August 2025

MEES TEACHER CANDIDATE TOOL TRAINING

Missouri
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY
EDUCATION

Thank You

Kim Nuetzmann and Stephanie Koscielski were instrumental in leading the revision of both this document and teacher performance assessment. DESE appreciates their efforts to strengthen the assessment.

Expected Training Outcomes



Become familiar with the MEES Teacher Candidate Assessment Rubric (2023) and the scoring protocol.



Score videos using the MEES Rubric.



Justify scores assigned using observed evidence.



Generate examples of quality, actionable feedback.



Compare your scores with those generated by colleagues and experts.

Nine Missouri Teacher Standards

The MEES is intended to assess the Missouri Teacher Standards.

- Standard 1: Content Knowledge
- Standard 2: Student Learning, Growth, and Development
- Standard 3: Curriculum Implementation
- Standard 4: Critical Thinking
- Standard 5: Positive Classroom Environment
- Standard 6: Effective Communication
- Standard 7: Student Assessment & Data Analysis
- Standard 8: Self-Assessment & Improvement
- Standard 9: Professional Collaboration

Let's Look at a Standard…

Standard 1: Content knowledge aligned with appropriate instruction. The teacher candidate understands the central concepts, structures, and tools of inquiry of the discipline(s) and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful and engaging for students.				
0-The teacher candidate does not possess the necessary knowledge; therefore, the standard is not evident or is incorrect in performance.	1-The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge but does not demonstrate in performance.	2-The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and demonstrates in performance with some success.	3-The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.	4-The teacher candidate adapts and develops the lesson according to the teaching environment/ student response.
Student Engagement in Subject Matter				
• Provides no opportunity for students to process content.	• Demonstrates an awareness of strategies to allow students to process content.	• Provides students with limited opportunities to process content.	• Provides students with multiple opportunities to process the content.	• Implements additional individualized learning resources and instruction in the content to meet the unique needs of students.
Content Knowledge and Academic Language				
• Shares incorrect information.	• Demonstrates an understanding of basic content.	• Conveys accurate information when teaching content.	• Conveys accurate content knowledge, relevant examples, and content-specific resources to engage students and support learning.	• Makes intentional connections between and among relevant content areas.
Vocabulary and Terminology				
• Provides no evidence of addressing needed vocabulary and/or terminology for student understanding of content.	• Plans to introduce vocabulary and terminology but does not use strategies to enhance student engagement and responses.	• Introduces vocabulary and terminology necessary to understand content, but uses limited strategies to engage students	• Conveys vocabulary and terminology necessary to understand content and uses evidence-based instructional strategies to engage students.	• Promotes students' application of authentic use of vocabulary and terminology relevant to the content.
Student Engagement with Content				
• Provides no evidence of planning for student engagement.	• Plans for student engagement but no evidence of implementation.	• Inconsistently engages students with the content.	• Consistently engages the majority of students with the content.	• Facilitates a lesson in which every student in the class is actively engaged for the duration of the lesson.

Teacher Candidate Performance Rubric

- It is essential that all parties understand the standards and the language of the rubric and be able to identify them in practice.
- Evaluators should ensure they have a common understanding.
- Supervisors should work with candidates to review the rubric and share examples of what the standards look like in practice.

Diving Deeper –Standards 4, 5, 6, 7

Group Prompts

- Discuss the rubric language.
- Identify key language that distinguishes each level of performance.
- Generate specific examples of what this might look like in a classroom setting.
- Discuss additional possible artifacts/evidence

Group Questions

- What did you notice about each standard?
- What key language stands out to you?
- What classroom examples did you generate?
- What additional evidence or artifacts might you use in the scoring process?

High Quality Feedback

Think of times when you have received feedback. Jot down a few examples.

Now, think about how you received each piece of feedback and what impact it had on your future practices.

Share at your table.

High Quality Feedback

What makes feedback meaningful?

- Tangible and transparent
- Actionable
- User-friendly
- Timely
- Ongoing
- Consistent

It is important to know your candidate's needs and your intentions when sharing feedback, so you can carefully construct feedback that will have the greatest impact.

Provide specific feedback linked the quality indicators.

