Purpose: To provide a comprehensive assessment (both formative and summative) of the teaching practice of teacher candidates.

Administration: This instrument is administered by mentor teachers and/or University Supervisors, once formative and once summative, during each field experience placement.

Success Indicator: Items rated at the "Meets Standard" level represent successful teaching practice by the teacher candidate. Anything below "Meets Standard" can be seen as an area in need of improvement.

TEACHER INTERN ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT (TIAI)

Teacher Intern _____   Semester/Year: _____

Check one: 1ˢᵗ Placement: _____   2ⁿᵈ Placement: _____   Grade Level/Subject: _____

Evaluator: _____   Check one: Classroom Mentor Teacher ___   University Supervisor ___

School: _____   Date(s) Evaluation Completed: _____

Note: Classroom Mentor Teachers may take up to two weeks to complete the Formative and Summative Teacher Intern Assessments for assigned teacher interns. University Supervisors will schedule classroom evaluation visits with teacher interns twice each placement. Additional visits will be made if needed. The TIAI has been aligned to InTASC Standards, CAEP Standards, & Mississippi Educator Performance Growth System/Teacher Growth Rubric (TGR).

DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION

*Items 1-6 should be assessed from written lesson and unit plans, classroom observations, and from other artifacts (pretests, inventories, surveys, etc.)

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.2	7	1	**1. The teacher candidate develops measurable and observable grade and subject level objectives that are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.**	The teacher candidate's objectives are not measurable, observable, or aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	The teacher candidate's objectives are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks, but they are not measurable or observable.	The teacher candidate's objectives are measurable, observable, and aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	**In addition to meets standard**, the teacher candidate's objectives are stated at different instructional levels based on individual needs of students (DOK Levels and/or Bloom's Taxonomy).
SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS								
Formative Assessment Score:				Summative Assessment Score:			
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:				Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:			

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	2	2	**2. The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.***	The teacher candidate does not develop meaningful nor authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.	The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences, but accommodations are not made to meet individual needs of each learner in the group.	The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.	**In addition to meets standard,** the teacher candidate provides evidence of research-based strategies that accommodate developemental and individual needs of each learner in the group.

*Examples include developing learning experiences (remediation, enrichment, accommodations) planned for students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin.

SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS

Formative Assessment Score:	Summative Assessment Score:
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:	Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	7	4	**3. The teacher candidate integrates core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.**	The teacher candidate's nstructional plans never integrate core content knowledge across and within subject areas.	The teacher candidate's instructional plans integrate irrelevant core content knowledge across and within subject areas (does not make connections).	The teacher candidate's instructional plans integrate core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.	**In addition to meets standard,** the teacher candidate's instructional plans **include** connections of content across disciplines.*

*To Exceed Standard, the instructional plans include integrating content connections across disciplines throughout the internship experience.

SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS

Formative Assessment Score:	Summative Assessment Score:
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:	Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.5	8	2	**4. The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development.***	The teacher candidate does not plan appropriate or sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Different teaching strategies are not utilized.	The teacher candidate's plans lack logical sequence and different teaching strategies.	The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development.	**In addition to meets standard,** The teacher candidate multiple lesson plans cited research-based evidence.
*Examples include but are limited to the following: cooperative learning, discovery learning, demonstration, discussion, inquiry, simulation, etc.							
SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS							
Formative Assessment Score:				Summative Assessment Score:			
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:				Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:			

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.3	6	3	**5. The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.***	The teacher candidate's plans do not indicate use of assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.	The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of assessments but not all are appropriate.	The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.	**In addition to meets standard,** the teacher candidate's assessments are performance-based to enhance critical thinking and problem solving.
*Examples include assessments aligned with standards and objectives such as pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, and/or checklists.							
SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS							
Formative Assessment Score:				Summative Assessment Score:			
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:				Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:			

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.5	7	6	**6. The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.***	The teacher candidate's plans do not include technology that will engage students.	The teacher candidate's plans lack logical use of technology.	The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.	**In addition to meets standard,** the teacher candidate's **multiple lesson plans** utilize technology to enhance learning opportunities.

*Examples of technology include the implementation of digital leaning programs using Ipads, Chromebooks, powerpoints, Smart Boards, Promethean Boards, cell phones, etc.

SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS

Formative Assessment Score:	Summative Assessment Score:
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:	Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:

DOMAIN II: ASSESSMENT

*Items 7 – 8 should reflect the teacher intern's ability to effectively communicate assessment information to the students, provide feedback, and incorporate informal and formal assessments. Items should be assessed from written lesson and unit plans, classroom observations, and from other artifacts (pretests, inventories, surveys, etc.)

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.2	6	3	**7. The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance.**	The teacher candidate does not communicate assessment criteria or performance standards to the students or provide feedback to students about academic performance.	The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students. Fails to provide students with feedback.	The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about their academic performance.	Student input is sought in developing assessment criteria. The teacher candidate provides clear and actionable feedback that helps the student understand what s/he did well and provides guidance for improvement.*

*To meet the **Exceeds Standard**, intern must complete both stated requirements.

SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS

Formative Assessment Score:	Summative Assessment Score:
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:	Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.2	6	3	**8. The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.***	The teacher candidate does not use formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.	The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments but fails to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in learning and development of each learner in the group,	The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.	**In addition to meets standard,** the teacher candidate conferences with individual students to assist with monitoring progress.

*Examples of assessments include pretests, quizzes, unit tests, checklists, rating scales, rubrics, and remediation and enrichment activities.

SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS

Formative Assessment Score: | Summative Assessment Score:

Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence: | Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:

DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION

*Items 9 – 19 should reflect the teacher intern's overall ability to effectively communicate with students and implement innovative lessons using a variety of teaching strategies that meet the needs of all students. Items should be assessed from written lesson and unit plans and classroom observations.

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	5	4	**9. The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction.**	The teacher candidate does not use standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction.	The teacher candidate's standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication is difficult to follow for students.	The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction to engage students.	**In addition to meets standard,** the teacher candidate enriches conversation with expressive language and vocabulary to engage students.

SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS

Formative Assessment Score: | Summative Assessment Score:

Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence: | Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	5	4	**10. The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.**	The teacher candidate does not provide explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	The teacher candidate provides written and oral directions for instructional activities that are not explicit.	The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	**In addition to meets standard,** the teacher candidate uses concrete examples to model and to clarify tasks and concepts.
SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS							
Formative Assessment Score:				Summative Assessment Score:			
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:				Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:			

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	2	2	**11. The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students.**	The teacher candidate does not communicate positive expectations for learning for all students.	The teacher candidate has difficulty communicating positive expectations for learning for all students.	The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students.	**In addition to meets standard,** the teacher candidate encourages all students to set positive expectations for themselves and peers.
SCORES COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS							
Formative Assessment Score:				Summative Assessment Score:			
Formative Assessment Comments:				Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:			

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	3	7	**12. The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.**	The teacher candidate does not convey enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	The teacher candidate has difficulty conveying enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	**In addition to meets standard,** the teacher candidate elicits enthusiasm from students.
SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS							
Formative Assessment Score:				Summative Assessment Score:			
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:				Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:			

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	3	5	13. The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	The teacher candidate does not provide opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other but does not enhance learning.	The teacher candidate provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate enhances the development of student leadership and provides opportunities for students to work cooperatively on projects/activities of their choice.

SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS

Formative Assessment Score: | Summative Assessment Score:

Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence | Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.3	4	4	14. The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.	The teacher candidate does not demonstrate content knowledge and how to teach the content.	The teacher candidate has difficulty demonstrating content and content pedagogical knowledge.	The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.	In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate uses a variety of instructional methods to ensure an understanding of the content.

SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS

Formative Assessment Score: | Summative Assessment Score:

Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence: | Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.3	8	4	15. The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.*	The teacher candidate does not use a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning.	The teacher candidate has difficulty using a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.	The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.	In addition to meets standard, the teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate student-centered teaching strategies to impact student learning and development.

*Examples include use of teaching strategies such as cooperative learning, discovery learning, demonstration, discussion, inquiry, simulation, etc.

SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS

Formative Assessment Score: | Summative Assessment Score:

Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence: | Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.4	1	2	**16. The teacher candidate planned learning experiences are implemented that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.***	The teacher candidate does not implement planned learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.	The teacher candidate implements learning experiences, but fails to accommodate the differences in developmental needs of each learner in the group.	The teacher candidate implements planned learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.	**In addition to meets standard**, the teacher candidate cites research to support the planned learning experiences.

*Examples include students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin).

SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS

Formative Assessment Score:	Summative Assessment Score:
Formative Assessment Comments:/Evidence:	Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.4	5	4	**17. The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.***	The teacher candidate does not engage all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.	The teacher candidate relies on lower level questioning.	The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.	**In addition to meets standard**, the teacher candidate provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem-solving and critical thinking.

