**Part 1: Mini-Unit Plan**

Revise your mini-unit plan in your content area to include your reflection from your video assignment in Topic 6.

**Part 2: Reflection**

Discuss your mini-unit with your mentor teacher for feedback. The feedback should include strengths and areas for improvement in each of the following areas:

1. Ability to align standards and learning objectives
2. Use of appropriate strategies, develop appropriate sequencing, and provide multiple ways to demonstrate knowledge and skill
3. Ability to differentiate for the identified students
4. Ability to create adequate and appropriate assessments (both formative and summative)

Write a 750-1,000 word reflection about your unit plan’s strengths and opportunities for improvement.  In your reflection, include responses and suggestions from your mentor teacher. In addition, address the following questions:

1. How did you know how to differentiate your instruction based on your class profile?
2. How did you differentiate in your assessment for students with exceptionalities?
3. How do you know that your formative and summative assessments minimize sources of bias?
4. How did you use appropriate strategies, develop appropriate sequencing, and provide multiple ways to demonstrate knowledge and skills in your unit?

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

Challenging yourself to create a 3-day unit plan on the Maya, Aztec, and Inca civilizations in Central and South America was very impressive. I am thinking you can continue this unit by simply expanding to spend more time on these early civilizations with your varied assessments and activity ideas. Once you revise from my feedback this unit will be ready to use at any time in your teaching career. I appreciate your mentor teacher taking time out to review your unit plan. However, from your reflection I did not see specific details or suggestions from your mentor. In fact, it appeared that you didn’t review the rubric when writing your reflection. In addition, I did not see any revisions done from my week 5 feedback. Your unit plan had varied instructional differentiation and assessment strategies that you could have used to address the assignment requirements.

