Lesson Plan Rubric (Part A)						
Category	0 – Non-existent	1 – Insufficient	2 – Approaches Sufficiency	3 – Sufficient	4 – More than Sufficient	
A. NJ Student Learning Standard/s Standards Alignment- InTASC: 4, 7 NJPST: 4, 7 CAEP: R1.2, R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan did not include learning standards.	All learning standards did not align with student learning objectives. Learning standards did not include one or more of the following: specific identification of the standard, number, or full wording.	Some, but not all, of the learning standards aligned with student learning objectives. Learning standards did not include one or more of the following: specific identification of the standard, number, or full wording.	All learning standards aligned with student learning objectives. Learning standards included all of the following: specific identification of the standard, number, and full wording.	All learning standards aligned with student learning objectives and were interdisciplinary. Learning standards included all of the following: specific identification of the standard, number, and full wording.	
<i>B. Purpose</i> Standards Alignment- InTASC: 4, 7 NJPST: 4, 7 CAEP: R1.2, R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan did not include a purpose.	Purpose was unrelated to the content, student learning objectives, and learning standards of the lesson.	Purpose was unrelated to either the content, student learning objectives, or learning standards of the lesson.	Purpose was related to the content, student learning objectives, and learning standards of the lesson.	Purpose was directly related to the content, student learning objectives, and learning standards of the lesson. Purpose represented higher order thinking skills.	
C. Student Learning Objective/s Standards Alignment- InTASC: 4, 7 NJPST: 4, 7 CAEP: R1.2, R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan did not include student learning objectives.	Learning objectives were not clear or focused. Learning objectives were not developmentally appropriate nor measurable. Learning objectives did not contain the required components: condition, behavior, or criteria.	Learning objectives were somewhat clear. Learning objectives were either not developmentally appropriate or measurable. Learning objectives contained all required components - condition, behavior, and criteria - but only one of three were identified correctly.	Learning objectives were clear and focused. Learning objectives were developmentally appropriate and measurable. Learning objectives contained all required components - condition, behavior, and criteria - but only two of three were identified correctly.	 Learning objectives were clear, focused, and incorporated synthesis and analysis of ideas. Learning objectives were developmentally appropriate and measurable. Learning objectives contained all required components - condition, behavior, and criteria - and all three were identified correctly. 	
D. Delivery of Lesson Plan Content/Procedures Standards Alignment- InTASC: 7, 8 NJPST: 7, 8 CAEP: R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan did not include procedures.	 Procedures did not support the learning objectives and had little or no defined structure. Two or more of the following were not clearly explained: motivation/hook, activation of prior knowledge, learning activities, or closure. 	Procedures supported the learning objectives but did not include nor clearly explain one of the following: motivation/hook, activation of prior knowledge, learning activities, or closure.	Procedures supported the learning objectives and included and clearly explained all of the following: motivation/hook, activation of prior knowledge, learning activities, and closure.	 Procedures supported the learning objectives and included and clearly explained all of the following: motivation/hook, activation of prior knowledge, learning activities, and closure. Procedures furthered critical thinking and/or engaged problem solving. 	
F. Assessment/s Standards Alignment- InTASC: 6 NJPST: 6 CAEP: R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	The lesson plan did not include assessment/s.	One or more assessment/s did not align with student learning objectives. Assessment/s contained no clear criteria for acceptability.	All assessment/s aligned with student learning objectives. One or more assessment/s contained no clear criteria for acceptability.	 All assessment/s aligned with student learning objectives. All assessment/s contained clear criteria for acceptability. 	All assessment/s aligned with student learning objectives. All assessment/s contained clear criteria for acceptability.	

		Assessment/s did not	Assessment/s did not	Assessment/s provided	There was evidence of variety,
		provide evidence of every	provide evidence of every	evidence of every student's	including summative and formative
		student's learning.	student's learning.	learning.	assessments.
					Assessment/s provided evidence
					of every student's learning.
