

Appendix

Appendix B	Classroom Appraisal and Report Evaluation (CARE)
Appendix C	Accreditation Letter
Appendix D	Alignment
Appendix E	Intent to Hire form
Appendix F	Impact on Student Learning
Appendix G	Administrator Survey
Appendix H	Candidate Exit Survey



Classroom Appraisal and Report Evaluation
2020 – 2021

Growth Plan

Candidate Name

SSN (last 4 digits)

Date

Observation

Overall Rating

Content Observed / Grade Level

Beginning Time

Lesson Plan

Course 5600
Completed

Type of Observation

Exemplary - 4 Proficient - 3 Basic - 2 Unsatisfactory - 1 N/A - Not Applicable

Standard 1: Learner Development	<input type="text"/>
• Designs developmentally appropriate instruction	
• Implements developmentally appropriate instruction	
Standard 2: Learning Differences	<input type="text"/>
• Adapts instruction for individual needs	
• Inquires about students as individuals with diverse backgrounds	
• Exhibits fairness in supporting all students to learn	
Standard 3: Learning Environments	<input type="text"/>
• Fosters a safe and respectful environment promoting learning	
• Organizes time and resources to actively engage students	
• Manages classroom activity and behavior effectively	
• Proactively intervenes to redirect student misbehaviors	
Standard 4: Content Knowledge	<input type="text"/>
• Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter	
• Creates meaningful learning experiences	
Standard 5: Applications of Content	<input type="text"/>
• Connects content knowledge to issues in students' lives	
• Engages students in higher level thinking skills	
Standard 6: Assessment	<input type="text"/>
• Integrates formal and informal assessments	
• Communicates timely and useful descriptive feedback	
• Aligns assessments with objectives and standards	
• Exhibits fairness in grading practices	
• Uses a variety of formative and summative assessments	
Standard 7: Planning for Instruction	<input type="text"/>
• Connects lesson goals with school, district and state standards	
• Uses assessment data to inform planning for instruction	
Standard 8: Instructional Strategies	<input type="text"/>
• Varies instructional strategies to engage learners	

• Uses technology appropriately to enhance instruction	
• Differentiates instruction to meet learners needs	
• Paces lessons to allow learners to integrate their new learning	
Standard 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice	<input type="text"/>
• Seeks and accepts feedback to improve teaching effectiveness	
• Uses self-reflection to improve teaching effectiveness	
• Demonstrates commitment to the profession	
Standard 10: Leadership and Collaboration	<input type="text"/>
• Works effectively with school personnel	
• Works effectively with parents	
Communication	<input type="text"/>
• Communicates effectively	
• Uses appropriate vocabulary for age of students	
Professional Dispositions	<input type="text"/>
Technology	<input type="text"/>
• Uses available technology to create personalized and authentic learning experiences for students	
• Uses technology to accommodate learner differences and modify instruction to meet learners' needs	
• Models digital literacy and ethical use of digital tools for students and peers	

Reinforcement / Refinement:

Field Supervisor Signature:

Field Supervisor Name:

Candidate Signature (or email):

Field Supervisor Email:



1140 19th Street, NW | Suite 400 Washington, DC 20036
tel: 202.223.0077 | fax: 202.296.6620
caepnet.org

November 8, 2019

Dr. Diann Huber President iteachU.S.
101 N. Elm Suite 100
Denton, TX 76201 Dear Dr. Huber:

The Accreditation Council of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) met on October 21, 2019, and I am pleased to inform you that the following accreditation status has been granted:

The at iteachU.S. is granted **Accreditation** at the initial-licensure level as described in the Accreditation Action Report.

Included with this letter are two subsequent documents:

- 1) The Accreditation Action Report provides details of the accreditation status.
- 2) Information for EPPs Granted Accreditation provides further information on the Council's decision process and provider responsibilities during the accreditation term.

Congratulations on your accreditation achievement. I appreciate your commitment to excellence in educator preparation accreditation.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Christopher A. Koch'. The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D. President

Enclosures: Accreditation Action Report, Certificate of Accreditation (sent to provider leadership), and Information on CAEP Accreditation

cc: Dr. Diann Huber
Dr. Timothy Miller, Texas Education Agency



Teacher Licensure Intent to Hire

Candidate Name: _____ GPA: _____

SSN: _____ xxx-xx-xxx Degree: _____

Verification of Eligibility for Hire: Upon admission to the iteachVIRGINIA alternative certification preparation program, a candidate in good standing seeking certification through the Virginia Department of Education approved alternative certification program will use this form to verify eligibility for internship.

1. Pass Praxis II subject area exam.
 - a. Evidence: Copy of passing scores for exam(s) in licensure area.

--	--

Certification Requirements:

1. Teach for one full semester successfully.
 - a. Evidence: Signature from Campus Administrator and iteachVIRGINIA Supervisor/Observer verifying “one successful semester of teaching”
2. Complete courses towards licensure.
 - a. Evidence: Completion of all instructional coursework.
3. Pass Praxis Principles of Learning exam.
 - a. Evidence: Copy of passing scores.

Following information to be completed by hiring school/district:

School Information

School:	Principal:
Address:	Phone:
City:	Email:
Zip:	

District Information

School District:	District Number:
Address:	City / ZIP:
H/R Contact:	H/R Email:
H/R Phone:	H/R Fax:

Verification of Field Experience

Beginning Date of Teaching Contract			Ending Date of Teaching Contract			Grade(s) Teaching		Subject Teaching
MM	DD	YY	MM	DD	YY	Lowest	Highest	
Name and Title of Superintendent or Authorized Representative					Date: MM/DD/YY		Telephone	Signature

5700 Reflection

Second Semester: Reflection 2 Impact on Student Learning

This reflection is based on the Impact on Student Learning activity that is introduced in course 5300. It is based upon the emerging movement of national pre-professional licensure assessments. iteach believes that successful performance on this reflection will be of great benefit to you as your progress in your career.

This will be the most extensive reflection you will submit this year. It will involve several parts and should be saved as a Word or word-processing document and uploaded to instructNET upon completion. Your work must score Proficient in all 16 categories noted on the rubric to pass this assignment. Submissions earning less than proficient in any category will be returned with supervisor feedback to implement in the subsequent submission(s). We look forward to reviewing your best work.

The reflection will include three sections:

Knowledge of Students

Lesson Plan

Analysis of Teaching Effectiveness

Section 1: Knowledge of Students

An in-depth knowledge of your students is critical to effective teaching. Reflect on your students by identifying students' pre-existing knowledge and other factors (e.g. special needs, giftedness, other modifications, student diversity) that will impact how your students learn. This section should include:

detailed demographics of your class (if you teach more than one class period choose only one class period for this Reflection)

subgroups (e.g. English language learners, gifted students, students with a common learning disability like dyslexia) of your students and their related learning needs,

personal, cultural and community strengths of your students and how you will utilize the strengths to meet the diverse needs of your students.

Use specific, factual evidence about students to support your written reflections and eliminate any assumptions or stereotyping.

Section 2: Lesson Plan

Select a lesson plan you have used for the group of students described in part one. The lesson should involve a formative and summative assessment that may be quantitatively measured.

Provide the lesson plan in full.

Whether you use the lesson plan template included in TEPC 5300 or a district lesson plan template, the plan must include:

State-adopted standards

Lesson objectives associated with the standard

Learning theory or theories that you will incorporate into the lesson and why

Instructional strategies and learning tasks

Instructional resources and materials, including technology

Assessment plan for the lesson (formative and summative)

You should also include a description of the academic language your students will need in order to succeed in this lesson. Academic language will include:

key vocabulary in your subject field that your students need to understand for the lesson

words that describe what you are asking them to do (e.g. What does it mean to “compare” and “contrast” two ideas? What does it mean to “solve for x”?)

words that describe an important structure or idea in your discipline (e.g. What is an “if-then” statement?)

Identify at least two examples of academic language that you will use in your lesson, and how you will assess student comprehension of this language, as part of the overall lesson.

