**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 DisciplineACEI 2.2/2.3ACEI 2.2ACEI 2.2ACEI 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 DisciplineACEI 3.1ACEI 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 StudentACEI 1.0ACEI 3.2ACEI 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 4.0Based 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 springBreak in local schools and teacher/Students were not available for pre-tests |
| ACEI 4.0Based on DisciplineACEI 4.0ACEI 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 3.4ACEI 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 3.5ACEI 3.5Communicate 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 3.3Type of ThinkingACEI 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 4.0Analysis of LearningACEI 4.0ACEI 4.0ACEI 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 AssessmentACEI 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 5.1Analysis 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 4.0Analysis of LearningACEI 4.0ACEI 4.0ACEI 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 AssessmentACEI 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 5.1Analysis 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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