G. Instructional	Lesson plan did	Lesson plan included an	Lesson plan included a	Lesson plan included a	Lesson plan included a
Material/s	not include	incomplete list of	complete list of instructional	complete, chronological list of	complete, chronological list of
Standards Alignment-	instructional	instructional materials.	materials.	instructional materials that	instructional materials that furthered
InTASC: 4, 8	materials.	Lesson plan cited print	Materials were limited to	furthered the student learning	the student learning objectives.
NJPST : 4, 8	Lesson plan did	and online materials used,	only the required textbook or	objectives.	Materials included a wide variety
CAEP : R1.2, R1.3, R2.3, R3.2,	not cite print and	but materials were unrelated	worksheets.	Materials included more	of resources, such as alternative
R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	online materials	to the content, student	Lesson plan cited print	than the required textbook and	texts, technology, or manipulatives.
	used.	learning objectives, or	and online materials used.	worksheets.	Lesson plan cited print and
		procedures.	Materials were related to	Lesson plan cited print and	online materials used.
			the content, student learning	online materials used.	Materials were related to the
			objectives, or procedures.	Materials were related to the	content, student learning objectives,
			Materials were not cited in	content, student learning	and procedures.
			either standard APA, MLA,	objectives, or procedures.	Materials were cited correctly in
			or Chicago/Turabian format.	Materials were cited in	either standard APA, MLA, or
				either standard APA, MLA, or	Chicago/Turabian format.
				Chicago/Turabian format.	

Comments:

Supplemental Lesson Plan Rubric (Part C)						_
Category	0 – Non-existent	1 – Insufficient	2 – Approaches Sufficiency	3 –Sufficiency	4 – More Than Sufficient	Not Applicable
*A1. Differentiation: English Language Learners *If applicable Standards Alignment- InTASC: 2, 7 NJPST: 2, 7 CAEP: R1.1, R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan provided no evidence of differentiation for ELL's learning styles and needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of differentiation, but not for every ELL student's learning styles and needs. One or more differentiated approaches did not align with ELL student needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of differentiation for every ELL student's learning styles and needs, but one or more strategies did not align with student needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of appropriate differentiation for every ELL student's learning styles and needs.	 Lesson plan provided evidence of appropriate differentiation for every ELL student's learning styles and needs. Such differentiation furthered critical thinking and/or engaged problem solving. 	
A2. Differentiation: Struggling Readers and/or Underperforming Students Standards Alignment- InTASC: 2, 7 NJPST: 2, 7 CAEP: R1.1, R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan provided no evidence of differentiation for every struggling reader's and/or underperforming student's learning styles and needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of differentiation, but not for every struggling reader's and/or underperforming student's learning styles and needs. One or more differentiated approaches did not align with student needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of differentiation for every struggling reader's and/or underperforming student's learning styles and needs, but one or more strategies did not align with student needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of appropriate differentiation for every struggling reader's and/or underperforming student's learning styles and needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of appropriate differentiation for every struggling reader's and/or underperforming student's learning styles and needs. Such differentiation furthered critical thinking and/or engaged problem solving.	
A3. Differentiation: Advanced and/or Gifted Students Standards Alignment- InTASC: 2, 7 NJPST: 2, 7 CAEP: R1.1, R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan provided no evidence of differentiation for every advanced and/or gifted student's learning styles and needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of differentiation, but not for every advanced and/or gifted student's learning styles and needs. One or more differentiated approaches did not align with student needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of differentiation for every advanced and/or gifted student's learning styles and needs, but one or more strategies did not align with student needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of appropriate differentiation for every advanced and/or gifted student's learning styles and needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of appropriate differentiation for every advanced and/or gifted student's learning styles and needs. Such differentiation furthered critical thinking and/or engaged problem solving.	
