Institution:	Liberty University
Student:	Nigar Hasanova
Supervisor:	Megan Mejia
Site:	VIRGINIA ACADEMY
Date:	Spring 2026 - Term A (01/19/26 - 05/15/26)
Type:	EDSP 545 (CT (Cooperating Teacher - Site Supervisor))
Final Completed:	03/13/26 05:17 PM

Pre-CPAST Assignment 11-22 - Mentor

General overview

Assessment

Pre-CPAST Directions

Directions â€“ The form will be used once during the course of the term and will be provided by the Program Coordinator to the University Supervisor, Host Teacher, and Candidate.

Additional information about and support for using the form can be found in the â€œGlossaryâ€• and â€œLook Forsâ€• for select rows (indicated by an *) at the end of this document. Click here for a video overview of the Pre-CPAST/CPAST Assessment.

Comments are not required for indicators that meet the standard. However, please leave a comment on any standard indicator that your candidate scored "emerging" or "does not meet expectations" to help him/her grow in their practice.

Glossary of Terms

Analysis: Careful and critical examination of data and/or processes to identify key components and potential outcomes.

Assessment: â€œProcess of monitoring, measuring, evaluating, documenting, reflecting on, and adjusting teaching and relearning to ensure that learners reach high levels of Achievement

Candidate: (Also known as "intern") An individual participating in a full-time field experience in a P12 classroom in order to obtain professional education licensure/certification.

Cooperating Teachers: (Also known as â€œmentor teachersâ€•) Teachers in schools who mentor and supervise student teachers in their classrooms for the duration of a student teaching and/or field experience.

Data-informed decisions: â€œFocuses on using student assessment data and relevant background information to inform decisions related to planning and implementing instructional strategies at the district, school, classroom, and individual student levels.â€•

Developmental Theory (General): Theories that describe the stages of development of children/adolescents (e.g., Eriksonâ€™s Theory of Psychosocial Development, Kohlbergâ€™s Theory of Moral Development, Piagetâ€™s Cognitive Development Theory, Behavioral Theories, and Sociocultural Theories).

Developmental Theory (Content-Specific): Content-specific teaching that organizes activities and learning tasks to help learners move from one level to the next.

Evidence: Artifacts that document and demonstrate how [the student teacher] planned and implemented instruction

Feedback: â€œInformation communicated to the learner that is intended to modify the learnerâ€™s thinking or behavior for the purpose of improving learning.â€•

Formative Assessment: â€œAssessment used continuously throughout learning and teaching, allowing teachers to adjust instruction to improve learner achievement.â€•

Goals: See definition for â€œMeasurable Goals.â€•

Learner: Any P12 student in the student teacherâ€™s classroom.

Learning Environment: Any setting where learning occurs. The term may refer to the physical environment (e.g., the classroom), as well as the classroom management procedures and activities that enable teaching and learning to take place.

Measurable Goals: â€œProvides information for describing, assessing, and evaluating student achievement.â€•

Mentor Teachers: See definition for â€œCooperating Teachers.â€•

Objectives/Targets: P12 student (learner) learning outcomes to be achieved by the end of the lesson or learning segment.

Problem Solving: A mental process that involves discovering, analyzing, and solving problems. The ultimate goal of problem-solving is to overcome obstacles and find a solution that best resolves the issue.

Program Coordinator: Faculty or staff member from a college or university who coordinates/manages the administrative components of a teacher educator licensure program.

Research: "The use of rigorous, systematic, and objective methodologies to obtain reliable and valid knowledge."

Targets: See definition for 'Objectives/Targets.'

University Supervisor (US): The university instructor assigned to the student teacher who regularly observes his/her performance to provide feedback on strengths and weaknesses. The US coordinates the student teacherâ€™s evaluation, and is responsible for recording the consensus scores using this form.

Section Weight: 0%

Suggested Letter Grade Rubric

Please provide a suggested letter grade to signify the candidate's overall performance and effort in the placement.

			A B C D F	
Please provide a suggested letter grade to signify the candidate's overall performance and effort during the practicum. (1.000, 100.0%)	**Final** Required	**A**		Nigar did an excellent job observing and discussing her plans and any questions she had during the practicum.