Cindy

## You are required to submit this assignment to LopesWrite. Scoring Rubric:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CATEGORY:** | **%**  **Value** | **No Submission** | **Insufficient** | | **Approaching** | **Acceptable** | | **Target** | |
| **CRITERIA** |  | 0 | ≤ 65 | | 75 | 85 | | 100 | |
| **Feedback: Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement I’m glad you appreciated working you’re your mentor. I did not see any reference to suggestions from your mentor. In fact, it appears your reflection is from your video assignment. Your statement of “took everything I could from the experience” doesn’t really provide much detail. I suggested more reading, storytelling timelines, drawings, ancient games and map reading but I did not see that was addressed.** **Your lessons helped you plan out your delivery. It is advisable to graciously accept feedback to make a solid unit plan.** | **10%** | Not addressed. | | Reflection inaccurately and/or insufficiently addresses the unit plan’s strengths and opportunities for improvement. Responses and suggestions from mentor teacher are not addressed. | Reflection lacks detail on the unit plan’s strengths and opportunities for improvement. Responses and suggestions from mentor teacher are vague and/or insufficient. | | Reflection includes appropriate detail on the unit plan’s strengths and opportunities for improvement. Responses and suggestions from mentor teacher are included, based on field experience discussion. | | Reflection includes appropriate and sufficient detail on the unit plan’s strengths and opportunities for improvement. Responses and suggestions from mentor teacher are included, based on field experience discussion. Addresses specific feedback clear and concisely. |
| **Planned Instruction**  [COE 3.2; InTASC 7d] The reflection didn’t define your differentiation, however, your unit had maps, drawing, power points and short story. The reflection did not address your class profile. I suggested a pre-test and measurable objectives for assessment data and prior knowledge, but I didn’t see any revisions. Did you read the rubric? | **25%** | Not addressed. | | Provides a vague and/or insufficient description of differentiated instruction based on information on class profile. Plan includes minimal detail on planned instruction and/or available data. | Provides a basic description of differentiated instruction based on information on class profile. Plan considers available data at a minimal level. Supporting details are insufficient. | | Provides a clear explanation of differentiated instruction based on information on class profile. Plan considers available assessment data, prior student knowledge, and student interest. Supporting details are appropriate. | | Provides a clear and insightful explanation of differentiated instruction based on information on class profile. Plan considers available formative and summative assessment data, prior student knowledge, and student interest. Demonstrates ability to effectively differentiate instruction for the identified students. Supporting details are appropriate and sufficient. |
| **Differentiated Assessment**  [COE 1.2; InTASC 2a] Your unit plan is jam packed full of various activities and assessments for all student levels. However, you did not explain, nor did I see reference to a pre-test. I read mostly about you being nervous. Also, you did not revise any of my suggestions such as adjusting your quiz as you didn’t provide much room to write answers or creating measurable objectives and fully developed rubric for writing assignments. All of which will help students know and understand your expectations. | **20%** | Not addressed. | | Provides a vague and/or insufficient description of differentiated assessments for students with exceptionalities. Differentiated assessment includes minimal detail on diverse learning strengths and needs. | Provides a basic description of differentiated assessment for students with exceptionalities based on unit plan. Differentiated assessment considers diverse learning strengths and needs at a minimal level. Supporting details are insufficient. | | Provides a clear explanation of differentiated assessment for students with exceptionalities based on unit plan. Differentiated assessment considers diverse learning strengths and needs. Supporting details are appropriate. | | Provides a clear and insightful explanation of differentiated assessment for students with exceptionalities based on unit plan. Differentiated assessment considers diverse learning strengths and needs and creates opportunities to demonstrate learning in different ways. Demonstrates ability to differentiate assessment for students with exceptionalities. Supporting details are appropriate and sufficient. |
| **Unbiased Formative and Summative Assessments**  [COE 3.1; InTASC 6a, 6b] I did not see any reference to bias in your explanation. When students have multiple ways to demonstrate their knowledge and skills that naturally reduces assessment bias. Providing a rubric to guide students through a project or writing assignment is a valid method whereas the absence of a rubric invite bias. Rubrics help to equalize your expectations about student work and guides your grading thereby reducing bias. | **20%** | Not addressed. | | Provides a vague and/or insufficient rationale for the minimized bias in assessments. Description of assessments that reduce bias lack substantial detail. | Provides a basic rationale for the minimized bias in assessments in unit plan. Describes assessments that reduce bias at a minimal level. Supporting details are insufficient. | | Provides a clear rationale for the minimized bias in assessments in unit plan. Explains assessments that reduce bias and support, verify, and document learning. Supporting details are appropriate. | | Provides a clear and insightful rationale for the minimized bias in formative and summative assessments in unit plan. Explains formative and summative assessments that reduce bias and support, verify, and document learning. Demonstrates ability to develop and use unbiased assessments. Supporting details are appropriate and sufficient. |
| **Appropriate Strategies, Sequencing, and Demonstration of Knowledge and Skills**  [COE 3.5; InTASC 7c, 8a] The actual lesson plans provide multiple ways for students to demonstrate their knowledge and skills. In your reflection I did not see clear details of how your actual lesson plans followed in sequence. A review of the anticipatory set, clearly demonstrates sequencing. | **20%** | Not addressed. | | Provides a vague and/or insufficient description of the use of strategies and/or the development of sequencing without supporting detail. | Provides a basic description of the use of strategies and/or the development of sequencing. Supporting details are insufficient. | | Provides a clear explanation of the use of appropriate strategies, the development of appropriate sequencing, and the multiple ways provided to demonstrate knowledge and skill in the unit plan. Supporting details are appropriate. | | Provides a clear and insightful explanation of the use of appropriate strategies, the development of appropriate sequencing, and the multiple ways provided to demonstrate knowledge and skill in the unit plan. Demonstrates ability in instructional strategies, sequencing, and varied assessments. Supporting details are appropriate and sufficient. |
| **Organization**  You unit on the Maya, Aztec, and Inca civilizations probably could be a much longer unit plan. I am confident from this point it can easily be expanded to spread all of your ideas across several days. I am very impressed how well organized and how well the content flowed. | **3%** | Not addressed. | | An attempt is made to organize the content, but the sequence is indiscernible. The ideas presented are compartmentalized and may not relate to each other. | The content may not be adequately organized even though it provides the audience with a sense of the main idea. | | The content is logically organized. The ideas presented relate to each other. The content provides the audience with a clear sense of the main idea. | | The content is well-organized and logical. There is a sequential progression of ideas that relate to each other. The content is presented as a cohesive unit and provides the audience with a clear sense of the main idea. |
| **Mechanics** (spelling, punctuation, grammar, and language use) | **2%** | Not addressed. | | Surface errors are pervasive enough that they impede communication of meaning. Inappropriate word choice or sentence construction are used. | Frequent and repetitive mechanical errors distract the reader. Inconsistencies in language or word choice may be present. Sentence structure may not be varied. | | The submission includes some mechanical errors, but they do not hinder comprehension. A variety of effective sentence structures are used, as well as some practice and content-related language. | | The submission is virtually free of mechanical errors. Word choice reflects well-developed use of practice and content-related language. Sentence structures are varied and engaging. |