A4. Differentiation: Students with Different Learning Styles Standards Alignment- InTASC: 2, 7 NJPST: 2, 7 CAEP: R1.1, R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan provided no evidence of differentiation for every student's unique learning styles and needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of differentiation, but not for every student's unique learning styles and needs. One or more differentiated approaches did not align with student needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of differentiation for every student's unique learning styles and needs, but one or more strategies did not align with student needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of appropriate differentiation for every student's unique learning styles and needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of appropriate differentiation for every student's unique learning styles and needs. Such differentiation furthered critical thinking and/or engaged problem solving.	
*B. Accommodations (students with IEPs, 504 plans, etc.) *If applicable Standards Alignment- InTASC: 2, 7 NJPST: 2, 7 CAEP: R1.1, R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan provided no evidence of accommodations aligned with student learning needs, as per IEPs, 504 plans, etc.	Lesson plan provided evidence of accommodations aligned with student learning needs, as per IEPs, 504 plans, etc., but not for every student's learning needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of accommodations aligned with student learning needs, as per IEPs, 504 plans, etc., but one or more strategies did not align with student needs.	Lesson plan provided evidence of accommodations aligned with every student's learning needs, as per IEPs, 504 plans, etc.	 Lesson plan provided evidence of accommodations aligned with every student's learning needs, as per IEPs, 504 plans, etc. Accommodations led to higher order thinking for such students. 	

		I cucher Luucu		i i ogi uni		
<i>C. Extension</i> Standards Alignment- InTASC: 2, 7 NJPST: 2, 7 CAEP: R1.1, R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan was missing an extension activity.	Lesson plan included an extension activity, but did not align with the content or student learning objectives.	Lesson plan included an extension activity that aligned with the content but not the student learning objectives.	Lesson plan included an extension activity that aligned with the content and the student learning objectives. Extension activity was differentiated for needs of learners.	 Lesson plan included an extension activity that aligned with the content and the student learning objectives. Extension activity was differentiated for needs of learners. Extension activity deepened student understanding and promoted critical thinking of new material. 	
<i>D. Technology</i> Standards Alignment- InTASC: 7, 8 NJPST: 7, 8 CAEP: R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan did not include technology, but there were opportunities for technology to advance student learning.	Lesson plan included technology, but technologies did not enhance content and did not align with student learning objectives.	Lesson plan included technology. Technologies enhanced content, but did not align with student learning objectives.	Lesson plan included technology. Technologies enhanced content and aligned with student learning objectives.	Lesson plan included technology. Technologies enhanced content and aligned with student learning objectives. Technologies deepened student understanding and promoted critical thinking.	
<i>E. Academic Language</i> <i>Demands and Supports</i> Standards Alignment- InTASC: 8 NJPST: 8 CAEP: R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Language supports were missing.	Language supports were not aligned with the content nor learning objectives. Lesson plan did not indicate where students will apply language supports.	Language supports were aligned with the content but not the learning objectives. Lesson plan indicated where students will apply language supports.	Language supports were aligned with the content and the learning objectives. Lesson plan indicated where students will apply language supports to deepen content understandings.	 Language supports were aligned with the content and the learning objectives. Lesson plan indicated where students will apply language supports to deepen content understandings in new contexts. 	
<i>F. Prior Academic</i> <i>Learning and</i> <i>Prerequisite Skills</i> Standards Alignment- InTASC: 2, 4 NJPST: 2, 4 CAEP: R1.1, R1.2, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan was missing reference to prior knowledge and prerequisite skills.	Lesson plan included reference to prior knowledge and prerequisite skills, but these references were not related to the content or student learning objectives.	Lesson plan included reference to prior knowledge and prerequisite skills. These references were related to the content but not the student learning objectives.	_ Lesson plan included reference to prior knowledge and prerequisite skills. These references were related to the content and the student learning objectives.	 Lesson plan included reference to prior knowledge and prerequisite skills. These references were related to the content and the student learning objectives. Awareness of the necessary prior knowledge and prerequisite skills allowed for deeper understanding and critical thinking of new material. 	