Section Weight: 0%

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)	
A. Focus for Learning: Standards and Objectives/Target (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.3 InTASC-2017.7.a	Plans align to appropriate P-12 state Learning Standards AND Goals are measurable AND Standards, objectives/ targets, and learning tasks are consistently aligned with each other AND Articulates objectives/targets that are appropriate for learners	Plans align to appropriate P-12 state Learning Standards AND/OR Some goals are measurable AND/OR Standards, objectives/targets, and learning tasks, are loosely or are not consistently aligned with each other AND/OR Articulates some objectives/targets that are appropriate for learners	Plans do not align to the appropriate P-12 state Learning Standards AND/OR Goals are absent or not measurable AND/OR Standards, objectives/targets, and learning tasks are not aligned with each other AND/OR Does not articulate objectives/targets that are appropriate for learners	**Meets Expectations**

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Plans aligned with the stated objective.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
B. Assessment of P-12 Learning (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.3 InTASC-2017.6.b	Planned assessments 1. Provide opportunities for learners to illustrate competence 2. Align with the P-12 state Learning Standards	Planned assessments 1. Provide opportunities for some learners to illustrate competence OR 2. Align with the P-12 state Learning Standards	Planned assessments 1. Are not included OR 2. Do not align with the P-12 state Learning Standards

Meets Expectations

Question Comments : *Comment Required

Formative assessment demonstrated by students applying the skill taught.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
C. Learning Target and Directions (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.3 InTASC-2017.7.c	Articulates an accurate and clear learning target AND Articulates accurate directions/explanations AND Sequences learning experiences appropriately	Articulates an inaccurate or unclear learning target AND/OR Articulates inaccurate directions/explanations	Does not articulate the learning target OR Does not articulate directions/explanations

Meets Expectations

Question Comments : *Comment Required

At the beginning of the lesson clearly articulated the learning objective and clearly stated the step by step directions.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
D. Checking for Understanding and Adjusting **Instruction through Formative Assessment** (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.3 InTASC-2017.8.b	Checks for understanding (whole class/group) during lessons using formative assessment AND Differentiates through adjustments to instruction (whole class/group)	Inconsistently checks for understanding during lessons using formative assessment AND Adjusts instruction accordingly, but adjustments may cause additional confusion	Does not check for understanding during lessons using formative assessment OR Does not make any adjustments based on learners' responses

Meets Expectations

Question Comments : *Comment Required

During the lesson, Nigar conducted check ins throughout the lesson and provided support to students who need it.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
E. Digital Tools and Resources (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.2 InTASC-2017.5.l InTASC-2017.6.i	Discusses AND uses developmentally appropriate technologies (digital tools and resources) that 1. Are relevant to learning objectives/ targets of the lesson 2. Engage learners in the demonstration of knowledge or skills	Discusses developmentally appropriate technologies (digital tools and resources) relevant to learning objectives/ targets of the lesson AND Technology is not available	One of the following: A. Does not use technologies (digital tools and resources) to engage learners AND Technology is available in the setting OR B. Use of technologies is not relevant to the learning objectives/ targets of the lesson OR C. Does not discuss technologies AND Technology is not available in the setting

Meets Expectations

Question Comments : *Comment Required

Nigar incorporated a video that was engaging and helped students visualize the writing process for a personal narrative.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
F. Safe and Respectful Learning Environment (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.1 InTASC-2017.3.d	Manages a safe and respectful learning environment through the use of routines and transitions (i.e., classroom management) AND	Attempts to manage a safe learning environment through the use of routines and transitions (i.e., classroom management) AND/OR Attempts to	Does not manage a safe learning environment (i.e., insufficient classroom management) OR Does not establish constructive relationships to engage learners

Meets Expectations

	Establishes and promotes constructive relationships to equitably engage learners	establish constructive relationships to engage learners	

