

## Rubric 71 – Lesson Plan: World Languages

Category	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
<p><b>Planning for Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language</b></p>	<p>Lesson plan provides clear connections between language forms and functions of the target language, focusing on all three modes of communication in meaningful cultural context(s).</p> <p>20 points</p>	<p>Lesson plan provides connections between language forms and functions of the target language, focusing on the interpretive AND the interpersonal or presentational modes of communication.</p> <p>16 points</p>	<p>Lesson plan supports vague connections between language forms and functions in the target language, primarily focusing on the interpretive mode of communication.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>focuses solely on vocabulary and grammar with no connections to language functions of the target language.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There are significant content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Standards, objectives, language tasks, and materials are not aligned with each other</p> <p>0-12 points</p>
<p><b>Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs</b></p>	<p>Planned supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus. Supports address the needs of specific individuals or groups with similar needs.</p> <p>20 points</p>	<p>Planned supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus with attention to the characteristics of the class as a whole.</p> <p>16 points</p>	<p>Planned supports are loosely tied to learning objectives or the central focus of the learning segment.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate does not attend to ANY INSTRUCTIONAL requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.</p> <p>0-12 points</p>
<p><b>Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning</b></p>	<p>Candidate justifies why language tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using examples of students' prior academic learning AND personal, cultural, or community assets.</p> <p>Candidate makes connections to Second Language Acquisition/ Teaching research and/or theory.</p> <p>20 points</p>	<p>Candidate justifies why language tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using examples of students' prior academic learning OR personal, cultural, or community assets.</p> <p>Candidate makes superficial connections to research and/or theory.</p> <p>16 points</p>	<p>Candidate justifies language tasks with limited attention to students' prior academic learning or personal, cultural, or community assets.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>justification of language tasks is either missing</p> <p>OR</p> <p>represents a deficit view of students and their backgrounds.</p> <p>0-12 points</p>

<p><b>Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Students' Development of Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language</b></p>	<p>The assessments provide multiple forms of evidence to monitor students' development of communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s) throughout the learning segment.</p> <p>20 points</p>	<p>The assessments provide some evidence to monitor students' development of communicative proficiency in the target language in a meaningful cultural context at different points during the learning segment.</p> <p>16 points</p>	<p>The assessments provide limited evidence to monitor students' development of communicative proficiency in the target language at different points during the learning segment. OR The assessments provide no evidence of students' development of communicative proficiency in the target language. OR Candidate does not attend to ANY ASSESSMENT requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.</p> <p>0-12 points</p>
<p><b>Academic Writing</b></p>	<p>Writing is elegant and contributes to the effectiveness of the document. All citations and references follow MLA format.</p> <p>20 points</p>	<p>Writing is clear. There are few grammatical, spelling, and typographical errors. Citations and references follow MLA format.</p> <p>16 points</p>	<p>Writing is unclear. Errors in grammar, usage, and/or other mechanics impede readability of document. Citations and references are missing or flawed.</p> <p>0-12 points</p>

Comments: