|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories of Evaluations** | **Consistently Exceeds Standards** | **Exceeds Some Standards** | **Meets Standards** | **Inconsistently Meets Standards** | **Does Not Meet Standards** | **Rating** |
|  | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| **Writing**  **Competence:**  Candidate  demonstrates  professional  written  communication  skills | Candidate demonstrated professional writing skills with a rating of 4+ in 4-5 elements 1-5 below. | Candidate demonstrated professional writing skills with a rating of 4 in 3 of 5 elements 1-5 below. | Candidate demonstrated professional writing skills with a rating of 3 in all 5 elements 1-5 below. | Professional writing skills were not demonstrated given the rating of 1 or 2 in 2 elements 1-5 below. | Professional writing skills were not demonstrated given the rating of 1 or 2 in 3 or more elements 1-5 below. |  |
| **Form**  (CEC Adv St. 2, 3, 4, & 6; CEC/ASCI 3K1, 4K1, & 6S2; CEC/SEAIS 2, 3K5, 3S1, 3S2, 6K1, 6S3, & 6S4; CEC/SEA 6K4; IL CAS 6L; IL DIR 1A, 2A, & 2I; EIU 2, 3, & 4) | Candidate designs a curricular unit that incorporates evidenced-based planning, instructional, and assessment strategies that are in alignment with the needs of the learner(s) as described. Candidate consciously incorporates learners’ learning preferences, cultural values, and impact of the exceptionality into unit planning. Candidate includes adaptations within the unit based on information on learner needs. | Candidate designs a curricular unit that incorporates evidenced-based planning, instructional, and assessment strategies that are in alignment with the needs of the learner(s) as described. Candidate consciously incorporates learners’ learning preferences, cultural values, and impact of the exceptionality into unit planning. Candidate includes select adaptations within the unit, but it is not clear that the adaptations are grounded in learner needs. | Candidate designs a curricular unit that incorporates evidenced-based planning, instructional, and assessment strategies that are in alignment with the needs of the learner(s) as described. Candidate consciously incorporates learners’ learning preferences, cultural values, and impact of the exceptionality into unit planning. Candidate includes a menu of various adaptations within the unit, but it is not clear that the adaptations are grounded in learner needs. | Candidate designs a curricular unit that incorporates evidenced-based planning, instructional, and assessment strategies that are in alignment with the needs of the learner(s) as described. Candidate does not incorporate learners’ learning preferences, cultural values, and impact of the exceptionality into unit planning. Candidate may or may not include adaptations. | Candidate designs a curricular unit that does not incorporate evidenced-based planning, instructional, and assessment strategies that are in alignment with the needs of the learner(s) as described. Candidate does not incorporate learners’ learning preferences, cultural values, and impact of the exceptionality into unit planning. Candidate may or may not include adaptations. |  |
| **Organization**  (CEC Adv St. 1, 3, 4, & 6; CEC/ASCI 1S3, 3S3, 4K1, & 6S2; CEC/SEAIS 3K2 & 6K1; CEC/SEA 3K2; IL CAS 6F; IL DIR 1C,1E, & 2E; EIU 2, 3, & 4) | Candidate develops a curricular unit that extends beyond the mandatory components. The candidate’s system of organization the project components in a manner is easily used and also demonstrates strong potential for impact on P-12 learners with exceptional learning needs. The project reflects learner needs accurately and consistently. | Candidate develops a curricular unit extends beyond the mandatory components. The candidate systematically organizes the project components in a manner that is usable demonstrates the potential for impact on P-12 learners with exceptional learning needs. The project reflects learner needs accurately and consistently. | Candidate develops a curricular unit that incorporates the mandatory components. The candidate systematically organizes the project components in a manner that demonstrates the potential for impact on P-12 learners with exceptional learning needs. The project reflects learner needs accurately and consistently. | Candidate develops a curricular unit that incorporates the mandatory components, but the unit may not reflect the needs of the learner. In addition, the candidate did not organize the components in a manner that is usable and/or likely to demonstrate the potential for impact on P-12 learners with exceptional learning needs. | Candidate develops a curricular unit that is missing mandatory components. As a result, it is not evident that the needs of the learner are being addressed. |  |
| **Development**  (CEC Adv St. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 6; CEC/ASCI 1K2, 1K4,1S3, 2, 3K2, 3K6, 3S2, 3S3, 4S2, 4S3, 6S2, & 6S5; CEC/SEAIS 1S2, 2, 3K2, 3S1, 3S2, & 6S3; CEC/SEA 1K4, & 1S3; IL CAS 1A, 1E, 2E; IL DIR 1B, 1C, 1E, 1I, & 2G: EIU 2, 3, & 4) | Candidate develops a curricular unit that incorporates numerous (3 or more) general and specialized curricular areas.  Candidate’s selection of the curricular areas is strongly supported by the description of the setting and learner needs.  Generalization is comprehensively addressed.  Candidate demonstrates extensive variation in strategy selection with all strategies selected being supported by strong evidence/research. | Candidate develops a curricular unit that incorporates a minimum of two general and specialized curricular areas.  Candidate’s selection of the curricular areas is supported by the description of the setting and learner needs.    Generalization is addressed.  Candidate demonstrates some variation in strategy selection with all strategies selected being supported by strong evidence/research. | Candidate develops a curricular unit that addresses learners’ needs in a single general or specialized curricular area.  Candidate’s selection of the curricular area is supported by the description of the setting and learner needs.  Generalization is minimally addressed.  Candidate demonstrates little variation in strategy selection yet strategies selected are backed by strong evidence/research. | Candidate develops a curricular unit that addresses learners’ needs in a single general or specialized curricular area.  The candidate’s selection of the curricular area is somewhat supported by the description of learner needs.  Generalization is not addressed.  Variation in strategy selection is not evident, yet strategies chosen are supported by evidence/research. | Candidate develops a curricular unit that addresses learners’ needs in a single general or specialized curricular area.  The candidate’s selection of the curricular area is not supported by the description of learner needs.  Generalization is not addressed.  Strategies use lacks variety and research support. |  |
| **Style**  (CEC Adv St. 1 & 6; CEC/ASCI 1S4, 4K1, 4S2, & 6S4; CEC/SEAIS 1S3; IL CAS 3; EIU 2, 3, & 4) | Candidate writes using clear and precise language that can be understood by both professionals and families. Content terminology is accurate and when appropriate, explained within the project and illustrated with examples. |  | Candidate writes using language that may be understood by both professionals and families. Content terminology is accurate. Explanations of content terminology are defined within the project, but wordy. Illustrative examples are not provided. |  | Candidate writes using imprecise language resulting in a lack of clarity. Content terminology tends to be inaccurate and lacks explanation. |  |
| **Mechanics** | Candidate’s writing contains less than 3 minor errors in spelling and/or punctuation.  Writing style exceeds graduate level expectations. |  | Candidate’s writing contains a few minor errors and no major errors in writing style, spelling and/or punctuation. Writing style is commensurate with graduate level expectations. |  | Candidate’s writing contains numerous major or minor errors in spelling, punctuation, and/or writing style. Candidate is required to rewrite the unit. |  |
| **Professional Presentation: Candidate maintains the dignity of the learners by setting data-driven performance standards that are in alignment with the learners’ needs.**  (CEC Adv. St. 6; CEC/ASCI 6K2 & 6S1; CEC/SEAIS 6K1; IL CAS 8A; IL DIR 2Q; EIU 3) | Candidate maintains the dignity of the learner by setting performance standards that are commensurate to the learners’ ability level and aligned with grade level standards (NILS or DLM). Performance standards are based on learner(s) needs as described. Candidate uses non-labeling, person-first language throughout. Candidate presents a project that has strong potential to improve learner performance  within both general and specialized curricula or across multiple content areas. |  | Candidate maintains the dignity of the learner by setting performance standards that are commensurate to the learners’ ability level and aligned with grade level standards (NILS or DLM). Performance standards are based on learner(s) needs as described. Candidate uses non-labeling, person-first language throughout. Candidate presents a project that has the potential to improve learner performance within a curricular area. |  | Candidate does not maintain the dignity of the learner by setting performance standards that are commensurate to the learners’ ability level.  Candidate presents a project that has little to no relevance to the learner’s needs as described.  OR  Candidate uses labeling language. |  |
| **Candidate demonstrates skills in developing unit goals and objectives**  (CEC Adv St 2 & 3; CEC/ASCI 2, 3K1, 3K2, & 3S2; CEC/SEAIS 2, 3K2 & 3K5; CEC/SEA 2 & 6K4; IL.CAS 1A, 1B, 1E, 1F, 2B, & 2E; IL DIR 1A, 1C, 2I, 2V, 4N & 4O; EIU 1, 2 & 5) | Candidate develops unit goal(s) and objectives that integrate core academic subjects as defined by ESSA/State Plan. Goals that incorporate life skills, social/emotional development, and/or executive functioning skills are also included. Goals and objectives are age and developmentally appropriate for the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs and clearly aligned with state learning standards as well as the learners’ Individualized Education Program (IEP). Goal(s) and objectives are differentiated and individualized based on the learners’ learning preferences, modalities, output preferences, and interests. Objectives directly link to the goals.  Data collection/ assessment tools, as designed, justify the goals, objectives, and content of the unit. | Candidate develops unit goal(s) and objectives that integrate core academic subjects as defined by ESSA/State Plan. Goals and objectives are age and developmentally appropriate for the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs and aligned with state learning standards as well as the learners’ needs/Individualized Education Program (IEP) as described. Objectives directly link to goals and are individualized based on the learners’ learning preferences, modalities, output preferences, and interests. Differentiation is inconsistently evident.  