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar promoted constructive relationships and created a respectful learning environment.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
G. Data- Guided Instruction (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.3 InTASC-2017.6.l	Uses data-informed decisions to design instruction and assessment	Uses minimal data to design instruction and assessment	Does not use data to design instruction and assessment

Meets Expectations

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar used the students' planning sheet to guide instruction for their planning.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
H. Feedback to Learners (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.3 InTASC-2017.6.d	Provides feedback that 1. Enables learners to recognize strengths OR areas for improvement AND Provides timely feedback	Provides minimal feedback that 1. Enables learners to recognize strengths OR areas for improvement OR Feedback is provided in a somewhat timely fashion	Does not provide feedback OR Feedback does not enable learners to recognize strengths OR areas for improvement OR Feedback is not provided in a timely fashion

Meets Expectations

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar provided timely feedback and engaged students in asking questions to check in on their understanding as she was teaching.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
I. Assessment Techniques (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.3 InTASC-2017.7.d	Evaluates and supports learning through assessment techniques that are 1. Developmentally appropriate 2. Formative	Assessment techniques are 1. Developmentally appropriate 2. Formative	Assessment techniques are 1. Developmentally inappropriate OR Not used

Meets Expectations

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Used formative assessment by having students write their plan on a graphic organizer.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
J. Connections to Research and Theory (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.1	Discusses and provides evidence of connections to educational research and/or theory	Mentions connections to educational research and/or theory	No connections OR inaccurate connections to educational research and/or theory

Does Not Meet Expectations

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar did not mention any connection to educational research and/or theory.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
K. Demonstrates Punctuality (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 InTASC-2017.9.o	Reports on time for experience AND Additional teacher engagements (e.g., IEPs, teacher committees)	Inconsistently reports on time for experience AND/OR Additional teacher engagements (e.g., IEPs, teacher committees)	Does not report on time for experience AND/OR Additional teacher engagements (e.g., IEPs, teacher committees)

Meets Expectations

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar regularly reports on time.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
L. Meets Deadlines and Obligations (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 InTASC-2017.9.o	Meets deadlines and obligations established by the cooperating teacher, instructor, and/or supervisor AND Informs all stakeholders (cooperating teacher, supervisor, instructor, and/or faculty members) of absences prior to the absence	Most of the time meets deadlines and obligations established by the cooperating teacher, instructor, and/or supervisor AND Informs some stakeholders (cooperating teacher, supervisor, instructor, and/or faculty members) of absences prior to the absence	Frequently misses deadlines or obligations established by the cooperating teacher, instructor, and/or supervisor AND/OR Does not inform stakeholders (cooperating teacher, supervisor, instructor, and/or faculty members) of absences prior to the absence

Meets Expectations

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar met all deadlines and informed, in advance, when she would be present or when she would not be present.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
M. Collaboration (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 InTASC-2017.10.b	Demonstrates collaborative relationships with cooperating teacher AND/OR members of the school community (other teachers, school personnel, administrators, etc.) AND Attempts to work with and learn from colleagues in planning and implementing instruction	Demonstrates collaborative relationships with cooperating teacher AND/OR members of the school community (other teachers, school personnel, administrators, etc.)	Does not demonstrate collaborative relationships with cooperating teacher AND/OR members of the school community (other teachers, school personnel, administrators, etc.)

Meets Expectations

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar demonstrated collaboration with me as the cooperating teacher to help plan her lesson.

	Meets Expectations (2.000 pts)	Emerging (1.000 pt)	Does Not Meet Expectations (0.000 pt)
N. Responds Positively to Feedback and Constructive Criticism (1.000, 7.1%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 InTASC-2017.9.n	Is receptive to feedback, constructive criticism, supervision, and responds professionally AND Incorporates feedback (e.g., from cooperating teacher, university supervisor) to improve practice	Is receptive to feedback, constructive criticism, and supervision AND/OR Incorporates feedback inconsistently	Is not receptive to feedback, constructive criticism, and supervision AND/OR Does not incorporate feedback

Meets Expectations

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar responds professionally and respectfully to feedback.