*Guiding questions need to be listed in lesson plans.

SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS

Formative Assessment Score:	Summative Assessment Score:
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:	Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.4	8	4	**18. The teacher candidate adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.**	The teacher candidate does not adjust instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	The teacher candidate elicits student input during instruction and attempts are made to adjust instruction based on student responses.	The teacher candidate elicits student input and adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/ group responses.	**In addition to meets standard**, the teacher candidate constructs appropriate prompts to encourage student responses that expand and justify their reasoning. Revises instruction based on student responses.
				SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS			
			Formative Assessment Score:		Summative Assessment Score:		
			Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:		Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:		

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	10	9	**19. The teacher candidate uses family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.***	The teacher candidate does not use family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.	The teacher candidate attempts to use family and/or community resources to impact instruction but meaningful connections are not made.	The teacher candidate uses family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.	**In addition to meets standard,** the teacher candidate designs and organizes instruction to foster ongoing communication and high expectations for learners.
			*Examples include special guests, materials, extracurricular activities, etc				
			SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS				
			Formative Assessment Score:		Summative Assessment Score:		
			Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:		Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:		

DOMAIN IV: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

*Items 20 - 24 should reflect the teacher intern's ability to manage the classroom environment in a way that is conducive to learning. Items should be assessed from classroom observations.

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	3	5	**20. The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.**	The teacher candidate does not adjust the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	The teacher candidate has difficulty adjusting the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment and delivers instruction to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	**In addition to meets standard**, the teacher candidate encourages students to develop self-monitoring skills.
SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS							
Formative Assessment Score:				Summative Assessment Score:			
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:				Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:			

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	3	6	**21. The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks.**	The teacher candidate does not attend to and delegate routine tasks.	The teacher candidate attempts to attend to and delegate routine tasks but there is no consistency or established routine.	The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks.	**In addition to meets standards,** the teacher candidate has a systematic routine for attending to and delegating tasks.
SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS							
Formative Assessment Score:				Summative Assessment Score:			
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:				Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:			

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	3	5	**22. The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.**	The teacher candidate does not manage student behavior.	The teacher candidate has difficulty applying appropriate strategies in managing student behavior.	The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	**In addition to meeting the standard,** the P-12 students self-monitor their behavior.
SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS							
Formative Assessment Score:				Summative Assessment Score:			
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:				Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:			

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	3	7	**23. The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.**	The teacher candidate does not create a culturally inclusive environment.	The teacher candidate has difficulty maintaining a culturally inclusive environment.	The teacher candidate creates and maintains a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.	**In addition to meets standard,** the teacher candidate cultural inclusivity is evident in student interactions.
SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS							
Formative Assessment Score:				Summative Assessment Score:			
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:				Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:			

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	7	6	**24. The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time.**	The teacher candidate does not maximize instructional time.	The teacher candidate has difficulty maximizing instructional time.	The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time.	**In addition to meets standard**, the teacher candidate's transitions, routines, and procedures are executed in an efficient manner with minimal teacher direction.
SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS							
Formative Assessment Score:				Summative Assessment Score:			
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:				Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:			

DOMAIN V: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

*Item 25 should reflect the teacher intern's ability to collaborate with professional colleagues to involve parents and/or guardians in the student's learning and development. Items should be assessed from written lesson and unit plans, classroom observations, and from other artifacts (inventories, surveys, and other documentation).

CAEP	InTASC	TGR	Indicators	Unacceptable 0	Needs Improvement 1	Meets Standard 2	Exceeds Standard 3
1.1	10	9	**25. The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues (classroom mentor teacher and/or university supervisor) to communicate with families about student learning and development.**	The teacher candidate does not collaborate with professional colleagues to communicate with families about student learning and development.	The teacher candidate has difficulty collaborating with professional colleagues to communicate with families about student learning and development.	The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues to communicate with families about student learning and development.	**In addition to meets standard**, the teacher candidate engages in ongoing professional learning opportunities with professional colleagues, and seeks advice/information from experienced educators.
*Examples include documented evidence such as PLCs, data meetings, newsletters, positive notes, extracurricular activities, professional development opportunities, conferences, etc.							
SCORES AND COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS							
Formative Assessment Score:				Summative Assessment Score:			
Formative Assessment Comments/Evidence:				Summative Assessment Comments/Evidence:			