO ELLS FOR STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENTS.	assessment measures for psychological, cultural, and linguistic limitations and create strategies to help ELLs in such situations.	have strategies to help them in such situations. They know state-allowed test accommodations and accessibility features for ELLs and apply them when appropriate.	assessments, but may not effectively employ them with consistency in assessment settings.	and accessibility features for ELLs.
4D. CANDIDATES DEMONSTRATE UNDERSTANDING OF HOW ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT RESULTS ARE USED FOR IDENTIFICATION, PLACEMENT, AND RECLASSIFICATION.	Includes All of Meets Expectations, plus: Candidates collaborate with other educators and families, sharing knowledge of specific student performance for the purposes of identification, placement, reclassification, and exiting of ELLs.	Candidates make informed recommendations to CST regarding placement and reclassification of students in ESOL programs based on national and state requirements.	Candidates can articulate national and state requirements (e.g., L1 surveys of benchmarks) for identifying, reclassifying, and exiting ELLs from language support programs.	Candidates are unable to articulate national and state requirements for identifying, reclassifying, and exiting ELLs.