Section Weight: 0%

School Setting: Part A

School Setting (This section's scoring will not affect the student's overall score. The point values are for reporting purposes only.) (1.000, 100.0%) **Suburban**

Question Comments :

Section Weight: 0%

Element 1Method of Instructional Delivery (This section's scoring will not affect the student's overall score. The point values are for reporting purposes only.) (1.000, 100.0%) **In Person Only**

Question Comments :

Section Weight: 0%

Pre-SCRIP Dispositions Assessment Rubric

Dear Host Teacher, Cooperating Teacher, or On-site Mentor,

Before completing the SCRIP/Pre-SCRIP assessment, please review the SCRIP/Pre-SCRIP Scorer Training video. This video will explain the importance of this assessment and will provide direction on how to accurately score the candidate using the instrument. The video is less than 15 minutes in length. Here is the link: https://watch.liberty.edu/media/t/1_103thmlr

Comments are not required for indicators that meet the standard. However, please leave a comment on any standard indicator that your candidate scored "does not meet - developing" or "no evidence" to help him/her grow in their practice.

Also attached is a copy of the PowerPoint used in the video in case you would like to refer back to the slides after watching the training. Thank you so much for investing in the training and preparation of future educators!

Attachments: SCRIP__Pre_SCRIP_Scorer_Training_200602.pptx

	Level 2: Met-Proficient (2.000 pts)	Level 1: Not Met-Developing (1.000 pt)	Level 0: No Evidence (0.000 pt)	Level 2: Met - Proficient

A. Social Responsibility (1.000, 10.0%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 CAEP-Revised-Advanced-2022.RA1.1f InTASC-2017.9.m NASDTEC-MCEE-2015.3	The candidate demonstrates a sense of fairness, justice, and equity for all students	The candidate states that all students can learn BUT the candidate's actions do not confirm the belief.	No evidence provided.

Question Comments : *Comment Required

Nigar demonstrated fairness throughout her lesson.

	Level 2: Met-Proficient (2.000 pts)	Level 1: Not Met-Developing (1.000 pt)	Level 0: No Evidence (0.000 pt)
B. Social Responsibility (1.000, 10.0%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 CAEP-Revised-Advanced-2022.RA1.1f InTASC-2017.10.c NASDTEC-MCEE-2015.3	The candidate interacts effectively with students and/or teachers to provide a positive, structured, safe learning environment.	The classroom environment is lacking in positive affirmation, structure, OR safety.	No evidence provided.

Level 2: Met - Proficient

Question Comments : *Comment Required

Nigar provided a positive and structured learning environment.

	Level 2: Met-Proficient (2.000 pts)	Level 1: Not Met-Developing (1.000 pt)	Level 0: No Evidence (0.000 pt)

Level 2: Met - Proficient

C. Commitment (1.000, 10.0%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 CAEP-Revised-Advanced-2022.RA1.1f InTASC-2017.10.p NASDTEC-MCEE-2015.1	The candidate follows through on commitments and takes responsibilities seriously while meeting deadlines	The candidate makes commitments that he/she is unable to keep.	No evidence provided.

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar followed through on commitments and responsibilities.

	Level 2: Met-Proficient (2.000 pts)	**Level 1: Not Met-Developing (1.000 pt)**	**Level 0: No Evidence (0.000 pt)**
D. Commitment (1.000, 10.0%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 CAEP-Revised-Advanced-2022.RA1.1f InTASC-2017.9.k NASDTEC-MCEE-2015.1	The candidate shows the self-discipline and work ethic essential to be planned, prepared and organized for successful instruction and learning/ or leadership and supervision to occur. AND The candidate completes assigned tasks on time.	The candidate's lack of planning, preparation, or organization hinders successful instruction or leadership. OR The candidate completes assigned tasks after the deadline.	No evidence provided.

Level 2: Met - Proficient

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar completed tasks on time and demonstrated self-discipline and work ethic.

	Level 2: Met-Proficient (2.000 pts)	**Level 1: Not Met-Developing (1.000 pt)**	**Level 0: No Evidence (0.000 pt)**

Level 2: Met - Proficient

E. Reflective Practice (1.000, 10.0%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 CAEP-Revised-Advanced-2022.RA1.1f InTASC-2017.9.c NASDTEC-MCEE-2015.2	The candidate thoughtfully considers educational matters and the practice of teaching to make informed decisions	The candidate spends little time reflecting on the practice of teaching to make informed decisions.	No evidence provided.

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar carefully considered the class and their lesson to make an informed decision about her lessons.

	Level 2: Met-Proficient (2.000 pts)	Level 1: Not Met-Developing (1.000 pt)	Level 0: No Evidence (0.000 pt)
F. Reflective Practice (1.000, 10.0%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 CAEP-Revised-Advanced-2022.RA1.1f InTASC-2017.9.c NASDTEC-MCEE-2015.2	The candidate makes choices after pondering ideas and experiences.	The candidate acts quickly before thinking about the results.	No evidence provided.

Level 2: Met - Proficient

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar demonstrated that she thinks before acting.

	Level 2: Met-Proficient (2.000 pts)	Level 1: Not Met-Developing (1.000 pt)	Level 0: No Evidence (0.000 pt)

Level 2: Met - Proficient

G. Integrity (1.000, 10.0%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 CAEP-Revised-Advanced-2022.RA1.1f InTASC-2017.9.o NASDTEC-MCEE-2015.2	The candidate models good citizenship and acts in an ethical and moral manner. AND The candidate values honesty inside and outside of the classroom and school.	The candidate does not follow the rules or the law. OR The candidate acts in a way which causes others to question his/her ethics or morals.	No evidence provided.

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar demonstrated model citizenship and ethics.

	Level 2: Met-Proficient (2.000 pts)	**Level 1: Not Met-Developing (1.000 pt)**	**Level 0: No Evidence (0.000 pt)**
H. Integrity (1.000, 10.0%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 CAEP-Revised-Advanced-2022.RA1.1f ISTE.2.3 ISTE.LDR.3 InTASC-2017.10.g NASDTEC-MCEE-2015.5	The candidate demonstrates a positive commitment to consuming, creating, distributing, and communicating information through all technologies.	The candidate lacks professional discretion when consuming, creating, distributing, and/or communicating through the use of all technologies.	No evidence provided.

Level 2: Met - Proficient

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar demonstrated the ability to communicate information through all technologies.

	Level 2: Met-Proficient (2.000 pts)	Level 1: Not Met-Developing (1.000 pt)	Level 0: No Evidence (0.000 pt)
I. Professionalism (1.000, 10.0%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 CAEP-Revised-Advanced-2022.RA1.1f InTASC-2017.10.c NASDTEC-MCEE-2015.2	The candidate demonstrates appropriate behavior; possesses patience, self-control, and flexibility when obstacles or difficult situations occur. AND The candidate manages personal emotions and feelings and reacts reasonably to situations. AND The candidate acts confidently and maturely.	The candidate is impatient or inflexible, lacks personal management skills and confidence.	No evidence provided.

Level 2: Met - Proficient

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar demonstrated clear professionalism at all times.

	Level 2: Met-Proficient (2.000 pts)	Level 1: Not Met-Developing (1.000 pt)	Level 0: No Evidence (0.000 pt)
J. Professionalism (1.000, 10.0%) CAEP-Initial-2022.R1.4 CAEP-Revised-Advanced-2022.RA1.1f InTASC-2017.9.c NASDTEC-MCEE-2015.2	The candidate effectively uses the English language in speech and writing.	The candidate has many errors in written communication.	No evidence provided.

Level 2: Met - Proficient

Question Comments : ***Comment Required**

Nigar effectively used English in writing and speech.

Pre-SCRIP Dispositions Assessment Rubric Comments : *Comment Required

Nigar demonstrated excellent professionalism, integrity and actively sought feedback.

Overall Evaluation Comments

Comments: *Required

Nigar was an excellent intern and did an excellent job teaching her language arts lesson.

Evaluation Score Summary

Title:	Score	Weight	Adj. Score	
Primary Evaluation	0.00	100.00%	0.00	*Finalized*
			0.00	