**Lesson Series Scoring Guide**

**Teacher Education Program - Hanover College**

**February 2012- Science/Math Lesson Series**

***Part I: Developing the lesson (100 pts)***

***I. Competence: Knowledge (INTASC Principle 1,7)***

***Data for 2012 cohort-18 students (2 candidates off sequence and took methods at time time)***

***Data for 2013 cohort-13 students (1 student in cohort is not seeking certification-data not included)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level 1: C | Level 2: grade B | Level 3: Benchmark for A grade | Comments: |
| Knowledge of Discipline  ACEI 2.2/2.3  ACEI 2.2  ACEI 2.2  ACEI 2.3  (5 pts each-20 pts) | \* Identifies major concepts, conceptual frameworks that are central to the discipline  **2012: 0**  **2013:5/13- 38%**  \*no possible misconceptions identified  **2012: 0**  **2013: 1/13 7%**  \*only one dimension of science presented  **2012: 0**  **2013: 3/13 23%**  \*students follow one method for solving problems  **2012: 2/18-11.1%**  **2013: 11/13- 84.6%** | \* Explains major concepts, conceptual frameworks that are central to the discipline  **2012: 8/18- 44.4%**  **2013: 6/13 46.1%**  \*identifies one or two common student misconceptions from literature  **2012: 6/18-33.3%**  **2013: 0/13- 0%**  \*Only two dimensions of science are presented  **2012: 12/18- 66.7%**  **2013- 7/13- 53.8%**  \*opportunity for various student representations/explanations of math content, but not shared  **2012: 8/18-44.4%**  **2013-2/13- 15.3%** | \* Clearly explains (in paragraph form or concept map) content to be presented in lesson, defining key concepts and how they are connected in own words. (both science and math)  **2012: 10/18- 55.6%**  **2013: 2/13- 15.3%**  \* Identifies at least 3 common student misconceptions from literature or actual misconceptions of your current students.  **2012: 12/18- 66.7%**  **2013: 12/13 92.3%**  \* All three dimensions of science are present in objectives and lesson content (content, process and nature of science)  **2012: 1/18- 5%**  **2013-3/13 23%**  \*opportunity for various student representations/explanations of math content shared with class  **2012: 8/18-44.4%**  **2013: 0/13- 0%** |  |
| Teaching of the Discipline  ACEI 3.1  ACEI 3.3  5 pts/5 pts)  ACEI 2.2/2.3  (7 pts)  ACEI 2.2  (5 pts)  ACEI 2.2  (10 pts) | \* Shows no connection between multiple content area learning experiences  **2012: 0**  **2013: 0**  \* Sets objectives limited to basic recall of facts of the discipline  **2012: 0**  **2013: 0**  \*Creates few if any hands-on activities for students  **2012: 0**  **2013: 0**  \*type of inquiry misidentified or not present  **2012: 3/18 16.7%**  **2013: 7/13- 53.8%**  \*lessons not in a 5E format  **2012: 0**  **2013: 0** | \* Develops interdisciplinary experiences are forced and are not a natural progression for students  **2012: 0**  **2013: 3/13-23%**  \* Sets objectives for comprehension of concepts  **2012: 3/18- 16.7%**  **2013: 2/13- 15.3%**  \*Creates varied activities/cookbook based for students with low level of inquiry  **2012: 7/18- 38.9%**  **2013: 3/13- 16.7%**  \*type of inquiry identified but nor justified why  **2012: 9/18-50**  **2013: 0**  \*5E format used, but steps in wrong order or not appropriately used  **2012: 3/18- 16.7%**  **2013: 5/13- 38.4%** | \* Creates interdisciplinary learning experiences that allow students to integrate knowledge and skills  **2012: 18/18 -100%**  **2013: 10/13- 76.9%**  \* Sets objectives for application of concepts in the discipline  **2012: 15/18- 83.3%**  **2013: 11/13- 84.6%**  Creates opportunities for inquiry/ problem-based learning) within the discipline for students  **2012: 11/18- 61.1%**  **2013: 10/13 -76.9%**  \*Identified type of inquiry according to inquiry continuum and justified why  **2012: 6/18- 33.3%**  **2013: 6/13- 46.1%**  \*5E lesson plan format used effectively  **2012: 15/18- 83.3%**  **2013: 8/13- 61.5%** |  |

