

Lesson Plan Rubric

Overview: This Lesson Plan Rubric was developed by a Rubric Writing Team made up of interdisciplinary faculty members within the School of Teacher Education and Leadership (STEL) and the Music Department, and three A&P Faculty members in the Dean's Office, who regularly supervise students in Field Experience settings. This rubric is to be used over the course of the Early Field Experience and Student Teaching to guide and scaffold students' efforts and professional development. The Lesson Plan Rubric is used by university supervisors to rate teacher candidates on 12 evaluation categories based upon and tagged with InTASC standards as well as the respective SPA standards when applicable.

The Lesson Plan Rubric: The lesson plan rubric is used to evaluate teacher candidates' ability to create original, standards-based lessons for diverse groups of learners. Teacher candidates will be evaluated with this rubric once during early field (or pre-student teaching) experience(s) and once during student teaching experience(s). This tool will capture teacher candidates' development over time as they learn about the planning process across their experiences. University supervisors will use the rubric to scaffold teacher candidates' understanding of the planning process as well as the considerations that have to be made to ensure learning occurs. The data collected from these instruments will be shared with faculty to assist them as they make curricular and programmatic decisions.

University Supervisors may have their candidates complete as many lesson plans as is preferred for the program. However, for reporting purposes in Tk20, only **one** Lesson Plan Rubric for **Early Field Experience** (if applicable) and **one** Lesson Plan for **Student Teaching** is completed, resulting in two to four scored lesson plans depending on the specific program.

Ratings and Basis for Judgement: The rubrics differentiate between four levels of performance – *unsatisfactory, emerging, satisfactory, and proficient*. The performance indicators are based upon criteria and language found in the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0 (2013).¹ This release stipulates that the InTASC standards no longer apply to only “beginning” teachers, but are instead intended as “professional practice standards” (p. 6). Therefore, these standards and the associated learning progressions describe a teacher's professional development throughout his or her career. We would not expect to see a large number of proficient ratings in early field experience. Rather, we, and our respective accrediting agencies and SPAs would expect to see development across experiences with students earning more “emerging” ratings in earlier phases and progressing toward “satisfactory” or “proficient” in later phases. Furthermore, these ratings are based upon expectations for teacher candidates who are still in our programs. Based upon this assumption, a Satisfactory rating is relatively high and one that most of our teacher candidates are expected to achieve by the completion of their student teaching. Ratings of Proficient should only be awarded to the teacher candidates who can consistently and independently demonstrate exemplary classroom performance per the rubric evaluation categories.

The rating levels *DO NOT translate into A – F grades*. Instead, the rubrics are designed to generate data that will reveal patterns of student performance at various stages of development across the learning progressions. These data are intended to guide continual improvement of our preparation of teachers. All candidates perform differently. However, it is expected that on most indicators, those in *early field experience typically would be rated at the Emerging level and progress to the Satisfactory level by the end of their student teaching experience*. *To reiterate*, ratings of Proficient are only awarded for exemplary performance and this rating needs to reflect all of the “Satisfactory” criteria in addition to a preponderance of the “Proficient” criteria.

Validity and Reliability: The Rubric Writing Team conducted exercises to establish validity and reliability on this instrument. They established three types of validity, content validity, face validity, and structural validity. The content and face validity was established by a panel of content experts who evaluated each item based on InTASC model for core teaching standards. Each instrument underwent multiple rounds of validation and scrutiny to establish both content and face validity. During the 2016-2017 Academic Year, the Lawshe method will be used to further establish content validity. During the 2015-2016 Academic Year, these instruments were piloted. The Lesson Plan Rubric was constructed as a unidimensional construct with one main construct to measure, the ability to develop an effective lesson plan. Further analysis of internal consistency validated the alpha value, the inter-item correlation analysis suggested a positive and high correlation among the items within each subscale and all items within the instrument. The Lesson Plan Rubric consisted of 12 items with a high internal consistency ($\alpha = .88$). The results of this analysis and data will be used to inform revisions and administration of the instruments in the 2017-2018 Academic Year. The validity and reliability processes will be guided by the CAEP Instrument Rubric² and the CAEP Evidence Guide.

¹ http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2013/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf

² <http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/caep-assessment-rubric-june2016.pdf?la=en>

Date of Lesson: _____ Time of Lesson: _____ Grade Level: _____ Subject(s): _____

If needed, Date of Revised Lesson Scoring: _____

Length of Lesson: _____

<i>The candidate...</i>						
Lesson Plan Item	N/A	Unsatisfactory (1)	Emerging (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Proficient (4)	Comments
Standard(s) and Objective(s)		does not identify SOL standards or objective.	lists the number and the wording of the SOL and/or other curriculum resource objectives, if available, to create whole class learning objective(s).	identifies SOL and then refines the learning objective(s) based on an understanding of their students' learning and development.	and... collaborates with students in identifying personalized learning objective(s).	
Vocabulary (InTASC 4 h, j, l); (SPA #)		does not identify vocabulary.	identifies only content vocabulary with no or limited definitions.	identifies and correctly defines all new vocabulary in language that is clear, and appropriate for students.	and... provides opportunities for students to learn and use vocabulary throughout the lesson.	
Assessment (InTASC 6 a, b, g); (SPA #)		does not list or include assessments; or assessments are not aligned with the learning objective(s).	includes assessments that are limited in type (e.g., only summative) and/or are poorly aligned to learning objective(s).	includes a variety of classroom assessments (formative and summative) which align with the learning objective.	and... designs and utilizes a variety of assessment tools which take into consideration student learning difference and provide multiple ways to demonstrate performance.	
Student Considerations: Developmental and Challenge (InTASC 1 b; 2 a, c, e, f); (SPA #)		plan is identical for all students —disregards the developmental needs, cultural, linguistic, social exceptionality, and/or background knowledge of students.	plan reflects a basic understanding of child/adolescent development, new language acquisition, exceptional needs, and/or students' background knowledge; plan does not meet the basic	plan includes strategies, modified materials, tools, and/or technology that reflects legal requirements ; plan includes an appropriate balance of support/challenge to move all students forward.	and ... plan goes beyond legal requirements to make content and academic language accessible to diverse students; anticipates challenges across a range of differences, and plans	

			legal requirements for some populations.		adaptations, scaffolds, enrichment , and/or acceleration to promote quality work in deepening academic content from all students	
Instructional Resources, Materials, and Technology (InTASC 3 d, e, g); (SPA #)		has no list or only includes an inappropriate list of materials, resources and technology . The selected materials do not fit the context of the lesson and/or needs of the students.	resources, materials, and technology are listed, however some are inappropriate, do not fit support the content, and or support student learning.	resources, materials, and technology listed are appropriate for the learners and the content.	and... includes a range of materials, resources, and technologies to engage learners and provide for optimal learning. Additional resources are listed to extend learning or remediate as needed.	
Procedures: Beginning/ Anticipatory Set (InTASC 2 c, d); (SPA #)		does not include an opening to the lesson.	plans an opening statement of what topic will be covered.	plans an opening statement/experience of the topic to generate interest in the lesson amongst students.	and... makes connections to students' prior knowledge thus making the lesson content more accessible to the students.	
Other Personnel in the classroom (InTASC 3 a, c); (SPA #)		no plans or instruction provided for other adults (who are expected to be present) are considered.	lists names of other adults (who are expected to be present) during the lesson.	lists names and describes role of the other adults (expected to be in the present) during the lesson.	and... plans roles and directions for/with other adults in order to promote full student engagement.	
Procedures: Middle (engagement) (InTASC 7 a); (SPA #)		planned activities are inappropriate and/or do not align with the content being presented.	planned activities align with the content standards and/or learning objectives.	chooses instructional tools, methods and strategies that are aligned and developmentally appropriate for most students.	and... chooses developmentally appropriate strategies, methods, and instructional tools to provide for student choice and mastery of lesson objectives.	

<p>Procedures: Middle (Candidate's role(s)) (InTASC 8 d); (SPA #)</p>		<p>does not provide evidence of her/his instructional role in relation to the content and purposes of the instruction.</p>	<p>provides evidence of only assuming one instructional role (such as only providing direct instruction) where varied roles would have been more appropriate for the content and purposes of the instruction.</p>	<p>varies her/his role in the instructional process (e.g., instructor, facilitator, coach, audience), if appropriate, in relation to the content and purposes of the instruction.</p>	<p>and... expands her/his teaching roles (e.g., instructor, facilitator, coach, audience) and employs them to tailor instruction and challenge all learners</p>	
<p>Procedures: Middle (varied presentation) (InTASC 4 a); (SPA #)</p>		<p>represents the content and goal(s) of the lesson inappropriately and/or inaccurately.</p>	<p>represents the content of the lesson using one method or example based on the lesson's goals.</p>	<p>represents the content in multiple ways (e.g., chunk information, provide multiple examples/non-examples, use graphic organizers, technology, etc.) related to the key points of the lesson.</p>	<p>and... the representations of the content supports the diverse needs of the students and promotes individual student's achievement of the content standards.</p>	
<p>Procedures: The End/ Closing (InTASC 7 c, f); (SPA #)</p>		<p>does not provide a closing or inadequately synthesizes or reinforces points from the lesson.</p>	<p>synthesizes and reinforces major points from the lesson as part of the closure.</p>	<p>synthesizes major points and previews learning to come as part of the closure.</p>	<p>and... involves students in the review of the content to provide the teacher with information about student learning as part of the closure.</p>	
<p>Reflection: (InTASC 6 c, g, j, l); (SPA #)</p>		<p>does not use data to guide instruction and adjust learning activities.</p>	<p>uses inappropriate and/or minimal data for analysis to guide instruction and adjust learning activities to meet student needs.</p>	<p>uses assessment data that aligns with the objectives to guide the design of differentiated learning experiences and assessments.</p>	<p>and... gathers additional data and anecdotal notes to better understand student progress and expand the range of student supports.</p>	