Data collection/ assessment tools support the goals, objectives, and content of the unit. | Candidate develops unit goal(s) and objectives that address a core academic subject as defined by ESSA/State Plan. Goals and objectives are age and developmentally appropriate for the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs and aligned with state learning standards as well as the learners’ needs/Individualized Education Program (IEP) as described. Objectives are directly linked to goals.  Data collection/ assessment tools, as designed, support the goals, objectives, and content of the unit. | Candidate develops unit goal(s) and objectives that address a core academic subject as defined by ESSA/State Plan. Goals and objectives lack age/ developmental appropriateness for the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs or Goal(s)/Objectives are not appropriately aligned with state learning standards and the learners’ needs/Individualized Education Program (IEP) as described. Objectives and goals are loosely linked.  OR  Data collection/ assessment tools, as designed, lack the potential to support the goals, objectives, or content of the unit. | Candidate develops unit goal(s) and objectives that do not focus on a core academic subject as defined by ESSA/State Plan. Goals and objectives are not age and developmentally appropriate for the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs. Objectives inconsistently link to the goals. Objectives are not individualized based on the learners’ learning preferences, modalities, output preferences, and interests. Alignment to state learning standards nor the learners’ Individualized Education Program (IEP) is evident.  Data collection/pre-assessment tools are missing |  |
| **Candidate demonstrates skills in developing lesson plans**  (CEC Adv St 2, 3 & 4; CEC/ASCI 2, 3K1, 3K6, 3S1,3S3, 4K1, & 4S3; CEC/SEAIS 2, 3K2, 3K3, 3K5, 3S1, 3S2, 3S5 & 4K1;; CEC/ SEA 2 & 3K2;IL. CAS 2B, 2D, 2E, & 2F; IL DIR 2A, 2E, & 2N; EIU 1, 2, 4 & 5) | Candidate develops lesson plans that are developmentally appropriate, culturally sensitive, and tailored to the learning styles, modalities, output preferences and interests of the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs. As appropriate, content, strategies and learner products are incorporated into the plan and differentiated in a manner that supports the needs of all learner(s). Lesson plans directly relate to the unit goals/objectives and are logically sequenced as well as engaging. Evidenced-based strategies were incorporated into each lesson plan.  Generalization plan was detailed and feasible. | Candidate develops lesson plans that are developmentally appropriate, culturally sensitive, and tailored to the learning style of the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs. As appropriate, content, strategies, and learner products are incorporated into the plan and differentiated in a manner that supports the needs of all learner(s). Lesson plans directly relate to the unit goals/objectives and are logically sequenced. Evidenced-based strategies were incorporated into each lesson plan.  Generalization was addressed. | Candidate develops lesson plans that are developmentally appropriate, culturally sensitive, and tailored to the learning style of the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs. Content, strategies, and learner product differentiation is present but may lack appropriateness to the needs of all learner(s). Lesson plans directly relate to the unit goals/objectives and are logically sequenced. At least one evidenced-based strategy was incorporated into each lesson plan. | Candidate develops lesson plans that are developmentally appropriate, culturally sensitive, and tailored to the learning style of the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs. Content, strategies, and learner product differentiation is not evident. Lesson plans indirectly relate to the unit goals/objectives. Some evidence-based strategies are incorporated across the unit. | Candidate develops lesson plans that are not developmentally appropriate, culturally sensitive, and tailored to the learning style of the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs. Content, strategies, and learner product differentiation is not evident. Lesson plans indirectly relate or have no relation to the unit goals/objectives. Evidenced-based strategies were incorporated. |  |
| **Candidate demonstrates skills in developing unit activities**  (CEC Adv St 2, 3, & 4; CEC/ASCI, 2, 3K2, 3K6, 3S3, 4K1, 4S2, & 4S3; CEC/SEAIS 2, 3K3, 3S1, 3S2, 3S3, & 4K1; CEC/SEA 2 & 3K2; IL. CAS 4A, 4C 4I, 6F & 6L; IL DIR 2J, 2K, 2M, 2N, 2P, 2R, 4L, & 4M; EIU 1, 2, 4 & 5) | In each lesson, the candidate develops and implements a wide variety of activities targeting academic content as well as other skill development (e.g. social/emotional, life skills, executive functioning) that possesses the potential to engage the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs in meaningful learning of the academic/non-academic content targeted in the unit. Activities are adapted based upon the learning styles, output mode preferences and instructional needs of the learner(s). Activities are creative in design and implementation. Technology is incorporated throughout