***I. Competence: Planning (INTASC Principle 1,2,7,8)***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | | Level 1 | Level 2- B | Level 3- A- | Comments: |
| Based on Student  ACEI 1.0  ACEI 3.2  ACEI 3.2  ( 4 pts each- 12 pts total) | \* Plans instruction that is occasionally developmentally inappropriate  **2012: 1/18-5%**  **2013:0**  \*strategies not well documented for academic needs of students  **2012: 0**  **2013: 3/13 23%**  \*little variation in lesson strategies  **2012: 0**  **2013: 3/13 23%** | | \* Plans developmentally appropriate activities  **2012: 2/18- 11.1%**  **2013: 2/13— 15.3%**  \*strategies for various present but not well-described  **2012: 6/18- 33.3%**  **2013: 7/13- 53.8%**  \*varied strategies in lesson for diverse learners  **2012: 11/18- 61.1%**  **2013: 8/13 61.5%** | \*Plans developmentally appropriate activities and documents how incorporated or built upon students’ prior knowledge and experience  **2012: 15/18- 83.3%**  **2013: 11/13 84.6%**  \*strategies for various levels of academic diversity well described and documented in lesson plan  **2012: 12/18 -66.7%**  **2013: 3/13- 23%**  \*varied strategies in lesson for diverse learning styles with detailed and targeted connections  **2012: 7/18- 38.9%**  **2013: 2/13- 15.4%** |  |
| ACEI 4.0  Based on Assessment  (3 pts) | \* Not likely to use assessments as part of planning  **2012: 0** | | \* Uses assessments as part of planning  **2012: 3/18-16.7%** | \*Uses and documents informal and formal assessments (pretests, classroom observations, and discussions with mentor teacher) in planning lesson series  **2012: 15/18-83.3%** | Did not assess for 2013 cohort as lesson  Series was immediately after spring  Break in local schools and teacher/  Students were not available for pre-tests |
| ACEI 4.0  Based on Discipline  ACEI 4.0  ACEI 4.0  ( 5 pts each-15 pts total) | \*Chooses and implements activities with little or no connection to the objectives of the lesson series.  **2012: 0**  **2013: 3/13- 23%**  \*lesson objectives are incomplete or certain ones missing  **2012: 0**  **2013: 1/13-7%**  \*more than one standard or objective is not assessed  **2012: 1/18 5%**  **2013: 6/13 46.1%** | | \*Chooses and implements activities that allow students to make some connections to the objectives of the lesson series.  **2012: 3/18- 16.7%**  **2013: 2/13- 15.4%**  \*lesson objectives are present but are not measurable  **2012: 3/18- 16.7%**  **2013: 7/13- 53.8%**  \*One standard or objective is NOT assessed  **2012: 2/18- 11.1%**  **2013: 5/13- 38.4%** | \*Lists subject specific behavioral/performance objectives developed for each lesson related to student standards  **2012: 15/18- 83.3%**  **2013: 8/13 61.5%**  \*Lesson objectives are written correctly and cover all aspects of standards/prerequisite skills  **2012: 15/18- 83.3%**  **2013: 5/13- 38.4%**  \*All standards and behavioral objectives assessed  **2012: 15/18- 83.3%**  **2013: 2/13- 15.4%** |  |

***I. Competence: Organizing for Teaching (INTASC Principle 5 &6)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level 1- C | Level 2- B | Level 3- A | Comments |
| ACEI 3.4  ACEI 3.4  Motivation and  Instructional Groups  (3 pts each) | \*Whole group instruction/teacher directed lessons used extensively with little attention for learning from peers  **2012: 0**  **2013: 0**  \*students working individually  **2012: 2/18-11.1%**  **2013: 0** | \* Engages in primarily whole group instruction with opportunities for social interaction and supportive learning atmosphere; varied teacher role  **2012: 7/18- 38.9%**  **2013: 7/13 53.8%**  \*groups used, but no strategy for assigning groups given  **2012: 9/18- 50%**  **2013: 4/13 30.7%** | \* Incorporates cooperative groups that develop shared values and responsibility for positive climate/productive work; teacher role varies (coach, audience member, facilitator)  **2012: 11/18- 61.1%**  **2013: 6/13 46.1%**  \*describes how groups are determined  **2012: 7/18- 38.9%**  **2013: 9/13 69.2%** |  |
| ACEI 3.5  ACEI 3.5  Communicate to foster collaboration  ( 3 pts each) | \* Uses verbal and nonverbal strategies to communicate  **2012: 0**  **2013: 0**  \* Uses little technology and/or uses inappropriately  **2012: 5/18- 27.8%**  **2013: 2/13 15.4%** | \* Uses some verbal and nonverbal strategies  **2012: 1/18-5%**  **2013: 0**  \* Uses some technology but it does not contribute to teaching and learning  **2012: 2/18- 11.1%**  **2013: 3/13- 23%** | \*Uses a variety of verbal and nonverbal teaching strategies  **2012: 17/18- 94.4%**  **2013: 13/13- 100%**  \* Integrates appropriate technology that makes a contribution to teaching and learning  **2012: 11/18- 61.1%**  **2013: 8/13 61.5%** |  |

