



Advanced Internship Assessment (AIA)

EDRS 699 Reading Specialist Internship

DIRECTIONS: Please rate the candidate’s overall performance on the ILA 2017 standards during the internship. Select the most appropriate performance level. In order to complete the internship successfully, candidates must have met every standard at a “Level 2: Met Acceptable” rating or higher. Provide a comment below for any rating at a “Level 1: Not Met.” Candidates who receive any “Level 1: Not Met” ratings will receive remediation before being able to complete the internship.

ILA STANDARD	Performance Levels		
	Level 1: NOT MET DEVELOPING	Level 2: MET ACCEPTABLE	Level 3: MET TARGET
1. Foundational Knowledge CAEP A1.1b MCEE 2 ISTE 1	Candidates have gaps in their knowledge of major theoretical, conceptual, historical, and evidence-based foundations of reading, writing, and language.	Candidates demonstrate knowledge of major theoretical, conceptual, historical, and evidence-based foundations of reading, writing, and language. AND Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the relationship between reading, writing, and language. AND Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the role of the reading/literacy specialist in schools.	LEVEL 2 PLUS Candidates critique major theoretical, conceptual, historical, and evidence-based components of reading, writing, and language. OR Candidates share their knowledge of the theoretical, conceptual, historical, and evidence-based foundations of reading, writing, and language with colleagues, administrators, or families.
	SUGGESTED LOOK FORs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are unfamiliar with current 	SUGGESTED LOOK FORs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates show their foundational 	SUGGESTED LOOK FORs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates present a professional

	<p>research in reading, writing, and language.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are unfamiliar with evidence-based practices in reading, writing, and language. 	<p>knowledge as they discuss literacy issues in the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates use foundational knowledge about literacy as they work with case study participants. • Candidates’ actions and attitudes show they understand how to function as reading specialists in day-to-day practice at the internship site. 	<p>development workshop on a literacy topic. The presentation is grounded in research and theory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates share new research findings that support or contradict established beliefs about literacy. • Candidates use foundational knowledge of literacy as they interact with colleagues in the PD follow-up meetings.
<p>2. Curriculum and Instruction</p> <p>CAEP A1.1b Diversity</p>	<p>Candidates do not use foundational knowledge to design literacy curricula.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidates use foundational knowledge to design literacy curricula BUT the curricula does not meet the needs of all learners.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidates design, implement, and evaluate literacy instruction only for the whole class.</p>	<p>Candidates use foundational knowledge to design literacy curricula to meet the needs of all learners, especially those who experience difficulty with literacy.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Candidates design, implement, and evaluate whole class, small-group, and individual evidence-based literacy instruction for all learners.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Candidates collaborate with teachers to implement effective literacy practices.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 PLUS</p> <p>Candidates ensure the planned literacy instruction is consistent with school-wide literacy goals.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Candidates support teachers in implementing evidence-based instruction and reflecting on classroom instructional practice to maximize student learning.</p>
	<p>SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates’ planned instruction for case study participants is not based on foundational knowledge of literacy. • Candidates lack an understanding of how to plan instruction for small groups or individuals. • Candidates lack an understanding of evidence-based supplemental and intervention programs. • Candidates lack an understanding of how to scaffold instruction to meet the needs 	<p>SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates use evidence-based strategies to plan literacy instruction for case study participants. • Candidates effectively use informational and narrative texts in instruction. • Candidates are skilled in providing effective literacy instruction for the whole class, small groups, and individuals. • Candidates understand how to integrate literacy into other subject areas. 	<p>SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates use a variety of evidence-based strategies to plan literacy instruction for case study participants. • Candidates understand horizontal and vertical alignment of literacy instruction within and across the grades. • Candidates plan instruction for case study participants, which is explicit, intense, and provides adequate scaffolding. • Candidates support one teacher in implementing a new literacy strategy in

