

**Rhode Island College**  
**Elementary Education Undergraduate Program Review**

**Section IV Evidence for Meeting Standards**

Assessment 3: Assessment of Candidate Ability to Plan Instruction

Program Requirements

1. ELED 300: Concepts of Teaching - Implemented Lesson Plan and its Reflection
  2. **ELED 422: Teaching Developmental Reading I – Comprehension Lesson Plan**
  3. ELED 436: Teaching Elementary Social Studies - Unit Plan
- 

Program Requirement 2 – ELED 422: Teaching Developmental Reading I – Comprehension Lesson Plan

**Brief Description of the Assessment**

ELED 422 Teaching Developmental Reading I is one of the six, content-based methods courses teacher candidates are required to take in their program in elementary education. This field-based experience is concerned with reading instruction from a developmental perspective and instructional implications for teaching special populations is included. Teacher candidates and their assigned partners work together to plan eight lessons with each teaching four to a small group of students. The Comprehension Lesson is used for their portfolio artifact. The reflection is a response to their own growth and development as teachers as a result of analyzing their effectiveness on student learning. This Comprehension Lesson Plan is one measure teacher candidates use to demonstrate competence in their abilities to write and execute lesson plans and reflect on the learning experience and is then presented as evidence in their Preparing To Teach Portfolio prior to student teaching as documentation of readiness in this area.

**Alignment with ACEI Standards**

This tool addresses ACEI 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language-Candidates demonstrate a high level of competence in the use of the English language arts and they know, understand and use concepts from reading, language and child development, to teach reading, writing, speaking, viewing, listening, and thinking skills and to help students successfully apply their developing skills to many different situations, materials, and ideas. In addition to ACEI 2.1 the ACEI standards 3.1, where the candidates use integrating and applying knowledge for instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connection across curriculum, curricular goals and knowledge of the community; 3.2 the candidate has adapted and modified the lesson content to the learning style, development and approaches to learning, and adapts instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse students; and 3.3 whereby candidates development of critical thinking, higher level questions and thinking and problem solving are used. The candidates employ ACEI 3.4 as they use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self motivation, and positive social interaction and to create a supportive learning environment. The candidates use ACEI 3.5, communication to foster collaboration via their knowledge and understanding of effective verbal, non-verbal and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the elementary classroom. These are strongly addressed in the implemented lessons, their reflections and the selected implemented comprehension lesson and its reflection that is the artifact for the course.

**Analysis of the Data Findings**

The data shows that more teacher candidates scored at the Target level than at the Acceptable level. The Spring 2010 data shows that 56% of the teacher candidates taking this course scored at the Target level; Fall 2009 data shows that 60% of the candidates scored at the Target level; and the Spring 2009 data shows that 67% scored at the Target level. The data includes information that while some candidates earned ratings of Developing all revised to earn Acceptable ratings.

### Interpretation of How the Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards

The artifact ratings in the Planning and Action sections of this artifact are linked to ACEI standards. The ratings from this set of data inform the Department of Elementary Education that the teacher candidates are quite competent in their abilities to plan and teach Reading/Language Arts (ACEI 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5).

### Assessment Documentation

Throughout the semester, teacher candidates plan lessons and teach small groups of children at the practicum site. The idea and requirements for the teaching plan are discussed with the classroom teacher and the professor before the plan is written. A copy of the teaching plan is presented to the teacher before the lesson begins. The lessons on a particular phase of reading instruction are scheduled to last between 45 minutes and one hour with a small group of children in one of two different grade levels. The teacher candidate and classroom teacher meet to conference immediately after the lesson. The classroom teacher's written feedback/comment is given to the professor after the lesson and conference. The professor returns the lesson plan with a review and the cooperating teacher's feedback/comments to the teacher candidate in a timely manner during the next class session on campus. All lesson plans and feedback/comments are placed in the teacher candidate's Notebook.

The FSEHD Observation Tool for practicum assessment is divided in three sections for evaluation: Planning, Action and Reflection. The tool provides a checklist in each section with space to comment, conference with the candidates and then set goals for the next lesson. The 6 capsule ratings are categorized into three groups: Target Acceptable and Unacceptable. **Assessment tool follows this section.**

This artifact is one of the Department of Elementary Education's Preparing to Teach Portfolio requirements and as such must have a rating of Acceptable or Target (Exemplary). Teacher candidates are allowed one opportunity for revision should there be any issues with this work. The Acceptable or Target artifact scores represent the candidates' levels of readiness in this area.

The data is listed in the columns: Target, Acceptable, Developing, Revised and NA (Not Applicable). In the instance of a teacher candidate who transfers to Rhode Island College with prior experience and coursework the Department of Elementary Education Chair makes a decision about course substitutions. NA denotes that a decision was made based on the Chair's decision to substitute one course for another. The Revised column lists the number of teacher candidates who revised the artifact after receiving an Unacceptable or Developing and upon revision earned an Acceptable rating. The Acceptable column includes the scores from teacher candidates who earned an Acceptable rating and also includes the scores of those who revised their artifacts and earned Acceptable.

### Program Requirement 2 – ELED 422: Teaching Developmental Reading I – Comprehension Lesson Plan

	Comprehension Lesson Plan				
	Number scored at each rating level.				
	Target 5-6	Acceptable 3-4	Developing 1-2	Revised	NA
Spring 2010 n = 57	32	23	2	2	2
Fall 2009 n = 81	48	32	3	3	1
Spring 2009 n = 49	33	16	1	1	-

No artifacts were submitted and scored as Unacceptable.

**FSEHD Teacher Candidate Observation and Progress Report  
for  
IMPLEMENTED LESSON PLAN  
(Preparing to Teach)**

Teacher Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_ Emplid: \_\_\_\_\_

Practicum Professor/College Supervisor's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Cooperating Teacher's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Grade Level/Content Area Assignment: \_\_\_\_\_

Cooperating School District/School: \_\_\_\_\_

Person Completing This Observation (Check one):  
 Cooperating Teacher  
 Practicum Professor/College Supervisor

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

The purpose of this instrument is to provide instructive feedback about the teacher candidate's teaching performance and to assess the Implemented Lesson Plan during Practicum. Prior to the lesson, the observer will review the teacher candidate's lesson plan. During the lesson, the observer takes notes then completes this instrument. SECTION THREE should be completed following a post-observation conference with the teacher candidate.

While this is the same Observation and Progress Report used for teacher candidates during student teaching, it is expected that teacher candidates in Practicum will be at an earlier stage of development on the indicators than student teachers. Consequently, items rated as "developing" are adequate at this stage.

In addition, the range of indicators suitable for assessment during Practicum may be narrower than during student teaching. Items marked with an asterisk (\*) in the instrument are optional.

---

Signature of Person Completing This Form

Date

## SECTION ONE: LESSON INDICATORS

In this section of the protocol, rate indicators associated with effective lesson delivery: Planning, Implementation, Content, Climate, and Classroom Management. For each indicator, identify the level of proficiency demonstrated by the teacher candidate during the observed lesson.

Use the following rating scale to rate the Planning indicators.

0 Unacceptable	1-2 Developing	3-4 Acceptable	5-6 Target
Not present.  The candidate does not include the indicator in his/her planning, action, or reflection.	Elements of the indicator are clearly present but are partially or ineffectively carried out.  The candidate is developing an awareness and may be beginning to meet the knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to meet the needs of some learners.	Elements of the indicator are of good quality, but there is room for improvement.  The candidate knows and demonstrates the methods, skills, and strategies needed to meet the needs of most learners.	High quality implementation of indicator.  The candidate knows and consistently demonstrates the methods, skills, and strategies needed to meet students' diverse needs and interests.

Use the Comments section to note factors that were influential in determining the ratings or to record specific examples or quotes to illustrate the noted factors.

### PLANNING

ACEI 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5

#### Planning Indicators

#### Rating

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| 1. The design of the lesson demonstrates careful planning and organization, from appropriate set induction to closure.   | _____ |
| 2. Lesson objectives are measurable and observable.  | _____ |
| 3. The lesson plan objectives are aligned with GLEs, GSEs, and/or appropriate standards.   | _____ |
| 4. The instructional strategies, activities and technical resources (e.g. manipulatives, adaptive or assistive technologies, electronic technology) in this lesson plan demonstrate attention to students' experience, preparedness, and/or learning styles. | _____ |
| 5. The instructional strategies, activities and technical resources (e.g. manipulatives, adaptive or assistive technologies, electronic technology) in this lesson plan demonstrate attention to issues of access, equity, and diversity for students.       | _____ |
| 6. The lesson design demonstrates an accurate understanding of content.  | _____ |
| 7. The lesson is designed to engage students in meaningful instructional tasks related to content.   | _____ |
| 8. The lesson is designed to be student-centered, take advantage of students' curiosity, and be highly engaging.   | _____ |
| 9. Formative and/or summative assessments are aligned with objectives.   | _____ |
| 10. The lesson incorporates flexibility and plans for reteaching and/or extension, if needed   | _____ |

Comments:

Use the following rating scale to the Implementation and Content Indicators.

0 Unacceptable	1-2 Developing	3-4 Acceptable	5-6 Target
Not present.  The candidate does not include the indicator in his/her planning, action, or reflection.	Elements of the indicator are clearly present but are partially or ineffectively carried out.  The candidate is developing an awareness and may be beginning to meet the knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to meet the needs of some learners.	Elements of the indicator are of good quality, but there is room for improvement.  The candidate knows and demonstrates the methods, skills, and strategies needed to meet the needs of most learners.	High quality implementation of indicator.  The candidate knows and consistently demonstrates the methods, skills, and strategies needed to meet students' diverse needs and interests.

ACTION  
ACEI 2.1

Implementation Indicators

Rating

1. The teacher candidate arranges the physical environment to maximize learning in this particular lesson. \_\_\_\_\_
2. The teacher candidate attends to individual student needs, including learning and behavioral issues. \_\_\_\_\_
3. The teacher candidate designs or adapts relevant learning experiences that incorporate digital tools and resources (e.g. manipulatives, adaptive or assistive technologies, electronic technology) to promote student learning and creativity. \_\_\_\_\_
4. The pace of the lesson is appropriate for the developmental levels/needs of the students and the purposes of the lesson. \_\_\_\_\_
5. The teacher candidate customizes and personalizes learning activities using digital tools and resources (e.g. manipulatives, adaptive or assistive technologies, electronic technology). \_\_\_\_\_
6. The teacher candidate uses multiple forms of assessment (e.g., observation, rubrics, oral questioning, etc.) to measure student learning. \_\_\_\_\_
7. The teacher candidate's questioning strategies are likely to enhance the development of student conceptual understanding/problem solving (e.g., emphasized higher order questions, appropriately used "wait time," identified prior conceptions and misconceptions). \_\_\_\_\_
8. The lesson is modified as needed based on formative assessment within the lesson. \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

Content Indicators

Rating

1. The content of the lesson is significant and worthwhile. \_\_\_\_\_
2. The content of the lesson is appropriate for the developmental levels of the students in this class. \_\_\_\_\_
3. Students are intellectually engaged with important ideas relevant to the focus of the lesson. \_\_\_\_\_
4. The teacher candidate provides accurate content information and displays an understanding of important concepts. \_\_\_\_\_
5. Appropriate connections are made to other areas of the discipline, to other disciplines, and/or to real-world contexts. \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

### SECTION THREE: POST OBSERVATION

This section is to be completed following a post-observation conference with the teacher candidate.

Use the following rating scale to rate the Reflection Indicators.

0 Unacceptable	1-2 Developing	3-4 Acceptable	5-6 Target
<p>Not present.</p> <p>The candidate does not include the indicator in his/her planning, action, or reflection.</p>	<p>Elements of the indicator are clearly present but are partially or ineffectively carried out.</p> <p>The candidate is developing an awareness and may be beginning to meet the knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to meet the needs of some learners.</p>	<p>Elements of the indicator are of good quality, but there is room for improvement.</p> <p>The candidate knows and demonstrates the methods, skills, and strategies needed to meet the needs of most learners.</p>	<p>High quality implementation of indicator.</p> <p>The candidate knows and consistently demonstrates the methods, skills, and strategies needed to meet students' diverse needs and interests.</p>

### REFLECTION

Reflection Indicators

1. The teacher candidate describes how s/he made decisions for planning and implementation.
2. The teacher candidate discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson and generates appropriate ideas for possible improvements.
3. The teacher candidate accurately analyzes and assesses student engagement, progress toward meeting the lesson objectives, and classroom management issues.
4. The teacher candidate is aware of how his/her demeanor, actions, and reactions affect the classroom climate and individual students.
5. Based on this lesson, the teacher candidate sets concrete goals (e.g. related to flexibility, pace, response to behavioral issues, etc.) s/he will focus on for future lessons.

Rating

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

Goals\*

Use the space below to record goals for the teacher candidate. Goals are based on the observation and subsequent conversation with the teacher candidate. *Note to observer:* Review goals prior to next observation.

This section used for conference time between teacher candidate and classroom teacher and/or professor.