***I. Competence: Critical Thinking (INTASC Principle 4,6 & 8)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level 1- C | Level 2- B | Level 3- | Above and Beyond-A |
| ACEI 3.3  Type of Thinking  ACEI 3.3  ( 3 pts each) | \* Lists various kinds of instructional strategies  **2012: 0**  **2013: 0**  \*no HOT question prompts provided  **2012: 0**  **2013: 2/13 15.3%** | \* Uses a variety of instructional strategies  **2012: 3/18- 16.7%**  **2013: 4/13- 30.7%**  \*documents questions in lessons  **2012: 10/18- 55.5%**  **2013: 4/13 30.7%** | \*Uses a variety of instructional strategies which promote higher level thinking and problem solving  **2012: 15/18 -83.3%**  **2013: 9/13 69.2%**  \*documents HOT question prompts in lessons  **2012: 8/18- 44.4%**  **2013: 7/13- 53.8%** |  |

***Part II: Analysis of Learning and Teaching- Being Critically Reflective (INTASC 8 and 9) (75 points)- SCIENCE***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level 1: C | Level 2: B | Level 3: Benchmark for A- work | Above and Beyond: A |
| ACEI 4.0  Analysis of Learning  ACEI 4.0  ACEI 4.0  ACEI 4.0  (40 pts-10 pts each) | \*One type of Assessment is used primarily for assessing student work  **2012: 0**  **2013: 4/13- 30.8%**  No clear connection between data and student learning  **2012: 0**  **2013: 1/13 7.7%**  \*No rubric or plans for grading assignments provided to students  **2012: 0**  **2013: 1/13- 7.7%**  \*class overview comparison of pre/post test with no attention to individual objectives  **2012: 0**  **2013: 7/13 53.8%**  \*little or no attention to student responses to HOT questions  **2012: NA (new for 2013 rubric)**  **2013: 8/13- 61.5%** | \*Both informal and formal assessments are used to assess student work; analysis includes student strengths and weaknesses  **2012: 7/18- 38.9%**  **2013: 1/13- 7.7%**  \* Describes one data source understand learner needs and behavior  **2012: 4/18- 22.2%**  **2013: 7/13- 53.8%**  \* Has criteria for assignments and assessment tasks; tasks evaluated and graded but no clear method present  **2012: 8/18- 44.4%**  **2013: 8/13- 61.5%**  \* general overview of what students learned with one or two objectives addressed  **2012: 13/18- 72.2%**  **2013: 4/13- 30.8%**  \*some mention of student responses to HOT questions  **2012: NA (new for 2013 rubric)**  **2013: 5/13- 38.4%** | \*Uses varied assessments to assess learning and modify instruction or learning goals (present or future)  **2012: 11/18- 61.1%**  **2013: 8/13 61.5%**  \*Uses multiple sources of information/data sources in order to compile a complete picture of what each student has learned.  **2012: 14/18- 77.8%**  **2013: 5/13- 38.4%**  \*criteria for assessments clear and work graded fairly and transparently  **2012: 10/18- 55.5%**  **2013: 4/13- 30.8%**  \*clear description of what objectives students understood and what objectives need to be retaught; all objectives addressed  **2012: 5/18- 27.8%**  **2013: 2/13- 15.4%**  \*Detailed discussion of student responses to HOT questions  **2012: NA (new for 2013 rubric)**  **2013: 0** |  |
| Analysis of Assessment  ACEI 4.0  (10 pts) | \*Little or no discussion related to measurement issues  **2012: 0**  **2013: 8/13- 61.5%** | \*Some discussion or analysis related to measurement issues  **2012: 12/18- 66.7%**  **2013: 1/13- 7.7%** | \*Assessments are evaluated with an understanding of validity, reliability, and bias and explicit use of the terms  **2012: 6/18- 33.3%**  **2013: 4/13- 30.8%** |  |
| ACEI 5.1  Analysis of Teaching  (25 pts)  ACEI 5.1 | \* Analyzes his/her teaching and learning in a minimal or inaccurate manner  **2012: 0**  **2013: 0**  \* Little attempt to use problem-solving strategies to improve teaching practice and student learning  **2012: 0**  **2013: 0**  \* Limited evidence of supervisor or mentor teacher feedback in revised practice  **2012: 0**  **2013: 1/13- 7.7%** | \* Analyzes his/her teaching and learning primarily based on self  **2012: 3/18- 16.7%**  **2013: 7/13- 53.8%**  \* Uses problem-solving strategies to improve teaching practice and student learning.  **2012: 5/18- 27.8%**  **2013: 5/13- 38.4%**  \* Accepts feedback from supervisors and mentor teachers  **2012: 11/18- 61.1%**  **2013: 3/13- 23%** | \* Analyzes his/her teaching and student learning broadly considering self, students, instrument and contextual factors  **2012: 15/18- 83.3%**  **2013: 6/13- 46.2%**  \* Conducts continuous analysis and reflection on his/her teaching practices; makes timely adjustments.  **2012: 13/18- 72.2%**  **2013: 8/13- 61.5%**  \*uses and documents in detail feedback from supervisors and mentor teachers and how this feedback was incorporated into teaching.  **2012: 7/18- 38.9%**  **2013: 9/13- 69.2%** |  |