G. Learning Theories Standards Alignment- InTASC: 7 NJPST: 7 CAEP: R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan was missing reference to research or theory.	 Lesson plan included reference to research or theory. References did not connect to the content, student learning objectives, or procedures. 	Lesson plan included reference to research or theory. References included superficial connections to the content, student learning objectives, or procedures.	Lesson plan included reference to research or theory. References included connections to the content, student learning objectives, and procedures.	 Lesson plan included reference to research and theory. References included connections to the content, student learning objectives, and procedures. 	

	x 1	x 1 1 1	x 1		x 1 1 1	
H. Culturally	_Lesson plan was	_Lesson plan demonstrated	_Lesson plan	_Lesson plan	_Lesson plan demonstrated specific	
Responsive Teaching	missing reference to	limited attention to students'	demonstrated general	demonstrated general	attention to students' personal,	
Standards Alignment-	students' personal,	personal, cultural, or	attention to students'	attention to students'	cultural, or community assets, and	
InTASC: 2, 3	cultural, or community	community assets.	personal, cultural, or	personal, cultural, or	these elements aligned with the	
NJPST: 2, 3 CAEP: R1.1, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3,	assets.		community assets, but	community assets, and	content and student learning	
R5.1, R5.2			these elements did not	these elements aligned	objectives.	
			align with the content or	with the content and		
			student learning	student learning		
			objectives.	objectives.		

	Post-Lesson Rubric (Part D)							
Category	0 – Non-existent	1 – Insufficient	2 – Approaches Sufficiency	3 –Sufficiency	4 – More Than Sufficient	Not Applicable		
A. Follow-up / Data-driven Instruction Standards Alignment- InTASC: 2, 6 NJPST: 2, 6 CAEP: R1.1, R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan did not include next steps for instruction.	Lesson plan included next steps for instruction. Next steps did not connect to the content, student learning objectives, or procedures.	Lesson plan included next steps for instruction. Next steps included superficial connections to the content, student learning objectives, or procedures. Next steps addressed the needs of some students, but not all.	 Lesson plan included next steps for instruction. Next steps included connections to the content, student learning objectives, or procedures. Next steps were informed by student performance data. Next steps addressed the needs of most students, but not all. 	 Lesson plan included next steps for instruction. Next steps included connections to the content, student learning objectives, or procedures. Next steps were informed by student performance data and provided targeted support to individuals or groups to improve their learning. Next steps addressed the needs of all students. 			
<i>B. Feedback</i> Standards Alignment- InTASC: 2, 6 NJPST: 2, 6 CAEP: R1.1, R1.3, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan did not reference a plan for feedback.	Lesson plan provided a general plan for feedback that addressed strengths or needs related to the student learning objectives. Lesson plan did not indicate how students will understand or use feedback.	Lesson plan provided a specific plan for feedback that addressed strengths or needs related to the student learning objectives. Lesson plan indicated how students will understand or use feedback related to the student learning objectives.	Lesson plan provided a specific plan for feedback that addressed strengths and needs related to the student learning objectives. Lesson plan indicated how students will understand and use feedback related to the student learning objectives.	 Lesson plan provided a specific plan for individualized feedback that addressed strengths and needs related to the student learning objectives. Lesson plan indicated how individual students or groups will understand and use feedback related to the student learning objectives. 			
<i>C. Post-lesson</i> <i>Reflection</i> Standards Alignment- InTASC: 7, 9 NJPST: 7, 9 CAEP: R1.3, R1.4, R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2	Lesson plan did not include a post-lesson reflection.	Lesson plan included a brief post-lesson reflection. Reflection was focused on classroom procedures but not analysis of student learning.	 Lesson plan included a general post-lesson reflection. Reflection was focused on classroom procedures but not analysis of student learning. 	Lesson plan included a specific post-lesson reflection. Reflection focused on analysis of student learning leading to proposed changes to future instruction.	 Lesson plan included a specific and comprehensive post-lesson reflection. Reflection focused on analysis of student learning leading to well- aligned proposed changes to future instruction. 			