GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

PROGRAM: Master of Education in Special Education

COURSE: SPD-590 **START DATE:** 8/19/2021 **END DATE:** 12/1/2021

COOPERATING SCHOOL NAME: Franklin Middle School

SCHOOL STATE: Illinois

COOPERATING TEACHER/MENTOR NAME: Katherine Sheraden

GCU FACULTY SUPERVISOR NAME: John Mendes

FOR COURSE INSTRUCTORS ONLY:		
EVALUATION 2S TOTAL POINTS	94.72 points	94.72 %

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Scoring Guide

No Evidence *(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should create a plan with the Teacher Candidate to determine how the Teacher Candidate will meet this standard in future evaluations)*	Ineffective *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Foundational *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Emerging *(Teacher Candidates within this range may benefit from a Professional Growth Plan)*	Proficient *(Target level for Teacher Candidates)*	Distinguished *(Usually reserved for master Teacher Candidates)*
No Evidence	**1 to 49**	**50 to 69**	**70 to 79**	**80 to 92**	**93 to 100**
There is no evidence that the performance of the Teacher Candidate met this standard or expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is insufficient in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is underdeveloped in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is developing in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate meets this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate consistently exceeds this standard and all expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.

Standard 1: Student Development	Score	No Evidence
1.1 Teacher candidates create developmentally appropriate instruction that takes into account individual students' strengths, interests, and needs and enables each student to advance and accelerate his or her learning.	95	☐
1.2 Teacher candidates collaborate with families, communities, colleagues, and other professionals to promote student growth and development.	95	☐

Evidence

(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should detail the evidence or lack of evidence from the Teacher Candidate in meeting this standard. For lack of evidence, please provide suggestions for improvement and the actionable steps for growth.)

Ron collaborates with the grade level team, as well as his partner teachers to prepare lessons and meet student needs.

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Scoring Guide

No Evidence *(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should create a plan with the Teacher Candidate to determine how the Teacher Candidate will meet this standard in future evaluations)*	Ineffective *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Foundational *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Emerging *(Teacher Candidates within this range may benefit from a Professional Growth Plan)*	Proficient *(Target level for Teacher Candidates)*	Distinguished *(Usually reserved for master Teacher Candidates)*
No Evidence	**1 to 49**	**50 to 69**	**70 to 79**	**80 to 92**	**93 to 100**
There is no evidence that the performance of the Teacher Candidate met this standard or expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is insufficient in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is underdeveloped in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is developing in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate meets this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate consistently exceeds this standard and all expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.

Standard 2: Learning Differences	Score	No Evidence
2.1 Teacher candidates design, adapt, and deliver instruction to address each student's diverse learning strengths and needs and create opportunities for students to demonstrate their learning in different ways.	95	
2.2 Teacher candidates incorporate language development tools into planning and instruction, including strategies for making content accessible to English language students and for evaluating and supporting their development of English proficiency.	95	
2.3 Teacher candidates access resources, supports, specialized assistance and services to meet particular learning differences or needs.	92	

Evidence

(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should detail the evidence or lack of evidence from the Teacher Candidate in meeting this standard. For lack of evidence, please provide suggestions for improvement and the actionable steps for growth.)

Ron has gotten creative when planning his lesson. He made the lesson fun for the kids, and collaborative for the whole class.

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Scoring Guide

No Evidence *(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should create a plan with the Teacher Candidate to determine how the Teacher Candidate will meet this standard in future evaluations)*	Ineffective *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Foundational *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Emerging *(Teacher Candidates within this range may benefit from a Professional Growth Plan)*	Proficient *(Target level for Teacher Candidates)*	Distinguished *(Usually reserved for master Teacher Candidates)*
No Evidence	**1 to 49**	**50 to 69**	**70 to 79**	**80 to 92**	**93 to 100**
There is no evidence that the performance of the Teacher Candidate met this standard or expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is insufficient in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is underdeveloped in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is developing in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate meets this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate consistently exceeds this standard and all expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.

Standard 3: Learning Environments	Score	No Evidence
3.1 Teacher candidates manage the learning environment to actively and equitably engage students by organizing, allocating, and coordinating the resources of time, space, and students' attention.	90	
3.2 Teacher candidates communicate verbally and nonverbally in ways that demonstrate respect for and responsiveness to the cultural backgrounds and differing perspectives students bring to the learning environment.	90	

Evidence

(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should detail the evidence or lack of evidence from the Teacher Candidate in meeting this standard. For lack of evidence, please provide suggestions for improvement and the actionable steps for growth.)

Classroom management is getting better. He has really been working with the kids and getting them to follow the classroom rules.

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Scoring Guide

No Evidence *(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should create a plan with the Teacher Candidate to determine how the Teacher Candidate will meet this standard in future evaluations)*	Ineffective *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Foundational *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Emerging *(Teacher Candidates within this range may benefit from a Professional Growth Plan)*	Proficient *(Target level for Teacher Candidates)*	Distinguished *(Usually reserved for master Teacher Candidates)*
No Evidence	**1 to 49**	**50 to 69**	**70 to 79**	**80 to 92**	**93 to 100**
There is no evidence that the performance of the Teacher Candidate met this standard or expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is insufficient in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is underdeveloped in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is developing in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate meets this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate consistently exceeds this standard and all expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.

Standard 4: Content Knowledge	Score	No Evidence
4.1 Teacher candidates stimulate student reflection on prior content knowledge, link new concepts to familiar concepts, and make connections to students' experiences.	95	
4.2 Teacher candidates use supplementary resources and technologies effectively to ensure accessibility and relevance for all students.	95	
4.3 Teacher candidates create opportunities for students to learn, practice, and master academic language in their content area.	95	

Evidence

(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should detail the evidence or lack of evidence from the Teacher Candidate in meeting this standard. For lack of evidence, please provide suggestions for improvement and the actionable steps for growth.)

Ron has been doing great with getting to know the materials he is teaching.

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Scoring Guide

No Evidence *(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should create a plan with the Teacher Candidate to determine how the Teacher Candidate will meet this standard in future evaluations)*	Ineffective *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Foundational *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Emerging *(Teacher Candidates within this range may benefit from a Professional Growth Plan)*	Proficient *(Target level for Teacher Candidates)*	Distinguished *(Usually reserved for master Teacher Candidates)*
No Evidence	**1 to 49**	**50 to 69**	**70 to 79**	**80 to 92**	**93 to 100**
There is no evidence that the performance of the Teacher Candidate met this standard or expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is insufficient in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is underdeveloped in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is developing in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate meets this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate consistently exceeds this standard and all expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.

Standard 5: Application of Content	Score	No Evidence
5.1 Teacher candidates engage students in applying content knowledge to real-world problems through the lens of interdisciplinary themes (e.g., financial literacy, environmental literacy).	95	
5.2 Teacher candidates facilitate students' ability to develop diverse social and cultural perspectives that expand their understanding of local and global issues and create novel approaches to solving problems.	95	

Evidence

(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should detail the evidence or lack of evidence from the Teacher Candidate in meeting this standard. For lack of evidence, please provide suggestions for improvement and the actionable steps for growth.)

Ron continues to work on applying real-world scenarios and applications to increase student engagement and motivation. Ron continues to develop skills in differentiating and adapting instruction to meet the needs of all students.

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Scoring Guide

No Evidence *(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should create a plan with the Teacher Candidate to determine how the Teacher Candidate will meet this standard in future evaluations)*	Ineffective *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Foundational *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Emerging *(Teacher Candidates within this range may benefit from a Professional Growth Plan)*	Proficient *(Target level for Teacher Candidates)*	Distinguished *(Usually reserved for master Teacher Candidates)*
No Evidence	**1 to 49**	**50 to 69**	**70 to 79**	**80 to 92**	**93 to 100**
There is no evidence that the performance of the Teacher Candidate met this standard or expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is insufficient in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is underdeveloped in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is developing in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate meets this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate consistently exceeds this standard and all expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.

Standard 6: Assessment	Score	No Evidence
6.1 Teacher candidates design assessments that match learning objectives with assessment methods and minimize sources of bias that can distort assessment results.	95	
6.2 Teacher candidates work independently and collaboratively to examine test and other performance data to understand each student's progress and to guide planning.	95	
6.3 Teacher candidates prepare all students for the demands of particular assessment formats and make appropriate modifications in assessments or testing conditions especially for students with disabilities and language learning needs.	95	

Evidence

(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should detail the evidence or lack of evidence from the Teacher Candidate in meeting this standard. For lack of evidence, please provide suggestions for improvement and the actionable steps for growth.)

Ron is even making his own assessment tools, in addition to the ones provided by the curriculum.

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Scoring Guide

No Evidence *(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should create a plan with the Teacher Candidate to determine how the Teacher Candidate will meet this standard in future evaluations)*	Ineffective *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Foundational *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Emerging *(Teacher Candidates within this range may benefit from a Professional Growth Plan)*	Proficient *(Target level for Teacher Candidates)*	Distinguished *(Usually reserved for master Teacher Candidates)*
No Evidence	**1 to 49**	**50 to 69**	**70 to 79**	**80 to 92**	**93 to 100**
There is no evidence that the performance of the Teacher Candidate met this standard or expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is insufficient in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is underdeveloped in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is developing in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate meets this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate consistently exceeds this standard and all expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.