dATA***Part II: Analysis of Learning and Teaching- Being Critically Reflective (INTASC 8 and 9) (75 points)- MATH***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level 1: C | Level 2: B | Level 3: Benchmark for A- work | Above and Beyond: A |
| ACEI 4.0  Analysis of Learning  ACEI 4.0  ACEI 4.0  ACEI 4.0  (40 pts-10 pts each) | \*One type of Assessment is used primarily for assessing student work  **2012: 0**  **2013: 5/13 38.4%**  No clear connection between data and student learning  **2012: 0**  **2013: 2/13 15.4%**  \*No rubric or plans for grading assignments provided to students  **2012: 0**  **2013: 2/13 15.4%**  \*class overview comparison of pre/post test with no attention to individual objectives  **2012: 0**  **2013: 6/13 46.2%**  \*little or no attention to student responses to HOT questions  **2012: NA (new for 2013 rubric)**  **2013: 9/13 69.2%** | \*Both informal and formal assessments are used to assess student work; analysis includes student strengths and weaknesses  **2012: 7/18- 38.9%**  **2013: 2/13 15.4%**  \* Describes one data source understand learner needs and behavior  **2012: 4/18- 22.2%**  **2013: 5/13 38.4%**  \* Has criteria for assignments and assessment tasks; tasks evaluated and graded but no clear method present  **2012: 8/18- 44.4%**  **2013: 7/13 53.8%**  \* general overview of what students learned with one or two objectives addressed  **2012: 13/18- 72.2%**  **2013: 6/13 46.2%**  \*some mention of student responses to HOT questions  **2012: NA (new for 2013 rubric)**  **2013: 4/13 30.8%** | \*Uses varied assessments to assess learning and modify instruction or learning goals (present or future)  **2012: 11/18- 61.1%**  **2013: 6/13 46.2%**  \*Uses multiple sources of information/data sources in order to compile a complete picture of what each student has learned.  **2012: 14/18- 77.8%**  **2013: 6/13 46.2%**  \*criteria for assessments clear and work graded fairly and transparently  **2012: 10/18- 55.5%**  **2013: 4/13 30.8%**  \*clear description of what objectives students understood and what objectives need to be retaught; all objectives addressed  **2012: 5/18- 27.8%**  **2013: 1/13 7.7%**  \*Detailed discussion of student responses to HOT questions  **2012: NA (new for 2013 rubric)**  **2013: 0** |  |
| Analysis of Assessment  ACEI 4.0  (10 pts) | \*Little or no discussion related to measurement issues  **2012: 0**  **2013: 8/13 61.5%** | \*Some discussion or analysis related to measurement issues  **2012: 12/18- 66.7%**  **2013: 3/13 23%** | \*Assessments are evaluated with an understanding of validity, reliability, and bias and explicit use of the terms  **2012: 6/18- 33.3%**  **2013: 2/13 15.4%** |  |
| ACEI 5.1  Analysis of Teaching  (25 pts)  ACEI 5.1 | \* Analyzes his/her teaching and learning in a minimal or inaccurate manner  **2012: 0**  **2013: 0**  \* Little attempt to use problem-solving strategies to improve teaching practice and student learning  **2012: 0**  **2013: 0**  \* Limited evidence of supervisor or mentor teacher feedback in revised practice  **2012: 0**  **2013: 1/13 7.7%** | \* Analyzes his/her teaching and learning primarily based on self  **2012: 3/18- 16.7%**  **2013: 7/13 53.8%**  \* Uses problem-solving strategies to improve teaching practice and student learning.  **2012: 5/18- 27.8%**  **2013: 6/13 46.2%**  \* Accepts feedback from supervisors and mentor teachers  **2012: 11/18- 61.1%**  **2013: 3/13 23%** | \* Analyzes his/her teaching and student learning broadly considering self, students, instrument and contextual factors  **2012: 15/18- 83.3%**  **2013: 6/13 46.2%**  \* Conducts continuous analysis and reflection on his/her teaching practices; makes timely adjustments.  **2012: 13/18- 72.2%**  **2013: 7/13 53.8%**  \*uses and documents in detail feedback from supervisors and mentor teachers and how this feedback was incorporated into teaching.  **2012: 7/18- 38.9%**  **2013: 9/13 69.2%** |  |
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