In the event your district requires a prescribed lesson plan, it will be your responsibility to identify how you modified the lesson to address the needs of your students, including special populations accommodations and supplementary activities. You will also need to add any of the additional elements NOT included in the district template, e.g. add a section about supporting learning theories or add a section about academic language as needed.

Section 3: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness

Based on the knowledge of students described in section 1 and the implementation of the lesson plan in provided in section 2, provide a written

reflection of what was successful in your instruction and how students responded to your instructions. Provide specific examples of students' reactions and input. Did you respond immediately to this feedback by modifying your plan in class? If so, what did you modify and why? If not, what could you change (based on students' responses) when you deliver this lesson in the future?

Questions to be addressed in this reflection are as follows:

What varieties of assessment strategies or methods did you use?

How and why were these strategies selected?

How did your assessment(s) align with your learning objectives and instructional goals?

Did the summative assessment measure a variety of objectives?

Were the assessment tasks appropriate for students' abilities and developmental levels?

What criteria were applied to judge or evaluate student progress?

Now, review your students' performance on the summative assessment. Create a spreadsheet that shows (in a FERPA-compliant way) how your students performed. Now, select at least two student subgroups. This could be male v. female performance, gifted students v. the general class, or performance of ESL students and performance of students with learning disabilities. In your spreadsheet, show how the performance of each subgroup compares to the whole—e.g. Whole group average grade: 87.5 percent, ELL group average grade, 83.4 percent.

Now, add to your written reflection to answer these final two questions:

What might account for the differences in performance between student groups?

What could you do differently to ensure all students have equal opportunity to master the material?

Include your spreadsheet analyzing student performance with the reflection.

Considerations for Small Sample Sizes or Unique Teaching Placements

iteach believes that every teacher, regardless of content area, should be able to plan, implement, and assess instruction. Therefore, candidates whose teaching placements do NOT allow them to disaggregate student performance data due to a small sample size should note on their reflection that the sample size of the lesson was not large enough to allow for analysis. Instead, candidates should provide a discussion of the students' mastery of assessed material and name what additional supports or modifications were used or could be used to ensure that the student(s) master learning objectives for the lesson.

If you have any further questions about this reflection assignment, please contact your field supervisor.

Administrator Survey

Classroom Environment - To what extent did the educator preparation program prepare this beginning teacher to:

1. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to effectively implement discipline management procedures?
2. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to communicate clear expectations for achievement and behavior that promote and encourage self-discipline and self-directed learning?
3. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to provide support to achieve a positive, equitable, and engaging learning environment?
4. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to build and maintain positive rapport with students?
5. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to build and maintain positive rapport and two-way communication with students' families?

Instruction - To what extent did the educator preparation program prepare this beginning teacher to:

6. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to implement varied instruction that integrates critical thinking, inquiry, and problem solving?
7. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to respond to the needs of students by being flexible in instructional approach and differentiating instruction?
8. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use the results of formative assessment data to guide instruction?
9. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to engage and motivate students through learner-centered instruction?
10. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to assume various roles in the instructional process (e.g., instructor, facilitator, audience)?
11. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to set clear learning goals and align instruction with standards-based content?

Students with Disabilities - To what extent did the educator preparation program prepare this beginning teacher to:

18. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of students with disabilities?

19. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to differentiate instruction to meet the behavioral needs of students with disabilities?

20. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to provide appropriate ways for students with disabilities to demonstrate their learning?

21. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to understand and adhere to the federal and state laws that govern special education services?

22. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to make appropriate decisions (e.g., when and how to make accommodations and/or modifications to instruction, assessment, materials, delivery, and classroom procedures) to meet the learning needs of students who have an IEP?

23. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to develop and/or implement formal and informal assessments that track students' progress toward IEP goals and objectives?

24. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to collaborate with others, such as paraeducators and other teachers, in meeting the academic, developmental, and behavioral needs of students with disabilities?

Limited English Proficient Students - To what extent did the educator preparation program prepare this beginning teacher to:

26. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to provide appropriate ways for LEP-ELL students to demonstrate their learning?

27. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to understand and adhere to federal and state laws that govern education services for LEP-ELL students?

28. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to comply with district and campus policies and procedures regarding LEP-ELL students?

29. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to support LEP-ELL students in mastering the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), including the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS)?

30. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to model and teach the forms and functions of academic English in content areas?

Technology Integration - To what extent did the educator preparation program prepare this beginning teacher to:

31. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use technology available on the campus to integrate curriculum TEKS and Technology Applications TEKS to support student learning?

32. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to provide technology-based classroom learning opportunities that allow students to interact with real-time and/or online content?

33. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to teach students developmentally appropriate technology skills?

Use Technology with Data - To what extent did the educator preparation program prepare this beginning teacher to:

34. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use technology to make learning more active and engaging for students?

35. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use technology to collect, manage, and analyze student data using software programs (such as Excel or an electronic grade book)?

36. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use technology to collect, manage, and analyze multiple data sources in order to interpret learning results for students?

Criterion

37. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use technology to document student learning to determine when an intervention is necessary and appropriate?

38. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use available technology to collect and manage formative assessment data to guide instruction?

39. What is your overall evaluation of how well the educator preparation program prepared this teacher?

40. How would you rate this teacher's influence on student achievement?
(Scale of 1 – 10; 1 = unacceptable, 10 = exceptional)

iteachU.S Exit Survey Questions

1. Were you employed as a beginning teacher (teacher of record) during the current or previous academic year?

- Yes
- No

2. The area in which your current teaching assignment is located is best described as (choose one):

- rural
- suburban/urban fringe
- urban
- Other (please specify)

3. To what extent were you prepared to effectively implement the discipline-management procedures approved by the campus?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

4. To what extent were you prepared to communicate clear expectations for achievement and behavior that promote and encourage self-discipline and self-directed learning?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

5. To what extent were you prepared to provide support to achieve a positive, equitable, and engaging learning environment?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

6. To what extent were you prepared to build and maintain positive rapport with students?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

7. To what extent were you prepared to build and maintain positive rapport and two-way communication with students' families?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

8. To what extent were you prepared to implement varied instruction that integrates critical thinking, inquiry, and problem solving?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

9. To what extent were you prepared to respond to the needs of students by being flexible in instructional approach and differentiating instruction?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

10. To what extent were you prepared to use the results of formative assessment data to guide instruction?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

11.. To what extent were you prepared to engage and motivate students through learner-centered instruction?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

12. To what extent were you prepared to integrate effective modeling, questioning, and self-reflection (self-assessment) strategies into instruction?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

13. To what extent were you prepared to assume various roles in the instructional process (e.g. instructor, facilitator, audience)?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

14. To what extent were you prepared to set clear learning goals and align instruction with standards based content?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

15. To what extent were you trained to know and apply the content knowledge standards for your area of certification?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

16. To what extent were you prepared to apply pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) for the purpose of facilitating student learning?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

17. To what extent were you prepared to provide quality and timely feedback to students?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

18. Did you have students with disabilities in your classroom?

A child is considered a student with disabilities if he or she has a physical, cognitive, behavioral, or other related impairment.

- Yes
- No

19. To what extent were you prepared to differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of students with disabilities?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

20. To what extent were you prepared to differentiate instruction to meet the behavioral needs of students with disabilities?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

21. To what extent were you prepared to provide appropriate ways for students with disabilities to demonstrate their learning?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

22. To what extent were you prepared to understand and adhere to the federal and state laws that govern special education services?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

23. To what extent were you prepared to make appropriate decisions (e.g., when and how to make accommodations and/or modifications to instruction, assessment, materials, delivery, and classroom procedures) to meet the learning needs of students who have an Individualized Education Program (IEP)?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

24. To what extent were you prepared to develop and/or implement formal assessments and informal assessments that track students' progress toward IEP goals and objectives?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

25. To what extent were you prepared to collaborate with others, such as para-educators and other teachers, in meeting the academic, developmental, and behavioral needs of students with disabilities?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

26. Did you have limited English (LEP-ELL) students in your classroom? A student is considered LEP-ELL if he or she has a primary language other than English and whose English language skills are such that the student has difficulty performing ordinary coursework in English.

- Yes
- No

27. To what extent were you prepared to provide appropriate ways for LEP-ELL students to demonstrate their learning?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

28. To what extent were you prepared to understand and adhere to federal and state laws that govern education services for LEP-ELL students?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

29. To what extent were you prepared to comply with district and campus policies and procedures regarding LEP-ELL students?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

30. To what extent were you prepared to support LEP-ELL students in mastering curricular standards?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

31. To what extent were you prepared to model and teach the forms and functions of academic English in content areas?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

32. To what extent were you prepared to use technology available on the campus to integrate curriculum standards and technology applications standards to support student learning?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

33. To what extent were you prepared to provide technology based classroom learning opportunities that allow students to interact with real-time and/or online content?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

34. To what extent were you prepared to teach students developmentally appropriate technology skills?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

35. To what extent were you prepared to use technology to make learning more active and engaging for students?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

36. To what extent were you prepared to use available technology to collect, manage, and analyze student data using software programs (such as Excel or an electronic grade book)?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

37. To what extent were you prepared to use available technology to collect, manage, and analyze data from multiple sources in order to interpret learning results for students?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

38. To what extent were you prepared to use available technology to document student learning to determine when an intervention is necessary and appropriate?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

39. To what extent were you prepared to use available technology to collect and manage formative assessment data to guide instruction?

- Well prepared
- Sufficiently prepared
- Not sufficiently prepared
- Not at all prepared

40. To what extent did your Field Supervisor share with you the expectations for your performance in the classroom before each observation?

- Always/Almost Always.
- Frequently.
- Occasionally.
- Rarely.

41. To what extent did your Field Supervisor base observation feedback on the expectations for your performance in the classroom?

- Always/Almost Always.
- Frequently.
- Occasionally.
- Rarely.

42. To what extent did your Field Supervisor provide you with a written report or checklist of his/her observation of your performance in the classroom?

- Always/Almost Always.
- Frequently.
- Occasionally.
- Rarely.

43. To what extent did your Field Supervisor offer feedback on your performance in the classroom within one week of each observation?

- Always/Almost Always.
- Frequently.
- Occasionally.
- Rarely.

44. To what extent did your Field Supervisor include specific strategies that address your strengths and weaknesses in his/her feedback about your performance in the classroom?

- Always/Almost Always.
- Frequently.
- Occasionally.
- Rarely.

45. To what extent did your Field Supervisor hold an interactive conference with you after each observation?

- Always/Almost Always.
- Frequently.
- Occasionally.
- Rarely.

46. To what extent did your Field Supervisor help you solve problems, make specific recommendations for improvement or act as your advocate?

- Always/Almost Always.
- Frequently.
- Occasionally.
- Rarely.

47. Did you ever communicate with your Field Supervisor by email, text, or telephone call?

- Yes
- No

48. To what extent did your Field Supervisor respond to your communications, for example email, text, or telephone call, within two school/business days?

- Always/Almost Always.
- Frequently.
- Occasionally.
- Rarely.

49. To what extent did your Field Supervisor offer you opportunities to reflect on your performance in the classroom?

- Always/Almost Always.

- Frequently.
- Occasionally.
- Rarely.

50. To what extent did your Field Supervisor provide multiple means for you to communicate with him/her, such as email, telephone, texting, videoconferencing, or face-to-face interaction?

- Always/Almost Always.
- Frequently.
- Occasionally.
- Rarely.

51. To what extent did your Field supervisor ask you for ways he/she can support you?

- Always/Almost Always.
- Frequently.
- Occasionally.
- Rarely.

52. The Field Supervisor FORMALLY observed me teaching a minimum of three times.

- Yes
- No

53. The Field Supervisor observed me teaching for a minimum of 45 minutes during at least three of my FORMAL observations.

- Yes
- No

54. What is your overall evaluation of how well the educator preparation program prepared you? Select the one statement that most closely matches your current overall perspective on the program.

- I was well prepared by the program for the first year of teaching.
- I was sufficiently prepared by the program for the first year of teaching.
- I was not sufficiently prepared by the program for the first year of teaching.
- I was not at all prepared by the program for the first year of teaching.