	<p>of individuals or groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates lack an understanding of how to co-plan, model, and co-teach with colleagues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates select, teach, and evaluate supplemental and intervention programs. • Candidates co-plan, model, and co-teach with colleagues to provide effective instruction. • Candidates work with teachers to solve problems related to literacy instruction. 	<p>the classroom.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates observe literacy instruction in classrooms and provide supportive feedback to teachers. • Candidates meet with teachers to discuss classroom observations and reflect on literacy practices.
<p>3. Assessment and Evaluation</p> <p>CAEP A1.1a,b,c</p> <p>ISTE 7</p> <p>Diversity</p>	<p>Candidates need additional practice with selecting and using valid, reliable, fair, and appropriate assessment tools to screen, diagnose, and measure student literacy achievement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Candidates do not understand how to use assessment results to plan instruction.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Candidates understand and use assessment results BUT are unable to support others in doing the same.</p>	<p>Candidates understand, select, and use valid, reliable, fair, and appropriate assessment tools to screen, diagnose, and measure student literacy achievement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Candidates use assessment results to inform instruction and evaluate interventions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Candidates assist teachers in their understanding and use of assessment results.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 PLUS</p> <p>Candidates use assessment results to advocate for appropriate literacy practices to relevant stakeholders.</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates need additional practice with understanding assessment tools. • Candidates need assistance in administering formal or informal measures. • Candidates do not collaborate with others regarding assessment data. • Candidates need additional practice to appropriately share assessment results with stakeholder groups. 	<p style="text-align: center;">SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates demonstrate knowledge and usage of formal and informal assessment tools for evaluating literacy performance. • Candidates accurately interpret formal and informal assessment data. • Candidates collaborate with colleagues to use data for decision making (i.e., with case study participants). • Candidates lead professional learning experiences to assist teachers in understanding and using assessment results (i.e., as part of the professional 	<p style="text-align: center;">SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates demonstrate knowledge and usage of a variety of assessment measures. • Candidates synthesize assessment results across various formal and informal measures. • Candidates identify the strengths/limitations of assessment measures. • Candidate utilize feedback from the classroom teachers of the case study participants to make instructional

		<p>development workshop).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates share assessment results orally and in writing with the parents and teachers of the case study participants. 	<p>decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates share assessment results orally and in writing with a variety of stakeholders. • Candidates support teachers in using assessment results for instructional decision making. • Candidates advocate for appropriate literacy practices to stakeholders such as students, administrators, teachers, and parents.
<p>4. Diversity and Equity</p> <p>CAEP A1.1f MCEE 1,2,3 ISTE 2,4,5 Diversity</p>	<p>Candidates lack an understanding of current research and theory in diversity and equity.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidates do not show an appreciation of the culture of others.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidates do not create an inclusive, affirming classroom.</p>	<p>Candidates demonstrate knowledge of research, relevant theories, pedagogies, and essential concepts of diversity and equity.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate an understanding of themselves and others as cultural beings.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Candidates create classrooms and schools that are inclusive and affirming.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 PLUS</p> <p>Candidates advocate for equity at school, district, and community levels.</p>
	<p>SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates show little or no evidence of the characteristics of diverse learners or how to provide culturally responsive teaching. • Candidates are unaware of the different cultures in the school community. • Candidates need to make adjustments in the classroom environment so all students are included. 	<p>SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates understand the characteristics of diverse learners and how to provide culturally responsive teaching (e.g., for case study participants). • Candidates recognize their own culture and the culture of others. • Candidates create an inclusive and affirming classroom environment when working with case study participants and other students. 	<p>SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates appear skillful at working with diverse learners and providing culturally responsive teaching. • Candidates celebrate their own culture and the culture of others. • Candidates select culturally relevant texts. • Candidates advocate for inclusive, affirming classrooms for all students. • Candidates advocate for equitable

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates advocate for equity for case study participants. 	literacy instruction in the school and in the community.
5. Learners and the Literacy Environment CAEP A1.1a,c, d,e MCEE 2,3,4,5 ISTE 1,2,3,4,5,6, 7 Diversity	<p>The instruction provided by candidates meets the developmental needs of certain groups of students.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Candidates fail to consult families and colleagues about the needs of students.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Candidates use only print resources.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Candidates use digital resources in unsafe ways.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Candidates foster an unhealthy climate, which does not support literacy learning.</p>	<p>Candidates meet the developmental needs of all learners.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Candidates collaborate with school personnel to use a variety of print and digital materials to engage and motivate all learners.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Candidates integrate digital technologies in appropriate, safe, and effective ways.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Candidates foster a positive climate that supports a literacy-rich learning environment.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 PLUS</p> <p>Candidates support colleagues in designing instruction that meets the developmental needs of all learners.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Candidates model the use of digital technologies in literacy instruction for colleagues.</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates do not understand the developmental needs of the case study participants or other students. Candidates struggle with working with parents or other teachers to meet the needs of students. Candidates limit student choice in reading material. Candidates use only print materials for instruction. Candidates provide no safeguards to ensure that students use digital resources in appropriate, safe, and effective ways. 	<p style="text-align: center;">SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates understand what is developmentally appropriate for case study participants. Candidates consider the physical, social, emotional, cultural, and intellectual needs of students. Candidates work together with families and colleagues to meet student needs. Candidates give the students opportunities to select their own reading materials. Candidates use a variety of print and 	<p style="text-align: center;">SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates consult with families and colleagues and use that knowledge in developing appropriate instructional activities for case study participants. Candidates support colleagues in designing instruction which meets the physical, social, emotional, cultural, and intellectual needs of students (e.g., through the professional development workshop). Candidates assist colleagues in using appropriate, safe, and effective digital resources during literacy instruction.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates need to make changes in classroom routines, groupings, or social interactions to create a healthy climate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • digital materials with case study participants or other students. • Candidates ensure that students use digital resources in appropriate, safe, and effective ways. • Candidates create a positive, literacy-rich learning environment, which includes appropriate classroom routines, groupings, or social interactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates model a positive, literacy-rich learning environment for colleagues.
<p>6. Professional Learning and Leadership</p> <p>CAEP A1.1b,c, d,f MCEE 1,2,4 ISTE 1,2,4 Diversity</p>	<p>Candidates show no evidence of reflecting on professional practice. OR Candidates do not belong to professional organizations. OR Candidates’ interactions with colleagues demonstrates a gap in knowledge of adult learning. OR Candidates are lacking in leadership or facilitation skills.</p>	<p>Candidates reflect on their professional practices. AND Candidates belong to professional organizations. AND Candidates use their knowledge of adult learning to work collaboratively with colleagues. AND Candidates demonstrate their leadership and facilitation skills when working with individuals and groups.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 PLUS</p> <p>Candidates are actively involved in professional organizations. AND Candidates advocate on behalf of teachers, students, families, and communities for effective literacy practices and policies.</p>
	<p>SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates receive feedback from supervisors and mentors but do not make needed changes in practice (e.g., items noted on internship assessments) • Candidates lack an understanding of adult learners. • Candidates do not work well with other colleagues. 	<p>SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are reflective in practice and accept feedback from supervisors and mentors. • Candidates display an understanding of adult learners • Candidates engage in collaborative discussions with teachers about effective instruction and intervention (e.g., through the professional development workshop and follow-up coaching sessions) • Candidates are recognized as literacy 	<p>SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates attend professional conferences and share information with colleagues • Candidates facilitate collaborative decision-making with colleagues. • Candidates demonstrate confidence and leadership when working with other adults. • Candidates are critical consumers of research, policy, and practice. • Candidates coach colleagues in the

		<p>leaders within the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates work well with other colleagues. • Candidates lead group meetings by setting norms and promoting group discussion (e.g., through the professional development follow-up sessions). 	<p>improvement of literacy instruction (e.g., through the professional development follow-up coaching session)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates make recommendations for future literacy instruction for case study participants. • Candidates make recommendations for future literacy-related professional development for the school.
<p>7. Practicum/ Clinical Experiences</p> <p>CAEP A1.1d MCEE 1,2,4 Diversity</p>	<p>Candidates complete practica/ clinical experiences which focus solely on intervention work with students.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Practica/clinical experiences are at sites other than an authentic, school-based setting.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidates do not receive supervision, including observation and feedback, from a qualified supervisor.</p>	<p>Candidates complete supervised, integrated, extended practica/clinical experiences that include intervention work with students and working colleagues.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Practica include ongoing experiences in school-based setting(s).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Supervision includes observation and ongoing feedback by qualified supervisors.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 PLUS</p> <p>Candidates collaborate with colleagues to develop, reflect on, and self-assess their own teaching practices and the practices of others.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Candidates engage in novice coaching practices with groups and individuals.</p>
	<p>SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates work with only individuals OR groups during the internship. • Candidates only work with students at one grade level during the internship. • Candidates do not use feedback from mentor observations or discussions to improve literacy instruction. • Candidates fail to follow-up on the professional development workshop with a coaching experience. • Candidates struggle to complete all expected duties during the internship. 	<p>SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates provide literacy instruction to individuals and small groups of students at different grade levels (e.g., case study participants). • Candidates seek to improve their literacy instruction by using feedback from mentor observations and discussion. • Candidates complete all expected duties during the internship. • Candidates have 200 hours of field experience with a minimum of 100 hours during the internship. 	<p>SUGGESTED LOOK FORs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates analyze the literacy instruction of others (e.g., professional development follow-up coaching session). • Candidates actively seek ways to improve their literacy instruction by implementing changes based on mentor observations and discussions. • Candidates provide coaching to colleagues (e.g., coach one teacher as a follow-up to the professional development workshop).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates have less than 200 hours of field experience at the conclusion of the internship. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates excel in completing tasks during the internship. • Candidates have more than 200 hours of field experience with a minimum of 100 hours during the internship.
--	--	--	---

(Revised 12/28/18 SLB)