Assessment Tool: ***Lesson Plan (Instructional Design)***

Assessment Purpose: Faculty of identified courses and/or experiences will assign candidates the task of researching, writing, analyzing, and in some courses implementing, a lesson plan. The practice of lesson planning allows the candidate to understand the connections between assessment, state and national standards, the content, and sound pedagogy. Each course along the continuum, from introduction to instructional design to methods and ending with the TPA builds progressively the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to effectively plan for student growth. With each step along that path assignments and assessments cultivate the spirit of reflective among our candidates.

Faculty Instructions: Faculty will create the lesson-plan prompt which reflect the specific goals and outcomes of the course. Generally, there is a progression of experiences - ***based on the cycles as described below*** - for each course. While the prompts will vary by course, the metric to evaluate candidate progress will be the same, being the **Lesson Plan Rubric.** While faculty are welcome to use this rubric to do so, it is understood that you might also use your unique scoring process for the purpose of course grades, which is a separate event. For the purposes of tracking candidate growth and development within the CAEP and EPSB frameworks, faculty will report the following information for data-collection purposes:

1) A description of the prompt and how it relates to your ***course goals** (*It is assumed that these are aligned with a set of Standards, your SPA/Content and/or other State or National Standards).
2) A description or copy of the instructions given to students, with specific reference to the feedback process. This should reflect how students who do not meet the target performance are given the opportunity to improve and resubmit the task.
3) The number of students in your course who completed the lesson plan.
4) A demographic breakdown of those students by their level, gender, race, and major.
5) The results of the assessment tool: percentage meeting target first round, percentage requiring second attempt, and so on.

As you design your assessment prompt, then backward plan the instruction and experiences, keep these Standards in mind:

CAEP Standard #1, Content and Pedagogical Knowledge: *The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward the attainment of college-and-career readiness standards.*

1.1 – Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s)[i] in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

1.2 - Provider Responsibilities

Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice.

1.3 - Provider Responsibilities

Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM).

1.4 - Provider Responsibilities

Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career

Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).

1.5 - Provider Responsibilities

Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.

2.3 – Clinical Experiences

The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple, performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

Kentucky Framework for Teaching (PGES) and InTASC Standards are tagged below in the rubric.

Lesson Plan Cycles and Corresponding InTASC Standards

Each Program/Certification Area determines the sequence of required courses for its candidates.
The three cycles below provide a guideline for implementation.

All Program/Certification Areas are aware of the requirement to offer candidates at least a three-cycle, progressive approach to Lesson Planning (Instructional Design)

Cycle I: The first course to introduce pedagogy **Expected Level:** Ineffective/Novice	**Cycle II:** The next to explore pedagogy and/or Methods Course **Expected Level:** Emergent/Developing	**Cycle III:** The TPA experience **Expected Level:** Developing/Target
Candidates are introduced to instructional design, how and why thoughtful planning of lessons and units is practiced. At this level, they are often simply learning and applying in an exploratory sense. Their level of performance during Cycle I is expected to be Novice, the candidate can describe the elements of the process but is not prepared to carry out plans in a classroom. Candidates demonstrate acquisition of new content from significant learning experiences. The Lesson Plan prompt provides evidence of gaining knowledge, making sense of new experiences, or making linkages between old and new information.	Candidates are now engaged in one on one, small group, and mentored, supervised field experiences. Their level of performance during Cycle II field experiences is expected to be at the emerging and developing stages through which instructors should see movement from reflective novices to beginning-level aware practitioners. Candidates demonstrate thoughts about or challenges to planning for classroom management, timing, individual student ability and behavior, the standards and content, and specific teaching methods and strategies. The Lesson Plan prompt provides examples of the candidate's ability to apply current and previous course knowledge, skills, and dispositions to instructional design.	Candidates are now engaged in their practicum experience. Under the guidance of their cooperating teacher and university supervisor, they are writing and implementing a three-day sequence of instruction. Their level of performance during Cycle III is expected to move from Developing to Target, and instructors should see movement from aware practitioners towards reflective practitioner. Candidates, through their instructional design task of the TPA, show knowledge, skills, and dispositions of reflective practitioners; part of the process is a reflective piece upon completion of the instructional sequence.

Lesson Plan (Instructional Design) Rubric

This rubric is structured around the Kentucky Framework for Teaching (KFT), which is adapted from the Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011). We believe our candidates benefit from early introduction to this framework given that most will teach in a Kentucky school. Additionally, this rubric cites and borrows language from the corresponding InTASC standards. In both cases, KFT and InTASC spell out standards and performances for ***current classroom teachers.*** The question must be asked: What should a ***Teacher Candidate*** know and be able to do upon completion of the program, prior to obtaining her or his first teaching position? Likewise, at which level of performance, either on the KFT scale or among the InTASC progressions, should a completer be? Arriving at an acceptable and agreed upon body of knowledge and skill, as well as performance level, is the next step in our process. We will use performance levels based on both KFT as a basis for collecting and analyzing results. The categories come from the idea that during the TPA – the Target level – candidates will be asked to do tasks within these. These tasks are taken from the edTPA. While we currently do not utilize the edTPA, we are discussing its adoption and know the format to be valid. These categories are tagged to InTASC Standards

I. **Planning for Content Understandings and Competencies** ***InTASC** ***IV – Content Knowledge*** ***V – Application of Content Knowledge***				
Level of Performance ⇒ **Category ⇓**	**Ineffective**	**Emergent**	**Developing**	**Target**
Lesson plan includes all necessary elements and reflects relevant state, national, and professional standards, including Common Core , NGSS, etc.	The lesson plan omits one or more of the necessary elements and does not reflect relevant state, national, and professional standards, including Common Core and—where relevant—standards for mathematical practice.	The lesson plan includes all necessary elements and reflects relevant standards. However, the standards may not be clearly aligned with learning activities or fully capture lesson content.	The lesson plan reflects content and Common Core reading, writing, or mathematics standards (including, where relevant, standards for mathematical practice), all of which are closely aligned with learning activities.	The lesson plan incorporates more than one of the Common Core standards and uses them in creative ways to support or extend the content standards.
Teacher candidate integrates authentic, real-world and/or interdisciplinary activities.	Instruction and assessment consists primarily of worksheets and other means of communicating and assessing factual knowledge.	The lesson plan addresses key disciplinary concepts, but learning activities and assessments do not consistently enable students to learn and apply these concepts.	Candidate has developed academic exercises that will enable them to learn and apply key disciplinary concepts to real-world and/or interdisciplinary situations.	Candidate creates activities that ask students to either creatively apply disciplinary concepts to analyze and propose solutions to challenging problems similar to those that they might face in adult life outside the classroom or to enrich instruction by incorporating concepts and insights from other disciplines.

Content and learning goals reflect teacher candidate's knowledge of the central concepts of the discipline and its modes of inquiry and argumentation.	Learning goals are not clearly formulated, do not address concepts and content that are central to the discipline, do not build upon one another, and/or are not clearly aligned with the relevant standards.	Learning goals are generally aligned with the topic of the lesson being taught, but may not adequately reflect the relevant conceptual understandings and/or modes of inquiry and argumentation.	Learning goals relate to concepts and content that are central to the discipline, and the lesson plan itself employs appropriate modes of inquiry and argumentation to develop student understanding of these ideas. The learning goals constitute a coherent sequence of instruction and are aligned with the relevant standards.	Learning goals reflect a sophisticated understanding of both content and the pedagogical content knowledge necessary for students to attain these goals; they clearly translate important disciplinary concepts and essential questions into instructional objectives; and/or they build upon one another to comprehensively address the issues at stake.
II. Supporting Students' Varied Learning Needs ***InTASC** ***I – Learner Development*** ***II – Learning Differences*** ***III – Learning Environment***				
Level of Performance ⇒ **Category ⇓**	**Ineffective**	**Emergent**	**Developing**	**Target**
Opening of lesson motivates students and will help prepare them to meet the lesson objectives.	Lesson does not have an opening or does not raise questions that motivate students to engage with the learning goals.	Lesson opening is generally aligned with learning goals, but either does not clearly focus on important disciplinary understandings or does not do so in a way that enables students to grasp the significance of the topic.	Lesson opening successfully motivates students to engage with a central disciplinary understanding.	Lesson opening employs creative strategies to engage students in the study of a complex question and does so in ways that make clear the relevance of the topic beyond the classroom.
III. Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Planning ***InTASC** ***VII – Planning for Instruction*** ***VIII – Instructional Strategies***				
Level of Performance ⇒ **Category ⇓**	**Ineffective**	**Emergent**	**Developing**	**Target**
Learning goals are developmentally appropriate and are based upon assessment of	The lesson plan is not developmentally appropriate, asks students to apply academic knowledge and	The lesson plan is for the most part develop- mentally appropriate; it reflects an awareness that students may	The lesson plan anticipates and effectively responds to common gaps in academic knowledge and skills; it takes advantage of	The lesson plan assesses student academic knowledge and skills and includes well- reasoned planned responses to expected individual needs;