the unit. | In each lesson plan, the candidate develops and implements a wide variety of activities that possesses the potential to engage the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs in meaningful learning of the academic content targeted in the unit. Activities are adapted based upon the learning styles, output mode preferences and instructional needs of the learner(s). Most activities are creative in design. Some technology is used. | In each lesson, the candidate develops a variety of activities that possesses the potential to engage the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs in meaningful learning of the academic content targeted in the unit. Activities are tailored to the primary learning styles and are developmentally appropriate to the needs of the learner(s). Activities demonstrate minimal creativity in design | Candidate develops activities that minimally possess the potential to engage the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs in meaningful learning of the content targeted in the unit. Although developmentally appropriate, activities lack creativity in design and implementation. Most activities are paper-pencil tasks. | Candidate fails to develop and implement a variety of activities that engage the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs in meaningful learning of the academic content targeted in the unit. Activities lack developmental appropriateness and creativity in design and implementation. Most activities are paper-pencil tasks. |  |
| **Candidate demonstrates skills in designing assessments and data collection tools.**  (CEC Adv St 1; CEC/ASCI 1K2, 1K4, 1S1, & 1S2; CEC/SEAIS 1K4, & 1S4; CEC/SEA 1S3; IL CAS 3H; IL DIR 2G & 2L; EIU 1, 2, & 4) | Candidate designs clear and feasible assessment tools and an efficient record keeping system for systematically tracking the current performance levels and progress of the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs on the unit goals/objectives.  A variety of pre and post assessment strategies are delineated within the unit to determine the level of performance on goals/objectives, with both formative and summative measures being utilized throughout.  Assessment strategies are creative.  Technology is employed to gather, manage, or display data. | Candidate designs clear and feasible assessment tools and a record keeping system for systematically tracking the current performance levels and progress of the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs on the unit goals/objectives.  A variety of pre and post assessment strategies are delineated within the unit to determine the level of performance on goals/objectives, with both formative and summative measures being utilized throughout.  Assessment strategies are creative. | Candidate designs assessment tools and a record keeping system for systematically tracking the current performance levels and progress of the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs on the unit goals/objectives.  Pre and post assessment strategies are delineated within the unit to determine the level of performance on goals/objectives, with both formative and summative measures being utilized throughout.  Assessment strategies generally lack creativity. | Candidate designs a record keeping system for measuring current performance levels and progress of the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs on unit goals/objectives.  Pre and post assessments are not clearly delineated within the unit.  Assessment strategies to determine level of performance on unit goals/objectives lack variety and creativity or alignment with unit. | Candidate designs a record keeping system for measuring current performance levels and progress of the learner(s) with exceptional learning needs. Record keeping system lacks alignment with unit goals/objectives.  Pre and post assessments are not clearly delineated within the unit.  Assessment strategies to determine level of performance on unit goals/objectives are described but lack variety, alignment, and/or creativity. |  |
| **Candidate**  **demonstrates skills in using research and**  **resources.**  (CEC Adv St 2,4,5; CEC/ASCI 4K1,4S1, 4S2, 4S3; CEC/SEAIS 4K1, 4K2, 4S2, 5K4, 5S3; CEC/SEBIS 4K1, 4K2, 4S1, 4S2, 5S4; CEC/ SEA 2K1; IL BIS d1D, f1B; IL CAS F1A, F1B, F1C, F2G; IL DIR b1D, b1E, b1J, b2D; EIU 1,4 | Candidate relies on a wide variety of high quality research and resources in unit development. Resources and research are cited on reference page as well as in text. Multiple evidence-based practices are included in each lesson and described with sufficient detail to ensure fidelity of implementation. | Candidate relies on a wide variety of high quality research and resources in unit development.  Resources and research are cited on reference page as well as in text. Evidence-based practices are included in each lesson. | Candidate utilizes a variety of high quality research and resources in unit development. Resources and research are cited on reference page as well as in text. Evidence-based practices are incorporated across the unit. | Candidate utilizes research to develop unit but does not reference the specific practices strategies (in text or on a reference page). The use of evidence-based practices is minimal across the unit. | Candidate does not use research to develop unit.  AND/OR  Candidate does not incorporate evidence- based practices within the unit. |  |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | |