

Teaching Unit Rubric

CRITERIA	MET for Level 2	DEVELOPING	NOT MET
Unit Information	Include: Unit title, grade level, topic, length of unit, author's name. Rationale included.	Parts missing and/or vague rationale or theme statement.	
Contextual Factors	Thorough analysis of the contextual factors with implications that show insight and potential classroom applications.	Contextual factors are vague and few implications made.	Contextual factors simply repeated with no implications or applications made.
Objectives	Relevant Social Studies and Language Arts core included. Well-written and appropriate unit goal(s) based on core.	Intent of unit goal(s) is implied but not clear. Alignment with state core is dubious.	Unit goals are unclear, too broad, or not aligned to the state core. May not be developmentally appropriate.
Assessment Plan	Clearly described unit summative assessment plan that is specific and aligned to unit goal(s) and instruction.	Summative assessment plan appropriate, but vague. An alignment issue.	Summative assessment plan is vague, unspecific, and not appropriate.
Design for Instruction (5 lesson plans minimum)	Daily plans are clearly specified with objective(s) (content and language objectives addressed), formative assessment(s), and instructional activities that are aligned . Well written and formatted. Shows wide variety in activities and instructional methods. Lessons flow and are well connected. Accommodations/Tier 2 Adjustments for individual learner differences are planned for the unit including reading, ELL, and special ed. Accommodations include the use of ASR. Length of unit is appropriate to rationale, and unit goal and lesson objectives.	Objectives, assessments, and learning activities are vague, incomplete, or not substantive. Little variety in activities and instructional methods. Writing and formatting not excellent. Lack of alignment between objectives, assessments, and instruction. Lessons seem to flow and connect but not always clear. Inappropriate or insufficient accommodations and adjustments are planned for reading, ELL, and special ed. Length of unit is questionable, given unit goal, etc.	Objectives and assessments may be missing and learning activities have not been clearly specified or are not aligned. Writing and formatting poor. No alignment between objectives, assessments, and instruction. Each lesson appears to be a stand alone; no flow or connection with previous or subsequent lessons. Accommodations and adjustments are not planned.
Overall Organization, Formatting, Depth, and Detail of the Unit	Unit is cohesive and easy to follow, understand, and read. It is formatted well, shows depth in curriculum design, and includes details . There are no mechanical errors.	Unit is somewhat cohesive and difficult to follow because of formatting. It is lacking some depth, and there are mechanical errors.	Unit is not cohesive and very difficult to make sense of and it needs formatting and organizational help. Depth is lacking and there are many mechanical errors.
Instructional Decision-Making	Description of changes made in the lessons while teaching were effectively described and elaborated along with reasons and justifications.	Little elaboration of changes made throughout the unit; little rationale or justification offered.	No mention nor discussion of changes made to the unit or its lessons.

<p>Analysis of Student Learning</p>	<p>A clear description of how assessment data was used and interpreted to impact student progress achievement is included. Specific data shared and discussed, especially with respect to effectiveness of modifications and adaptations made for specific students. **See Dr. Williams' course site for more detail.</p>	<p>Description, interpretation, and use of assessment data on student achievement is provided in general terms without any attention to specific individual students.</p>	<p>Analysis of student learning is not provided or the use and interpretation of assessment data on student achievement is vague.</p>
<p>Reflection and Self-Evaluation</p>	<p>Reflections and self-evaluations show evidence of insight, thoughtfulness, reflection, keen observations and included such statements as "I learned..." as well as connections with teaching and learning processes and theories.</p>	<p>Reflections and self-evaluations included but lack insight, thoughtfulness, analysis, and implications.</p>	<p>No reflections and self-evaluations included.</p>