students' prior academic knowledge, experience, skills, pre-, and misconceptions.	skills that the class (or individual students) can not reasonably be expected to possess, fails to take proper account of student experiences, and/or does not take account of common pre- and misconceptions.	not have the necessary knowledge and skills, but may not effectively meet individual student needs; and it may miss opportunities to build on student experiences or on their pre- and misconceptions.	student experiences as an instructional resource; and it uses pre- and misconceptions as opportunities to motivate students and extend their learning.	it enables students to build on their experiences to take ownership of their learning; and it uses pre- and misconceptions to illuminate central concepts of the discipline.
Lesson is founded upon essential questions that are designed to promote higher-level thinking skills.	The lesson aim fails to ask meaningful questions, and the planned activities do not advance beyond lower-level questioning.	The lesson aim and planned activities address central disciplinary concepts in a general manner, but are not structured in ways that will consistently promote higher-level thinking and problem solving skills.	The lesson uses higher-level thinking skills to inspire students to generate their own questions that promote deep understanding and higher-level thinking.	The lesson uses higher-level thinking skills to raise questions about the nature of human experience, the structures of the social and natural worlds, and the nature of our knowledge of and actions in them.
Teacher Candidate develops activities that allow for student engagement in collective problem solving using collaborative learning techniques.	Teacher candidate develops activities that ask students to work in groups to perform tasks that do not require collaborative problem solving or fails to insure that students involved in collaborative activities work together to achieve stated learning objectives.	Teacher Candidate develops activities that will allow students to be engaged in tasks that in principle involve collaborative problem solving, but that are not designed or so as to insure that students actually engage in higher-level thinking.	Teacher Candidate develops activities to engage students in carefully structured collaborative activities that give them the opportunity to develop both higher-level thinking and appropriate social skills.	Candidates develop activities that are well- designed and collaborative that give students the opportunity to work together to interpret challenging texts, listen sympathetically to the arguments of others, formulate and defend their positions orally or in writing, and to otherwise engage in activities that require higher-level thinking and that help develop social skills.
The lesson ending provides productive closure and enables the teacher candidate to assess actual student learning.	The closing does not ask the students to synthesize what they have learned or to apply this knowledge in new contexts, and it does not provide a measure of the extent to which learning goals have been met.	The closing returns in a general way to the lesson aim, but does not require students to engage in the sustained reasoning or provide a clear measure of student learning.	The closing asks students to summarize, synthesize, or apply what they have learned from the lesson and to otherwise engage in a thinking process that makes it possible to measure the extent to which learning goals have been met.	The closing connects the disciplinary concepts and lesson learning goals to material that has been previously studied or to the essential questions that structure the unit and the course.
IV. Identifying and Supporting Language and Literacy Demands ***InTASC** ***I - (G)*** ***II - (E), (I), (O)***				

IV - (H), (I), (L), *V - (B), (H), (N)* *VIII (H), (M), (Q)*				
Level of Performance ⇒ **Category ⇓**	**Ineffective**	**Emergent**	**Developing**	**Target**
Lesson plan provides students with the opportunity to acquire disciplinary vocabulary and develop the relevant academic language.	Lesson plan does not provide students with the opportunity to acquire relevant academic language in ways that reinforce the content being taught and/or fails to do so in an effective manner.	The lesson plan includes academic language acquisition, but may not do so in ways that reinforce the content being taught.	Lesson provides students with the opportunity to acquire disciplinary vocabulary, develop academic language functions, and/or precisely employ mathematical symbols in ways that reinforce the content being taught.	Lessons incorporate academic language in the appropriate places and promote the acquisition of vocabulary and academic language functions in ways that deepen student understanding of the content being taught and/or promote higher-level thinking.
V. Planning Assessment to Monitor Student Learning ***InTASC** ***VI – Assessment***				
Level of Performance ⇒ **Category ⇓**	**Ineffective**	**Emergent**	**Developing**	**Target**
Instruction and assessment include appropriate adaptations and accommodations for ELLs and/or exceptional students.	Lesson plan does not include any modifications, and planned adaptations are inappropriate for student needs.	Teacher candidate plans some adaptations and accommodations for ELLs and/or exceptional students, though these accommodations may be generic.	Teacher candidate effectively plans adaptations and accommodations to instruction and assessment to meet the specific needs of at least one group of students.	Teacher candidate effectively plans well- reasoned adaptations and accommodations in instruction and assessment to meet the specific needs of individual students.
Lesson plan includes assessments that determine the extent to which students have met the lesson learning goals.	Lesson plan does not include formal or informal assessments, or assessments are included, but do not measure student achievement.	Lesson plan includes one or more assessments. However, assessments are not effectively implemented and/or well aligned with learning goals.	Assessments are generally aligned with learning goals and instructional activities and provide an accurate measure of student achievement with regard to lesson learning goals.	Assessments are concretely aligned with learning goals and instructional activities and provide opportunities for students to apply and extend the knowledge acquired during the lesson.

Teacher candidate uses formal and informal assessment to monitor student learning and adapt instruction.	There is no evidence that the Teacher candidate is able to integrate formal and informal assessments to indicate that individuals, groups, or the entire class has failed to achieve lesson learning goals.	Teacher candidate is aware that learning goals must be assessed formally and informally, but is unable to clearly connect the assessment to instruction in an appropriate manner. As a result, the teacher candidate will often resort to a standardized, ready-made assessment of an assessment that is superficial in nature.	Teacher candidate is able to develop formal and informal assessments that will help them answer— why students have not met learning goals and would provide the types of student learning evidence that allows the candidate to reteach the material by providing additional information, responding to pre- or misconceptions, and/or employing alternative instructional strategies.	Teacher candidate is able both to identify formal and informal assessments that will lead to providing them with more than one reason why individuals, groups, or the entire class has failed to achieve lesson learning goals, successfully modify instruction in multiple ways, and/or teach the students themselves to diagnose the reasons why they failed to understand the original instruction.
VI. Effective Integration of Technology ***InTASC** ***III- (G), (M)*** ***IV- (G)*** ***V - (L)*** ***VIII – (G), (N), (O), (R)***				
Level of Performance ⇒ **Category ⇓**	**Ineffective**	**Emergent**	**Developing**	**Target**
Technology is not the focus of the instruction, but incorporates it to support teaching, learning, and/or assessment.	Lesson design employs technology, but does so in ways that are irrelevant to the learning goals, that confuse students, or that otherwise detract from instruction.	Lesson design employs basic technologies, such as PowerPoint, web-based videos and documents, and/or interactive white boards, in appropriate contexts, but candidate either cannot smoothly operate the technology or fails to make use of more than the basic functions.	Lesson design successfully employs basic technologies to enhance student learning. There is evidence that the teacher understands models for technology integration, such as SAMR, MS 21st Century Learning Design, or another.	Lesson design either employs basic technologies in innovative ways to teach more sophisticated content or makes use of more advanced technologies, such as video editing, social media, or advanced data analysis, so that development of proficiency in these technologies is integrated into content learning.

***Unless otherwise noted by Standard (Letter), Faculty should align the InTASC standard**