Standard 1: Content knowledge aligned with appropriate instruction. The teacher candidate understands the central concepts, structures, and tools of inquiry of the discipline(s) and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful and engaging for students.				
0-The teacher candidate does not possess the necessary knowledge; therefore, the standa[illegible]vident or is incorrect[illegible]	1-The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge but does not demonstrate in performance.	2-The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and demonstrates in performance with some success.	3-The teacher candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.	4-The teacher candidate adapts and develops the lesson according to the teaching environment/ student response.
Student Engagement in Subject Matter				
• Provides no opportunity for students to process content.	Demonstrates an awareness of strategies to allow students to process content.	• Provides students with limited opportunities to process content.	• Provides students with multiple opportunities to process the content.	• Implements additional individualized learning resources and instruction in the content to meet the unique needs of students.
Content Knowledge and Academic Language				
• Shares incorrect information.	• Demonstrates an understanding of basic content.	• Conveys accurate information when teaching content.	• Conveys accurate content knowledge, relevant examples, and content-specific resources to engage students and support learning.	• Makes intentional connections between and among relevant content areas.
Vocabulary and Terminology				
• Provides no evidence of addressing needed vocabulary and/or terminology for student understanding of content.	• Plans to introduce vocabulary and terminology but does not use strategies to enhance student engagement and responses.	• Introduces vocabulary and terminology necessary to understand [illegible] [illegible]dents	• Conveys vocabulary and terminology necessary to understand content and uses evidence-based instructional strategies to engage students.	• Promotes students' application of authentic use of vocabulary and terminology relevant to the content.
Student Engagement with Content				
• Provides no evidence of planning for student engagement.	• Plans for student engagement but no evidence of implementation.	• Inconsistently engages students with the content.	• Consistently engages the majority of students with the content.	• Facilitates a lesson in which every student in the class is actively engaged for the duration of the lesson.

Five Forms of Feedback

- Judgments
- Personal Comments
- Inferences
- Data
- Coaching Questions

Judgments

- Nice job
- Exemplary
- That was lousy.
- That’s a great chart.
- That was a great way to teach that.

Judgments may result in the candidate feeling positive or negative, but this type of feedback is often general and doesn’t provide specific evidence.

Personal Comments

- I completely understood your lesson.
- Your intro to the topic did not capture my attention.
- I really appreciated the examples you used.

Personal comments can result in the candidate seeking or rejecting the evaluator's approval. The focus is often on the evaluator's opinion rather than objective data.

Inferences

- The kids learned a lot.
- You must have spent a long time preparing that lesson.
- Your classroom management techniques are working.
- Your students seemed really interested in the topic.

Inferences may be inaccurate and often rely on assumptions rather than data.

Data

- Based on your summative assessment, 80% of your students scored proficient or higher.
- 50% of your students answered questions reflecting critical thinking.
- 5 of your 23 students shared responses during the whole group discussion.

Data provides clear evidence that can prompt a candidate to reflect and make their own judgments, inferences, and action steps. This type of feedback paired with reflective questioning is often the most effective.

Coaching Questions

- I noticed you changed directions during the lesson. What prompted this change in plans?
- How do you use the data from your formative assessment to monitor the progress of your students' learning?
- What are you noticing about student engagement throughout the lesson?

Coaching questions encourage candidates to consider their own practice and then to make appropriate revisions. This helps them develop the ability for constructive self-critique.

Scoring Protocol

Evidence

Although the evidence used in this training will come from observations, it is important to note that MEES scores should not be limited to evidence obtained from teaching observations. Documents and discussions (with the candidate, administrators, and others) should also be considered.

Score of 0

Rubric Description: The teacher candidate does not possess the necessary knowledge; therefore, the standard is not evident or is incorrect in performance.

Explanation: The teacher candidate is not meeting expectations. They are not prepared, provide misinformation during instruction, and/or the indicator is not evident in performance or writing.

Score of 1

Rubric Description: The Teacher Candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge but does not demonstrate in performance.

Explanation: The teacher candidate demonstrates knowledge through their lesson plan and dialogue, but they do not demonstrate the indicator in performance.

Score of 2

Rubric Description: The Teacher Candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and demonstrates in performance with some success.

Explanation: The teacher candidate demonstrates knowledge and attempts the indicator in performance, but it is not demonstrated at high levels of effectiveness.

Score of 3

Rubric Description: The Teacher Candidate can articulate the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrate it in performance.

Explanation: The teacher candidate demonstrates the necessary knowledge and effectively demonstrates the indicator.

Score of 4

The Teacher Candidate adapts and develops the lesson according to the teaching environment/student response.

The teacher candidate makes effective in-the-moment teaching decisions based on the teaching environment and/or student response.

Scoring Protocol

Score each indicator within a standard

Add indicator scores and divide by the number of indicators to get an average.

Standard 1 Example

Sum of 4 scores ÷ 4 =Standard Score

Round to single decimal

Add all nine Standard Scores

Round up or down, to single decimal point

For example, round 22.55 to 22.6 (CT); round 25.72 to 25.7 (US)

The score of the University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher will be added together for the final MEES Score. A score of 42 is required for passing.

Preparing to Score

- We will view a series of videos to practice scoring and calibrate with others.
- Please refer to the language of the rubric as you score and consider specific evidence to support.
- Be prepared to share your scores and evidence after we view the videos.
- Continue to think about what feedback might be most impactful for the candidate.
- We will then compare our scores with those generated by a group of experts in a calibration session. These target scores are only included if the experts had enough agreement on them.

Kindergarten Math (Video 1)

Link to video (use only first 24 minutes)

Focus MEES Standards

- Standard 1: Content Knowledge
- Standard 5: Positive Classroom Environment
- Standard 6: Effective Communication

Kindergarten Math (Video 1)

Link to MEES Rubric

1. Evaluate MEES Standards 1, 5, and 6
2. Provide feedback in the comment boxes.
3. Discuss and debrief.

Interrater Calibration for Kindergarten Math Video--Overall Standard Scores

	Standard Score
Standard 1: Content Knowledge	3.4
Standard 5: Positive Classroom Environment	3.4
Standard 6: Effective Communication	3.2

Interrater Calibration for Kindergarten Math Video

Standard 1: Content Knowledge	Interrater Average Score
Overall	3.4
1.1 Vocabulary and Terminology	3.25
1.2 Content Delivery	3.25
1.3 Student Application of Content	3.0
1.4 Student Engagement with Content	4.0

Total indicator score = 13.5	13.5 / 4 = 3.37	Round to 3.4

Interrater Calibration for Kindergarten Math Video

Standard 5: Positive Classroom Engagement	Interrater Average Score
Overall	3.4
5.1 Classroom Expectations	3.5
5.2 Positive Classroom Environment, Relationships, and Interactions	3.1
5.3 Classroom Management Strategies	3.6

Total indicator score = 10.2	**10.2 / 3 = 3.4**	**No rounding needed.**

Interrater Calibration for Kindergarten Math Video

Standard 6: Effective Communications	Interrater Average Score
Overall	3.2
6.1 Verbal and Non-Verbal Communications	3.1
6.2 Models Expectations for Student Communications	3.1
6.3 Communication Positively Impacts Lesson Delivery	3.6
6.4 Communication Conventions	3.0
6.5 Communication with Respect for Diverse Backgrounds and Experiences	3.0

Total indicator score = 15.8	**15.8 / 5 = 3.16**	**Round to 3.2**

Calibration

- Finalize your scores
- Share at your tables
  - How did you score each indicator and the overall standard?
  - What evidence did you refer to that supports your score?
  - How did your scores differ from those of your peers and the anchor scores? Why?

Feedback

- Consider the scores and evidence
  - What is one example of specific, positive feedback you could provide to the candidate?
  - What is one example of specific feedback that might have the most leverage to promote growth?
  - What follow up questions might you pose to the teacher?

4th Grade Social Studies (Video 2)

Link to video

MEES STANDARDS

- Standard 1: Content Knowledge
- Standard 3: Curriculum Implementation
- Standard 4: Critical Thinking
- Standard 5: Positive Classroom Environment

4th Grade Social Studies (Video 2)

Link to MEES Rubric

1. Evaluate MEES Standards 1, 3, 4, and 5.
2. Provide feedback in the comment boxes.
3. Discuss and debrief.

Interrater Calibration for 4th Grade Social Studies Video--Overall Standard Scores

	Standard Score
Standard 1: Content Knowledge	3.5
Standard 3: Curriculum Implementation	3.5
Standard 4: Critical Thinking	3.4
Standard 5: Positive Classroom Environment	3.2

Interrater Calibration for 4th Grade Social Studies Video

• Standard 1: Content Knowledge	Interrater Average Score
Overall	3.5
1.1 Vocabulary and Terminology	3.5
1.2 Content Delivery	3.87
1.3 Student Application of Content	3.0
1.4 Student Engagement with Content	3.5

Total indicator score = 13.87	13.87 / 4 = 3.46	Round to 3.5

Interrater Calibration for 4th Grade Social Studies Video

Standard 3: Curriculum Implementation	Interrater Average Score
Overall	3.5
3.1 Alignment of Learning Standards	3.5
3.2 Articulation of Learning Objectives	3.5

Total indicator score = 7	7 / 2 = 3.5	No need to round.

Interrater Calibration for 4th Grade Social Studies Video

Standard 4: Critical Thinking	
Overall	3.4
4.1 Instructional Strategies Leading to Student-Centered Ideas and Solutions	3.25
4.2 Instructional Strategies Leading to Problem-Solving and Critical Thinking	3.5
4.3 Questioning Techniques	3.5
4.4 Higher Order Thinking	3.5

Total indicator score = 13.75	13.75 / 4 = 3.43	Round to 3.4

Interrater Calibration for 4th Grade Social Studies Video

• Standard 5: Positive Classroom Engagement	Interrater Average Score
Overall	3.2
• 5.1 Classroom Expectations	3.12
• 5.2 Positive Classroom Environment, Relationships, and Interactions	3.12
• 5.3 Classroom Management Strategies	3.25

Total indicator score = 9.49	9.49 / 3 = 3.16	Round to 3.2

Calibration

- Finalize your scores
- Share at your tables
  - How did you score each indicator and the overall standard?
  - What evidence did you refer to that supports your score?
  - How did your scores differ from those of your peers and the anchor scores? Why?

Feedback

- Consider the scores and evidence
  - What is one example of specific, positive feedback you could provide to the candidate?
  - What is one example of specific feedback that might have the most leverage to promote growth?
  - What follow up questions might you pose to the teacher?

High School Art (Video 3)

Link to video

MEES STANDARDS

- Standard 1: Content Knowledge
- Standard 2: Student Learning, Growth, and Development
- Standard 3: Curriculum Implementation
- Standard 4: Critical Thinking
- Standard 5: Positive Classroom Environment
- Standard 6: Effective Communication

High School Art (Video 3)

Link to MEES Rubric

1. Evaluate MEES Standards 1-6.
2. Provide feedback in the comment boxes.
3. Discuss and debrief.

Interrater Calibration for High School Art Video
Overall Standard Scores

	Standard Score
Standard 1: Content Knowledge	1.5
Standard 2: Student Learning, Growth, and Development	0.5
Standard 3: Curriculum Implementation	1.6
Standard 4: Critical Thinking	0.2
Standard 5: Positive Classroom Environment	0.9
Standard 6: Effective Communication	1.2

Interrater Calibration for High School Art Video

• Standard 1: Content Knowledge	Interrater Average Score
• Overall	1.5
• 1.1 Vocabulary and Terminology	0.87
• 1.2 Content Delivery	1.87
• 1.3 Student Application of Content	1.87
• 1.4 Student Engagement with Content	1.87

Total indicator score = 5.98	5.98 / 4 = 1.49	Round to 1.5

Interrater Calibration for High School Art Video

Standard 2: Student Learning, Growth, and Development	Interrater Average Score
Overall	.5
2.1 Differentiated Lesson Design	0.75
2.2 Differentiation of Instruction	0.5
2.3 Diverse Social and Cultural Perspectives	0.37

Total indicator score = 1.62	1.62 / 3 = 0.54	Round to 0.5

Interrater Calibration for High School Art Video

Standard 3: Curriculum Implementation	Interrater Average Score
Overall	1.6
3.1 Alignment of Learning Standards	1.87 (indicator score)
3.2 Articulation of Learning Objectives	1.25 (indicator score)

Total indicator score = 3.12	3.12 / 2 = 1.56	Round to 1.6

Interrater Calibration for High School Art Video

Standard 4: Critical Thinking	Interrater Average Score
Overall	.2
4.1 Instructional Strategies Leading to Student-Centered Ideas and Solutions	0.37
4.2 Instructional Strategies Leading to Problem-Solving and Critical Thinking	0.12
4.3 Questioning Techniques	0.5
4.4 Higher Order Thinking	0.25

Total indicator score = 1.24	1.24 / 4 = 0.17	Round to 0.2

Interrater Calibration for High School Art Video

Standard 5: Positive Classroom Engagement	Interrater Average Score
Overall	0.9
5.1 Classroom Expectations	1.25
5.2 Positive Classroom Environment, Relationships, and Interactions	0.5
5.3 Classroom Management Strategies	1.0

Total indicator score = 2.75	2.75 / 3 = 0.91	Round to 0.9

Interrater Calibration for High School Art Video

Standard 6: Effective Communications	Interrater Average Score
Overall	1.2
6.1 Verbal and Non-Verbal Communications	2.12
6.2 Models Expectations for Student Communications	0.87
6.3 Communication Positively Impacts Lesson Delivery	0.5
6.4 Communication Conventions	2.0
6.5 Communication with Respect for Diverse Backgrounds and Experiences	0.75

Total indicator score = 6.24	6.24 / 5 = 1.24	Round to 1.2

Calibration

- Finalize your scores
- Share at your tables
  - How did you score each indicator and the overall standard?
  - What evidence did you refer to that supports your score?
  - How did your scores differ from those of your peers and the anchor scores? Why?

Feedback

- Consider the scores and evidence
  - What is one example of specific, positive feedback you could provide to the candidate?
  - What is one example of specific feedback that might have the most leverage to promote growth?
  - What follow up questions might you pose to the teacher?

Final Comments and Questions









Thank you for supporting Missouri's teacher candidates!

Missouri DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION