5.3 Creates and implements a range of long term plans, including thematic units, interdisciplinary/integrated units, literature-based units, and units based on commercial basal materials. (CO: 3.1)

Note: Components of the TWS/unit that align with assessment, instructional, or other standards are not addressed here but with those standards.

		Basic (1.0 - 1.9)	Developing (2.0 - 2.9)	Proficient (3.0 - 3.9)	Advanced (4.0)
Long Range Plans		No evidence that daily plans are aligned with weekly plans, unit plans, and term/course planning (yearly MAPP if applicable)	Plans a unit that aligns with term or yearly plans (may be demonstrated by classroom teacher approving that unit plans align)	Provides evidence that daily and unit planning consistently align with term or yearly plans/curriculum maps	Provides evidence of aligning weekly, unit, and term/course planning; if a secondary teacher, demonstrates evidence of effectively developing course syllabi
		No evidence of unit planning; lessons planned day to day	Evidence of completion of at least one unit plan	Plans units in more than one curricular area (e.g., for secondary social studies these could be history, geography, economics)	Uses long range planning as integral part of instructional planning in all curricular areas, planning long term beyond requirements for course/ student teaching
		Either no unit plan present or plans unit that is over 50% based on commercial basal materials	Can plan a unit using at least one of these formats: thematic units, interdisciplinary/integrated units, literature-based units, discipline-based organization, and units based on commercial basal materials	Can plan and implement at least two different units using different formats, including: thematic units, interdisciplinary/integrated units, literature-based units, discipline-based organization, and units based on commercial basal materials	Shows creativity and flexibility in planning and implementing units using a variety of formats, including : thematic units, interdisciplinary/integrated units, literature-based units, discipline-based organization, and units based on commercial basal materials
Planned Components		No evidence of a unit plan or plan does not include all of the following components: goals/generalizations, rationale, contextual analysis, lesson plans, assessment plan, assessment data (may be from one lesson or pre-test), reflection	Completes plans for at least one unit plan in which all of the following components are present: goals/generalizations, rationale, contextual analysis, lesson plans, assessment plan; pre-test, reflection or self-evaluation	Demonstrates consistency in unit planning by planning a unit with all components: goals/generalizations, rationale, contextual analysis, lesson plans, assessment plan, assessment data (may be from one lesson or pre-test), reflection	Meets criteria for "Proficient" and demonstrates fluency in planning and implementing more than one unit
		Does not gather sufficient information of teaching/learning context: demonstrates insufficient, irrelevant, stereotypic, biased knowledge of any of the following: community, school, classroom factors; student characteristics and knowledge	Gathers comprehensive information that demonstrates understanding of contextual characterstics (for individual students, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities that may affect learning) and explains general implications for instruction and assessment based on some (but not all) student and community, school, and classroom characteristics	Gathers comprehensive information that demonstrates understanding of contextual characterstics and includes specific implications for instruction and assessment based on individual student differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics	Meets all criteria for "Proficient;" provides a research base for decision making based on contextual factors

Planned Components	Long range plans not always based on Colorado/district standards in multiple curricular areas (e.g., for social studies they might be history, economics, geography, etc.)	At least one long range plan based on Colorado/district standards with aligned standards, expectations, and outcomes with unit goals and lesson objectives; inadequate examples of alignment may occur for some alignment or unit goals/ generalizations and/or lesson objectives with Colorado standards	Long range plans based on district/Colorado standards expectations, and outcomes in different curricular areas; unit is planned around a "big idea"/generalizations and goals and aligned with well-developed benchmarks and/or lesson objectives; all levels are good examples with only minor/inconsistent errors	Meets all criteria for "Proficient" with consistent alignment; unit generalizations and objectives demonstrate alignment with the 21st Century and Work Force goals
	Goals are ineffective in one or more of the following: not aligned with standards, not appropriate to meet student needs (e.g., prerequisite skills, interests), not outcomes (activities), reflect only one type or level of learning	Some (but not all) of goals meet the following criteria: clearly stated as outcomes, appropriate to level or interests of students, aligned with standards, reflect several types of levels of learning and are significant	All goals meet the following criteria: clearly stated as outcomes, appropriate to level or interests of students, aligned with standards, reflect several types of levels of learning and are significant	Goals meet the criteria for "Proficient" in more than one unit
	Cannot/does not use preassessments to gain student information useful for long-term planning OR assessment occurred after objectives and lessons were planned	Can plan preassessments to gain student information useful for long-term planning but may either not implement before planning OR make errors in analyzing results	Uses preassessment information to plan units following the guidelines of both a thorough contextual analysis and thorough pre-assessment student data; implements assessment before planning unit objectives and lessons	For more than one unit: uses preassessment information to plan units following the guidelines of both a thorough contextual analysis and thorough pre-assessment student data; implements assessment before planning unit objectives and lessons
	Lessons poorly developed and/or randomly sequenced	Sequences lessons to build on previous knowledge but at least one example of poor or random sequencing of content; ineffective relationships and patterns made across subject areas (interdisciplinary); ineffective introductory, developmental, culminating aspects	Sequences all lessons to build on previous knowledge and lesson outcomes build on one another to meet unit goal (see 3 components in "Developing")	Sequences all lessons to build on previous knowledge; during implementation of the unit may revise sequencing based on ongoing student data; lessons build to provide increasingly more authentic/higher order thinking outcomes
Content Integration	Cannot/does not integrate more than two of the following types of goals in long-term plans: cognitive, affective, learning, technology, social	Does integrate at least 4 of the following types of goals in long-term plans: cognitive, affective, learning, technology, social	Integrates all of the following goals aliong with content goals in long-term plans: cognitive, affective, learning, technology, and social	Shows creativity and flexibility in integrating content goals along with the following in more than one long-term plan: cognitive, affective, learning, technology, and social
	Cannot/does not integrate content from different disciplines or fields into unit	Integrates some content from different disciplines in a unit; may be in separate lessons; some content may not be integral to overall unit goals/"big idea" of unit	Integrates content from different disciplines in a way that reinforces the overall goals/"big idea" of the unit and are integral to the unit plan	Shows flexibility in integrating content from different disciplines within the unit and within lessons content from different disciplines in a way that reinforces the overall goals/"big idea" of the unit and are integral to the unit plan; integrates content within lessons, not always as separate lessons

	No evidence that a lesson from a unit plan is implemented	Implements at least one lesson from a planned unit	Implements all activities of a unit (assessment, lessons, etc.)	Demonstrates fluency by implementing more than one unit
Reflection	No evidence of reflection or self-evaluation of the unit or reflection does not address <u>any</u> of the areas listed below:	Reflection is written for at least one aspect implemented in the unit (assessment/lesson planning) and meets criteria listed below OR reflections for an implemented unit meet all of the following criteria:	Reflections are routinely written (at least 25% of lessons and unit) and provide evidence that the teacher understands how to alter written long range plans and assessments to enhance learning; Examples address all of the following:	Reflections documented for more than one unit that meet the criteria for "Proficient"
	a. Provides no evidence/reasons for conclusions OR conclusions are irrelevant or inaccurate	a. Conclusions are relevant and accurate and use evidence to connect learning goals, instruction, and assessment in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction; misunderstandings, simplistic hypotheses, or conceptual gaps may be present	a. Logically connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in discussion of student learning and effective instruction	
	b. Doesn't identify successful and unsuccessful activities/assessments OR provides no rationale for why some activities or assessments were more successful than others	b. Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities/assessments but superficially explores reasons for their success or lack thereof (no use of theory or research)	b. Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provides plausible reasons for their success or lack thereof (based on theory or research)	
	c. No ideas OR inappropriate ideas for redesigning goals, instruction, or assessment	c. Provides ideas for redesign of at least one of the following: learning goals, instruction, assessment but may offer no reasons/rationale for why changes would improve learning	c. Provides ideas for redesign of learning goals, instruction, assessment and explains why changes would improve learning	
	d. No evidence that written plans/assessments were changed to enhance learning	d. Provides plans for at least one specific change to instruction or assessment but may not implement them	d. As unit/TWS is implemented, makes changes based on student outcomes to enhance learning (more than one change documented)	

Operationalization/Criteria:

Guidelines for Admission to Education: *Not evaluated at admission*

Guidelines for Admission to Student Teaching: *Meets criteria for "developing" in all dimensions*

1. Benchmark at admission to student teaching is a rating of "developing" for all dimensions.

2. To evaluate, supervisors should review the material in the portfolio that is attached to the standard.

Examples of Evidence: unit plan, mini-TWS

Guidelines for Program Completion/Student Teaching:

1. Required for program completion is a rating of "proficient" for all dimensions

2. Evaluate the TWS and other unit plan to assure student teacher's thoroughness and fluency in planning.

3. Observe student teacher's ability to utilize a variety of strategies (per criteria in inventory) to implement each type of long term effectively.

4. Observe for success in sequencing plans and in individualizing based on information about students.

5. Evaluate student teacher reflections for understanding of planning strategies.

6. Evaluate for discipline specific and interdisciplinary standards-based plans.

3. A possible Inventory narrative should describe an example of student performance: e.g., *He completed an integrated unit (TWS) on bird migration,*
    with all components meeting criteria for proficiency on the TEP rubric.

Examples of Evidence:

Review of TWS, observation of teaching from the TWS, interviews with teacher with whom the student collaborated on TWS, unit plans in eportfolio

Rationale:

Borich, G.D. (2007). *Effective teaching methods* , 6th ed. Teaching effective methods. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Girod, G.R. (Ed.). (2002). *Connecting teaching and learning: A handbook for teacher educators on teacher work sample methodology.* Washington, D.C.: AACTE Publications.

Henning, J,E., & Robinson, V/ (2004). The teacher work sample: Implementing stabndards-based assessment. *The Teacher Educator, 30(4),* 231-248.

Kauchak, D.P., & Eggen, P.D. (1998). *Learning & teaching: Research based methods* , 3rd ed. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

McConney, A. Shalock, M.D., & Schlock, H.D. (1998). Focusing improvement and quality assurance: Work samples as authentic performance measures of prospective
    teachers' effectiveness. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 11, 343-363.*

Parkay, F., & Hass, G. (2005). Curriculum planning: A comprehensive approach, 7th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Morrison, G.R., Ross, S.M., Kemp, J.E., & Kalman, H.K. (2007), *Designing effective instruction,* 5th ed. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Roberts, P.L., & Kellough, R.D. (2008). *A guide for developing interdisciplinary thematic units* , 4th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality: Teacher Work Sample . Available at http://www.uni.edu/itq/PDF_files/June2002promptandrubric.pdf.

Wood, K.E.(2010). *Interdisciplinary instruction for all learners K-8: A practical guide* , 4th ed. Upper Saddle Rivers, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.