

Lesson Plan Summary Level III and Student Teaching - All Programs

Lesson planning is considered an essential task for all teachers, and as such, receives a great deal of attention in the preparation of teacher candidates in the College of Education at DSU. Lesson planning is introduced in pedagogy classes early in a candidate's program of study and is reinforced throughout the curriculum. While instructors in many introductory pedagogy classes assess lesson planning skills, formal assessment of lesson planning skills begins with the Level III experience, where university supervisors use a standard rubric to assess lesson plans. The rubric uses four levels as described below:

0 = Below Basic	1 = Basic	2 = Proficient	3 = Distinguished
Has not demonstrated understanding of requirements	Appears to understand, but responses are incomplete and/or incorrect in some way	Meets all expectations on all lesson plan requirements	Exceeds expectations in all requirements; includes original or unique components; high-quality professional products

Descriptors of 'proficiency' (2 = Proficient) are included in the full assessment form/rubric. A sample for the first component (Reflection) as reflected on the form is included as an example below.

Lesson Component	Proficient Requirements (2)	Score (0-3)	Comment
Reflection for each lesson at beginning of next day's lesson (also in the reflection log for TWS)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What went well with the lesson? 2) After analyses of students' errors, what new insights do you have about your students? 3) If not all students have met the objectives, what is the instructional plan? 4) What would you change with this lesson if you taught the lesson again? 5) What did you learn with this lesson that will affect the next lesson? 		

A total of 1,120 lesson plans were assessed in the three reporting years. Of these, candidates completing their Level III fieldwork placement submitted 591 lesson plans. A total of 529 lesson plans for candidates in their student teaching placement were reviewed.

Lesson planning is aligned with InTASC standard 7: Planning and Instruction, and as such, is offered as evidence of meeting CAEP standard 1. Various elements of the lesson plan also address the cross-cutting themes of Technology and Diversity (planning instruction for all students).

In the presentation of the components that follow, the columns for recording a score and adding comments have been deleted. Only the columns with the component and the descriptor of a proficient performance are displayed.

The following table serves as a guide when reviewing the data displayed in Table 1: Reflection as a component of lesson planning.

Lesson Component	Proficient Requirements (2)
Reflection for each lesson at beginning of next day's lesson (also in the reflection log for TWS)	1) What went well with the lesson? 2) After analyses of students' errors, what new insights do you have about your students? 3) If not all students have met the objectives, what is the instructional plan? 4) What would you change with this lesson if you taught the lesson again? 5) What did you learn with this lesson that will affect the next lesson?

Table 1: Reflection as a component of lesson planning.

Sub-Score	Academic Year	Overall Average	0 Below Basic	1 Basic	2 Proficient	3 Distinguished	No Rating
Level III Lesson Plan Assessment							
Reflection for each lesson at beginning of next day's lesson	2012-2013	2.17	4.70%	7.69%	52.14%	33.76%	1.71%
	2013-2014	2.11	6.28%	14.14%	41.88%	37.17%	0.52%
	2014-2015	2.20	5.42%	9.04%	45.18%	39.76%	0.60%
Level IV (Student Teaching) Lesson Plan Assessment							
Reflection for each lesson at beginning of next day's lesson	2012-2013	2.58	0.52%	2.08%	36.46%	60.42%	0.52%
	2013-2014	2.56	1.62%	1.62%	36.22%	60.54%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.44	2.63%	2.63%	42.76%	51.32%	0.66%

Discussion: Reflection is a critical practice that all program completers are expected to demonstrate in writing lesson plans. The data in Table 1 above shows that university supervisor's ratings of this element of the lesson plan improved consistently from the Level III experience to student teaching in all three reporting years.

Lesson Component	Proficient Requirements (2)
Contextual factors/learner characteristics	1) Identification of the factors and characteristics helps remind the writer of the lesson plan of environmental issues. 2) Identification of learner characteristics helps remind the writer of the impact these characteristics may have on lesson planning and delivery of instruction.

Table 2: Contextual Factor/Learner Characteristics

Sub-Score	Academic Year	Overall Average	0 Below Basic	1 Basic	2 Proficient	3 Distinguished	No Rating
Level III Lesson Plan Assessment							
Contextual	2012-2013	2.05	3.42%	5.98%	67.52%	17.95%	5.13%

factors/learner characteristics	2013-2014	2.07	6.28%	7.33%	59.69%	26.70%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.08	1.20%	12.05%	64.46%	22.29%	0.00%
Level IV (Student Teaching) Lesson Plan Assessment							
Contextual factors/learner characteristics	2012-2013	2.35	1.56%	3.13%	54.17%	41.15%	0.00%
	2013-2014	2.46	2.16%	2.70%	41.62%	53.51%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.35	5.92%	2.63%	42.11%	49.34%	0.00%

Discussion: Consideration for the contextual factors affecting instruction is also important for all program completers to incorporate in writing lesson plans. The data in Table 2 above shows that university supervisor's ratings of this element of the lesson plan also improved consistently from the Level III experience to student teaching in all three reporting years, with ratings in the Distinguished category more than doubling in all three years.

Lesson Component	Proficient Requirements (2)
Goals and objectives aligned to state standards	1) Goals of the lessons are clearly specified and aligned with the standards. 2) Specific objectives being addressed are measurable.

Table 3: Goals and Objectives Aligned to Standards

Sub-Score	Academic Year	Overall Average	0 Below Basic	1 Basic	2 Proficient	3 Distinguished	No Rating
Level III Lesson Plan Assessment							
Goals and objectives aligned to state standards	2012-2013	2.26	0.43%	5.13%	61.97%	32.05%	0.43%
	2013-2014	2.34	0.52%	8.90%	46.60%	43.98%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.23	0.00%	9.04%	59.04%	31.93%	0.00%
Level IV (Student Teaching) Lesson Plan Assessment							
Goals and objectives aligned to state standards	2012-2013	2.52	0.00%	2.08%	44.27%	53.65%	0.00%
	2013-2014	2.49	0.00%	6.49%	38.38%	55.14%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.45	0.00%	3.95%	46.71%	49.34%	0.00%

Discussion: The writing of goals and objectives is an extremely important task, as the learning experiences employed and the assessments used to measure student progress are directly aligned with the objectives of the lesson. Writing of objectives in behavioral terms allows the teacher to observe and measure student performance.

University supervisors rated the ability of candidates in their Level III experience as proficient in writing goals and objectives aligned to the standards, and ratings of student teachers suggests that these skills continued to improve during the capstone experience.

Lesson Component	Proficient Requirements (2)
An appropriate and organized selection of instructional materials and equipment	1) Copies of materials (e.g., instructional tools, independent work, comprehension questions, vocabulary lists for content, book, etc.) 2) Takes into consideration all of the technology components (e.g., software, # of computers, etc.)

Table 4: Selection of materials and equipment

Sub-Score	Academic Year	Overall Average	0 Below Basic	1 Basic	2 Proficient	3 Distinguished	No Rating
Level III Lesson Plan Assessment							
An appropriate and organized selection of instructional materials and equipment	2012-2013	2.17	0.85%	4.27%	71.37%	23.08%	0.43%
	2013-2014	2.38	1.05%	2.09%	54.45%	42.41%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.23	3.01%	4.82%	57.83%	33.73%	0.60%
Level IV (Student Teaching) Lesson Plan Assessment							
An appropriate and organized selection of instructional materials and equipment	2012-2013	2.48	0.00%	0.52%	51.04%	48.44%	0.00%
	2013-2014	2.48	1.08%	0.00%	48.65%	50.27%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.52	2.63%	0.66%	38.82%	57.89%	0.00%

Discussion: The ability to select and organize instructional materials and equipment for lessons was rated as Proficient in more than 90% of Level III lesson plan reviews, and in more than 96% of student teaching lesson plans. Appropriate integration of technology (cross-cutting theme) can enhance instruction and is addressed in the evaluation of this element of the lesson plan.

The next three tables reflect components of the actual lesson, with the first set of data reflecting the manner in which the lesson is introduced to the students. The second set of data reflects the delivery of the lesson content, and the third set displays the ratings for bringing closure to the lesson.

Lesson Component	Proficient Requirements (2)
Introduction	1) Introduction components: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Getting attention b. Relating to past experience and/or knowledge c. Creating a need to know d. Sharing objective in general terms

Table 5: Introducing the lesson

Sub-Score	Academic Year	Overall Average	0 Below Basic	1 Basic	2 Proficient	3 Distinguished	No Rating
Level III Lesson Plan Assessment							
Lesson: Introduction	2012-2013	2.34	0.43%	1.28%	61.97%	35.90%	0.43%
	2013-2014	2.52	0.00%	2.09%	43.98%	53.93%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.34	0.00%	1.20%	63.25%	35.54%	0.00%
Level IV (Student Teaching) Lesson Plan Assessment							
Lesson: Introduction	2012-2013	2.44	0.00%	0.52%	54.69%	44.79%	0.00%
	2013-2014	2.60	0.00%	3.24%	33.51%	63.24%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.53	0.00%	2.63%	42.11%	55.26%	0.00%

Discussion: Most university supervisors rated the quality of this section of the lesson plan high for both the Level III plan and the plans evaluated during the student teaching experience. Over 95% of the introductory sections evaluated at Level III and 97% of the student teaching lessons evaluated earned ratings of Proficient or Distinguished.

Lesson Component	Proficient Requirements (2)
Content delivery	1) Specific instructional examples. 2) Prompts as to what student will do or say. 3) Examples to be used to teach. 4) Examples of questions to be used. 5) Embed technology in the lesson as a natural part of the instruction (e.g., existing computer programs, technology developed by teacher, etc.). 6) An estimation of the time required for each part of the lesson. 7) Enough details for a substitute teacher.

Table 6: Lesson delivery

Sub-Score	Academic Year	Overall Average	0 Below Basic	1 Basic	2 Proficient	3 Distinguished	No Rating
Level III Lesson Plan Assessment							
Lesson: Content delivery	2012-2013	2.42	0.43%	2.14%	52.14%	45.30%	0.00%
	2013-2014	2.62	0.00%	2.09%	34.03%	63.87%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.48	0.00%	2.41%	46.99%	50.60%	0.00%
Level IV (Student Teaching) Lesson Plan Assessment							
Lesson: Content delivery	2012-2013	2.52	0.00%	0.00%	48.44%	51.56%	0.00%
	2013-2014	2.61	0.00%	2.16%	35.14%	62.70%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.63	0.00%	1.97%	33.55%	64.47%	0.00%

Discussion: The delivery of lesson content was also rated high for both Level III and student teaching lessons. The average rating in 2013-2014 was the only time a slight (-.01) but insignificant decline in the overall rating for this section of the lesson plan was noted.

Lesson Component	Proficient Requirements (2)
Closure	1) Listens to students' summarization/provides comments about the lesson. 2) What did you learn? 3) What did you like best about the lesson?

Table 7: Closure of the lesson

Sub-Score	Academic Year	Overall Average	0 Below Basic	1 Basic	2 Proficient	3 Distinguished	No Rating
Level III Lesson Plan Assessment							
Lesson: Closure	2012-2013	2.38	0.85%	2.99%	53.85%	42.31%	0.00%
	2013-2014	2.29	3.14%	4.71%	51.83%	40.31%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.37	0.00%	3.61%	56.02%	40.36%	0.00%
Level IV (Student Teaching) Lesson Plan Assessment							
Lesson: Closure	2012-2013	2.42	0.00%	2.08%	54.17%	43.75%	0.00%
	2013-2014	2.45	1.62%	4.32%	41.08%	52.97%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.45	0.00%	7.89%	38.82%	53.29%	0.00%

Discussion: The final section of the actual lesson reflects perceptions of the quality of the closing of the instructional portion of the lesson. Ratings in the 90%-97% range for Proficient and Distinguished were common for lesson plans submitted for both Level III and student teaching lesson plans.

Lesson Component	Proficient Requirements (2)
Assessment	1) Specific method for monitoring and evaluating instruction 2) For some types of assessment include cut-off scores. 3) Assessment matches each objective in order to measure students' knowledge / comprehension.

Table 8: Assessment

Sub-Score	Academic Year	Overall Average	0 Below Basic	1 Basic	2 Proficient	3 Distinguished	No Rating
Level III Lesson Plan Assessment							
Assessment	2012-2013	2.18	1.28%	7.26%	62.82%	27.78%	0.85%
	2013-2014	2.17	0.52%	8.90%	63.87%	26.70%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.14	0.00%	7.23%	71.08%	21.08%	0.60%
Level IV (Student Teaching) Lesson Plan Assessment							
Assessment	2012-2013	2.31	2.08%	4.17%	54.69%	39.06%	0.00%
	2013-2014	2.39	0.00%	2.70%	55.68%	41.62%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.38	2.63%	3.95%	46.05%	46.71%	0.66%

Discussion: Plans for assessing the lesson were rated among the lowest of the lesson plan components for Level III lesson plans, with descriptors of Contextual Factor/Learner Characteristics being the only section of the lesson plan rated lower. The assessment section of lesson plans submitted by student teachers was also lower than other sections of the lesson plans. However, scores for both the Level III assessment plans and those in the student teaching lessons exceeded the target of 2.0.

The ability to accurately assess student learning is considered a critical skill for program completers. The assessments included in the lesson plans reviewed are most often developed by the Level III or student teacher, and cooperating teachers and university supervisors provide guidance in addressing factors related to validity and reliability, as well as general concerns in conducting an assessment. Specific courses in assessment are common across majors, with generic references to assessment integrated in a number of courses.

Lesson Component	Proficient Requirements (2)
Adaptations and modifications for students with special	1) Relevant learner characteristics. 2) Adaptations and modifications for students with special needs. 3) Keep in mind instruction for low, average and gifted learners.

needs	
-------	--

Table 9: Differentiated Instruction

Sub-Score	Academic Year	Overall Average	0 Below Basic	1 Basic	2 Proficient	3 Distinguished	No Rating
Level III Lesson Plan Assessment							
Adaptations and modifications for students with special needs	2012-2013	2.18	2.56%	6.84%	58.12%	29.49%	2.99%
	2013-2014	2.07	7.33%	8.90%	50.26%	30.37%	3.14%
	2014-2015	2.34	0.00%	6.02%	51.20%	37.95%	4.82%
Level IV (Student Teaching) Lesson Plan Assessment							
Adaptations and modifications for students with special needs	2012-2013	2.27	3.65%	4.69%	52.60%	38.54%	0.52%
	2013-2014	2.37	2.16%	5.41%	45.95%	46.49%	0.00%
	2014-2015	2.38	3.29%	1.97%	48.03%	46.05%	0.66%

Discussion: The final section of the lesson plan reflects the candidate's/completer's ability to address the diversity of learning abilities within their classrooms. This differentiation of instructional strategies was evaluated as higher in student teaching than it was in the Level III placement, which would be expected given the additional 'practice' candidates would have had prior to completing their program of study. Differentiated instruction is interpreted broadly within the curriculum, and every lesson is expected to contain suggestions for challenging students who have already mastered the content, as well as suggestions for helping those experiencing difficulty with the lesson.

Summary

Lesson planning is a process that is critical to good teaching. Teachers must understand and address curriculum standards for their content areas, utilize effective pedagogical approaches to instruction, plan lessons that are sequential in nature and that accommodate the diversity of needs within their classrooms, and that are accompanied by plans that accurately assess student learning. Exercises in the development of lesson plans begins early in a candidate's program and are subject to assessment on a regular basis in order to enhance skills in developing plans that make effective and efficient use of available time and resources.