

2.9 Enhances content instruction through a thorough understanding of all Colorado P-12 Academic standards and bases lesson plans and long-term plans on content standards. (CO 4.2)

	Basic (1.0 - 1.9)	Developing (2.0 - 2.9)	Proficient (3.0 - 3.9)	Advanced (4.0)
Alignment	Lessons in content areas consistently do not support state standards in <u>any</u> of the following ways: standards, expectations, and outcomes are not listed on the lesson plan; objectives are not aligned with these; activities and input are not aligned with these; assessment is not aligned with these	All lessons included in the portfolio support state standards in all of the following ways: standards and expectations are listed on the lesson plan, objectives are aligned with standards and benchmarks, activities and input are aligned with standards and benchmarks, assessment is aligned with standards and benchmarks	Meets criteria for "developing" and demonstrates consistency across lessons in areas of responsibility; daily lessons during student teaching cite standards and benchmarks either on written lesson plans or visually displayed for students; consistency = at least 90% of lessons observed	Meets criteria for "proficient" and shows thorough understanding of alignment by modifying commercial and basal lesson plans to more appropriately align with Colorado standards (e.g., eliminating activities that are not aligned)
Objectives	Lesson objectives consistently fail to include <u>one or more</u> of the following: observable, measureable behavior, all important conditions, mastery criteria; objectives may not match the assessment of the lesson	Lesson objectives may have inconsistent errors in one of the following: observable, measureable behavior, all important conditions, mastery criteria; objectives match the assessment of the lesson	Lesson objectives written across all content areas of responsibility in daily lessons include observable, measureable behavior, all important conditions, and mastery criteria; errors may occur but are infrequent and inconsistent (e.g., mastery criteria may not be stated in terms of the assessment used and some behaviors may not be directly observable; however these are not consistent errors)	Meets criteria for "proficient" and shows consistency in developing objectives in meeting all criteria; criteria = all criteria present in >90% of lessons reviewed
Long Term Planning	No evidence OR s/he develops units/long term plans that are a sequence of unrelated objectives and activities and/or do not build on prerequisite knowledge/skills	Develops a unit/long term plan that sequences related objectives; however, the plan contains too few plans to determine if student is proficient (e.g., 2-3 plans related to a specific learning benchmark)	Develops a well-sequenced series of lessons built on content standards in which the lessons develop more complex behavior related to a specific standard/benchmarks	Meets criteria for "proficient" and provides evidence from more than one long term plan, in more than one area of responsibility (e.g., if a Social Studies teacher these might be history and geography)
	No evidence of ability to task analyze published benchmarks to identify and sequence objectives to build complex knowledge/skills	Lesson objectives demonstrate that important dimensions of the long term goals have been considered in developing and sequencing lesson objectives	Demonstrates skills at task analyzing goals/expectations to develop a sequence of objectives that build more complex knowledge/skills in at least one content area	Meets criteria for "proficient" and demonstrates flexibility by task analyzing goals/expectations into learning objectives in more than one content area

NOTE: Understanding of knowledge in content areas is assessed in Standard 2.11.

Operationalization/Criteria:

Guidelines for Admission to Education:

1. Benchmark at admission is: *Utilizes the Colorado Standards in planning and aligning instruction, including writing of lesson plan objectives in content areas based on standards and benchmarks.*
2. This benchmark requires a rating of "developing" on dimensions 1 and 2.
3. To evaluate, review all lesson plans included in the portfolio for this standard. The OVERALL rating is an average of the ratings on the two dimensions.
4. Students earning ratings in "1" should receive feedback about consistent errors; ratings of "1" should result in a recommendation of admission with reservations and the request for support for the student; this is a critical prerequisite skill for success in other methods courses.

Examples of Evidence: Portfolio exhibits of lesson plans

Guidelines for Admission to Student Teaching:

1. Benchmark at admission is: *Utilizes the Colorado Standards in planning and aligning instruction in daily lessons & long term plans based on standards & benchmarks.*
2. This benchmark requires a rating of "developing" on dimensions 1, 2, and 3
3. To evaluate, review all lesson plans and the unit included in the portfolio for this standard. The OVERALL rating is an average of the ratings on the three dimensions.

Examples of Evidence: Portfolio exhibits of lesson plans and units, field experience ratings by classroom teachers

Guidelines for Program Completion/Student Teaching:

1. Required for program completion are ratings of "proficient" on all dimensions.
2. Observe a variety of lessons in different content areas of responsibility in the student's lesson plan book.
3. Observe student teacher's ability to task analyze and develop benchmarks and lesson objectives based on standards and existing benchmarks in unit plans/TWS.
4. Observe for teacher consistency in implementing plans that align curricula; interview cooperating teacher to evaluate consistency.
5. Evaluate student teacher reflections for understanding of planning strategies.
5. The narrative for the Inventory should specify an example of a skill/observation that led to the rating, e.g.: *All lesson plans in her TWS on "Nation Building" were aligned with content standards in history, geography, literacy, and technology, building more complex skills across plans in all areas.*

Examples of Evidence: TWS, lesson plans, lesson plan book of daily lessons, direct observation of teaching, interview with others who have observed teaching

Rationale:

Allen, D.D. (1995). *Developing thematic units: Process and product*. Albany, NY: Delmar.

Bloom, B.S. (Ed.). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: Longman.

Colorado Department of Education. *Colorado model content standards*. Available at <http://www.cde.state.co.us/>.

English, R.E., & Reigeluth, C.M. (1996). Formative evaluation research on sequencing instruction with elaboration theory. *Educational Technology and Research Journal*, 44, 23-41.

Gagne, R.M. (1985). *Conditions of learning and theory of instruction* (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Gronlund, N.E., & Brookhart, S.M. (2008). *Writing instructional objectives* (8th ed.). Upper saddle river, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kovalik, S. (1993). *ITI: The model. Integrated thematic instruction* (2nd ed.). Village of Oak Creek, AZ: Books for Educators.

Mager, R.F. (1984). *Preparing instructional objectives* (2nd revised ed.). Belmont, CA: Pitman Learning.

Posner, G.J., & Strike, K.A. (1976). A categorization scheme for principles of sequencing content. *Review of Educational Research*, 46, 665-690.

Rosenshine, B.V. (1987). Explicit teaching. In D.C. Berliner & B.V. Rosenshine (Eds.), *Talks to teachers* (pp. 75-92). New York: Random House.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Curriculum & Instruction.