Standard 7: Planning for Instruction	Score	No Evidence
7.1 Teacher candidates plan how to achieve each student's learning goals, choosing appropriate strategies and accommodations, resources, and materials to differentiate instruction for individuals and groups of students.	95	
7.2 Teacher candidates develop appropriate sequencing of learning experiences and provide multiple ways to demonstrate knowledge and skill.	98	
7.3 Teacher candidates plan for instruction based on formative and summative assessment data, prior student knowledge, and student interest.	92	

Evidence

(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should detail the evidence or lack of evidence from the Teacher Candidate in meeting this standard. For lack of evidence, please provide suggestions for improvement and the actionable steps for growth.)

Ron is prepared for all his lessons--he continues to develop skills in instructional planning and delivery.

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Scoring Guide

No Evidence *(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should create a plan with the Teacher Candidate to determine how the Teacher Candidate will meet this standard in future evaluations)*	Ineffective *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Foundational *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Emerging *(Teacher Candidates within this range may benefit from a Professional Growth Plan)*	Proficient *(Target level for Teacher Candidates)*	Distinguished *(Usually reserved for master Teacher Candidates)*
No Evidence	**1 to 49**	**50 to 69**	**70 to 79**	**80 to 92**	**93 to 100**
There is no evidence that the performance of the Teacher Candidate met this standard or expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is insufficient in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is underdeveloped in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is developing in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate meets this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate consistently exceeds this standard and all expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.

Standard 8: Instructional Strategies	Score	No Evidence
8.1 Teacher candidates vary their role in the instructional process (e.g., instructor, facilitator, coach, audience) in relation to the content, purpose of instruction, and student needs	98	
8.2 Teacher candidates engage students in using a range of learning skills and technology tools to access, interpret, evaluate, and apply information.	98	
8.3 Teacher candidates ask questions to stimulate discussion that serve different purposes (e.g., probing for student understanding, helping students articulate their ideas and thinking processes, stimulating curiosity, and helping students to question).	98	

Evidence

(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should detail the evidence or lack of evidence from the Teacher Candidate in meeting this standard. For lack of evidence, please provide suggestions for improvement and the actionable steps for growth.)

His integration of technology is on point. He is teaching us a thing or two!

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Scoring Guide

No Evidence *(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should create a plan with the Teacher Candidate to determine how the Teacher Candidate will meet this standard in future evaluations)*	Ineffective *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Foundational *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Emerging *(Teacher Candidates within this range may benefit from a Professional Growth Plan)*	Proficient *(Target level for Teacher Candidates)*	Distinguished *(Usually reserved for master Teacher Candidates)*
No Evidence	**1 to 49**	**50 to 69**	**70 to 79**	**80 to 92**	**93 to 100**
There is no evidence that the performance of the Teacher Candidate met this standard or expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is insufficient in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is underdeveloped in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is developing in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate meets this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate consistently exceeds this standard and all expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.

Standard 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice	Score	No Evidence
9.1 Independently and in collaboration with colleagues, teacher candidates use a variety of data (e.g., systematic observation, information about students, and research) to evaluate the outcomes of teaching and learning and to adapt planning and practice.	92	☐
9.2 Teacher candidates actively seek professional, community, and technological resources, within and outside the school, as supports for analysis, reflection, and problem solving.	95	☐

Evidence

(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should detail the evidence or lack of evidence from the Teacher Candidate in meeting this standard. For lack of evidence, please provide suggestions for improvement and the actionable steps for growth.)

Ron is doing great with collaboration and figuring out if lessons are working or not. Whether re-teaching is necessary for certain lessons.

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Scoring Guide

No Evidence *(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should create a plan with the Teacher Candidate to determine how the Teacher Candidate will meet this standard in future evaluations)*	Ineffective *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Foundational *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	Emerging *(Teacher Candidates within this range may benefit from a Professional Growth Plan)*	Proficient *(Target level for Teacher Candidates)*	Distinguished *(Usually reserved for master Teacher Candidates)*
No Evidence	**1 to 49**	**50 to 69**	**70 to 79**	**80 to 92**	**93 to 100**
There is no evidence that the performance of the Teacher Candidate met this standard or expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is insufficient in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is underdeveloped in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is developing in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate meets this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate consistently exceeds this standard and all expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.

Standard 10: Leadership and Collaboration	Score	No Evidence
10.1 Teacher candidates use technological tools and a variety of communication strategies to build local and global learning communities that engage students, families, and colleagues.	95	
10.2 Teacher candidates advocate to meet the needs of students, to strengthen the learning environment, and to enact system change.	95	

Evidence

(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should detail the evidence or lack of evidence from the Teacher Candidate in meeting this standard. For lack of evidence, please provide suggestions for improvement and the actionable steps for growth.)

Ron is doing great making sure all the accommodations are being met for all his students.

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

Grand Canyon University: Impact on Student Learning					
No Evidence *(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should create a plan with the Teacher Candidate to determine how the Teacher Candidate will meet this standard in future evaluations)*	**Ineffective** *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	**Foundational** *(Teacher Candidates within this range require a Professional Growth Plan)*	**Emerging** *(Teacher Candidates within this range may benefit from a Professional Growth Plan)*	**Proficient** *(Target level for Teacher Candidates)*	**Distinguished** *(Usually reserved for master Teacher Candidates)*
No Evidence	**1 to 49**	**50 to 69**	**70 to 79**	**80 to 92**	**93 to 100**
There is no evidence that the performance of the Teacher Candidate met this standard or expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is insufficient in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is underdeveloped in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate is developing in meeting this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate meets this standard and expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.	The performance of the Teacher Candidate consistently exceeds this standard and all expectations for a Teacher Candidate during student teaching.

Grand Canyon University: Impact on Student Learning	Score	No Evidence
Teacher candidates demonstrate an understanding of their impact on student learning as evidenced in the Student Teaching Evaluation of Performance (STEP) and other formative and summative assessments.	92	

Evidence

(The GCU Faculty Supervisor should detail the evidence or lack of evidence from the Teacher Candidate in meeting this standard. For lack of evidence, please provide suggestions for improvement and the actionable steps for growth.)

Ron is making great progress and developing his instructional skillset. He is doing well getting to know his students and understanding their needs and learning preferences. Based on this data, he is adequately and effectively planning and delivering instruction. Keep up the great work, Ron!

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY™

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION 2S

TEACHER CANDIDATE NAME Thomas Logsdon II STUDENT NUMBER 20681003

INSTRUCTIONS

Please review the "*Total Scored Percentage*" for accuracy and add any attachments before completing the "*Agreement and Signature*" section.

Total Scored Percentage:	94.72 %
ATTACHMENTS	
Clinical Practice Time Log: (Required)	
Attachment 1: (Optional)	
Attachment 2: (Optional)	

AGREEMENT AND SIGNATURE

This evaluation reflects the results of a collaborative conference including feedback from the Cooperating / Mentor Teacher. The GCU Faculty Supervisor and Cooperating /Mentor Teacher should collaboratively review the performance in each category prior to the evaluation meeting.

I attest this submission is accurate, true, and in compliance with GCU policy guidelines, to the best of my ability to do so.

GCU Faculty Supervisor E-Signature	John Mendes (Oct 20, 2021 21:37 CDT)	**Date**	Oct 20, 2021

Clinical Practice Time Log
15 Week Course
70 minimum days required

STUDENT NAME (*Last, First, Middle*):	STUDENT ID:	PROGRAM OF STUDY:
Logsdon II Thomas R.	20681003	Master of Ed in Special Education
COOPERATING TEACHER/MENTOR NAME:	**SCHOOL:**	**GRADE:**
Katie Sharaden	Franklin Middle School	6
PLACEMENT START DATE:	**COURSE START DATE:**	**GCU FACULTY SUPERVISOR NAME:**
Aug. 19, 2021	Aug. 19, 2021	Dr. John Mendes

COOPERATING TEACHER CONTRACTED HOURS (i.e. 8:00 am – 3:00 pm): 7:35a to: 2:50p
1 Full Contracted Day = 6.5 **hours**

KEY	WEEKS	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Week 6	Week 7	Week 8	Week 9	Week 10	Week 11	Week 12	Week 13	Week 14	Week 15	Week 16	Week 17
X = Full Day Attendance in the placement following Cooperating Teacher contracted hours listed above.	Dates	Aug 16-20	23-27	28 Sep 3	Sep 6-10	Sep 13-17	Sep 20-24	Sep 27-Oct. 1	Oct 4-8	Oct 11-15	Oct 18-22							
PD = Partial Day* Include number of hours completed for the day. (i.e. PD 3).	Monday		X	X	DH	X	X	X	X	DH	X							
	Tuesday		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							
IW = Inclement Weather*	Wednesday		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							
DH = District Holiday*	Thursday	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X								
IL = Illness*	Friday	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X								
O= Other*	Days completed	2/2	5/7	5/12	4/16	5/21	5/26	5/31	5/36	4/40								
***Missed time/days must be made up**	Cooperating Teacher Initials	KMS	KMS	KMS	KMS	KMS	KMS	KMS	KMS	KMS								

Total Number of Days Completed: _____

Sign once time requirement has been met. I hereby certify that the GCU Teacher Candidate has completed 70 days in the student teaching placement.

Cooperating Teacher Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____
Teacher Candidate Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____
GCU Faculty Supervisor Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

The GCU Faculty Supervisor will not submit Clinical Practice Evaluation #4 until the time requirement has been met.

©2021. Grand Canyon University. All Rights Reserved.