# 

# Literacy Lesson Plan and Rationale

# Benchmark Assignment and Rubric

## Assignment Instructions:

For this benchmark, use the “Class Profile” to distribute students into the design tiered groupings. Provide rationale to explain movements from previous groupings. Based on the new groupings, create three lessons plans with differentiated activities. Your lesson plans should be focused on developing word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections.

Use the following documents to guide your lesson plan development:

1. Arizona’s Common Core Standards - English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects Standards
2. Hess’ Cognitive Rigor Matrix.

Use the "COE Lesson Plan Template," to prepare the mini-unit.

In addition, submit a 500-750 word rationale in support of your lesson plans that demonstrates:

1. Your knowledge of and a critical stance toward a wide variety of quality traditional print, digital, and online resources.
2. Your understanding of the research and literature that supports the reading and writing curriculum and instruction for all elementary students.
3. The information gathered from your field experience observations and interviews that support the strategies in these lesson plans.

Prepare this assignment according to the guidelines found in the APA Style Guide, located in the Student Success Center. An abstract is not required.

Support your response with 2-3 scholarly sources.

This assignment uses a rubric. Review the rubric prior to beginning the assignment to become familiar with the expectations for successful completion.

You are required to submit this assignment to Turnitin.

## Standards/Competencies Assessed:

Standards and program competencies assessed in the benchmark assignment:

* ILA: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3
* InTASC: 7k, 8a, 2g, 8s, 4f
* COE Program Competencies:

**2.1:** Candidates use foundational knowledge and research-based pedagogical and instructional practices to design and implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum. **(IRA 2.1; InTASC 7k, 8a)**

**2.2:** Candidates use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections. **(IRA 2.2; InTASC 2g, 8s)**

**2.3:** Candidates evaluate and select a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources based on purpose, settings, and learner needs. **(IRA 2.3; InTASC 4f)**

## Scoring Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **% Value** | | **No Submission** | **Insufficient** | **Approaching** | **Acceptable** | **Target** |
| **% Scaling** |  | | **0%** | **69%** | **74%** | **87%** | **100%** |
| **Content – 70%** | | | | | | | |
| **LESSON PLANNING:** Development  **ILA 2.2; InTASC 2g, 8s**  **COE 2.2** | | **25%** | No submission. | Fails to design lesson plans that focus on developing word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections to meet the language-proficiency needs of English learners and students who struggle to learn to read and write. | Unable to design lesson plans that focus on developing word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections to meet the language-proficiency needs of English learners and/or students who struggle to learn to read and write. | Designs lesson plans that focus on developing word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections to meet the language-proficiency needs of English learners and students who struggle to learn to read and write. | Highly skilled and adept at designing lessons plans that focus on developing word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections to meet the language-proficiency needs of English learners and students who struggle to learn to read and write. |
| **LESSON PLANNING RATIONALE:** Resources  **ILA 2.3; InTASC 4f**  **COE 2.3** | | **25%** | No submission. | Fails to design lesson plans that demonstrate knowledge of and/or a critical stance toward a wide variety of quality traditional print, and/or digital, and/or online resources. | Designs lesson plans that are passable and that demonstrate knowledge of and/or a critical stance toward a wide variety of quality traditional print, and/or digital, and/or online resources. | Designs lesson plans that demonstrate knowledge of and a critical stance toward a wide variety of quality traditional print, digital, and online resources. | Highly skilled and adept at designing lesson plans that demonstrate knowledge of and a critical stance toward a wide variety of quality traditional print, digital, and online resources. |
| **LESSON PLANNING RATIONALE:** Understanding of Research and Literature  **ILA 2.1; InTASC 7k, 8a**  **COE 2.1** | | **20%** | No submission. | Fails to design lesson plans that demonstrate understanding of the research and literature that undergirds the reading and writing curriculum and instruction for students. | Designs lesson plans that are passable and that demonstrate understanding of the research and/or literature that undergirds the reading and/or writing curriculum and/or instruction for students. | Designs lesson plans that demonstrate understanding of the research and literature that undergirds the reading and writing curriculum and instruction for students. | Highly skilled and adept at designing lesson plans that demonstrate understanding of the research and literature that supports the reading and writing curriculum and instruction for students. |
| **Format – 30%** | | | | | | | |
| **Research and Conventions** | | **10%** | No submission. | Submission is not supported by research. | Submission is inadequately supported by research that is not cited consistent with APA guidelines and/or the plan contains mechanical and conventional errors that affect meaning and/or clarity. | Submission is adequately supported by research that is cited consistent with APA guidelines with some mechanical and conventional errors that do not significantly affect meaning or clarity. | Submission is thoroughly supported by research that is cited consistent with APA guidelines and free of mechanical and conventional errors. |
| **Mechanics** | | **10%** | No submission. | Surface errors are pervasive enough that they impede communication of meaning. Inappropriate word choice and/or sentence construction are used. | Frequent and repetitive mechanical errors distract the reader. Inconsistent language and/or word choice are present. Sentence structure is lacking. | Prose is largely free of mechanical errors, although a few may be present. The writer uses a variety of effective sentence structures and figures of speech, as well as some practice and content-related language. | Submission is nearly/completely free of mechanical errors and has a clear, logical conceptual framework. Word choice reflects well-developed use of practice and content-related language. Sentence structures are varied and engaging. |
| **Organization** | | **10%** | No submission. | Statement of purpose is not justified by the conclusion. Argument is illogical. Conclusion does not support the claim(s) made. | Purpose statement is vague and claims do not thoroughly support it. Argument and conclusion are orderly, but present unconvincing justification of claims. | Purpose statement and conclusion are clear. Argument shows logical progression. There is a smooth progression of claims from introduction to conclusion. | Purpose statement and related conclusion are clear and convincing. Information is well organized and logical. Argument(s) is persuasive and presented in a distinctive and compelling manner. |