**Name:  Fed Fischer – TWT Scenario Teacher**

**Date of Unit Review:  April 1, 2005**

|  | F *<br>Score = 0 | C<br>Score = 1 | B<br>Score = 2 | A<br>Score = 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Needs Assessment** | ☐ A "real" need is not evident. The need is not based on student assessment evidence and/or connected to content standards. It is more of a unit description than a needs assessment. | ☐ A real need is identified but the information provided is vague. And/Or evidence of the match between the need and the goal is not strong. The need is based primarily on antidotal comments or general statements. | ☒ A real need is identified.  The need is based on two or more pieces of student assessment evidence and is written with sufficient detail. Quantitative (numeric) assessment information is provided where appropriate. Research based information documenting the need may also be provided. | ☐ A clear and imminent need is identified.  The need is based on two or more pieces of student assessment evidence.  The need and assessment evidence is connected to content standards.  Both qualitative and quantitative information provide evidence of need. Research based information documenting the need may also be provided. |

COMMENTS on Fred Fischer's Unit: **Mr. Fischer is very involved with curriculum development in his school and has a broad background of the needs.  He doesn't appear to have concrete quantitative assessment to support his rationale, though.  He explains the qualitative data very well and it is clear that there is a gap between how well the students do in classroom performance-based assessments with how the students apply their learning beyond the classroom.**

|  | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. Enduring Understanding and Essential Questions** | ☐ Enduring understanding statement(s) and essential questions are not included or are not written correctly. | ☐ Enduring understanding statement(s) and essential questions do not match the guidelines in the curriculum (are too narrow, not "kid friendly," etc.) and/or lack student appeal. | ☒ Enduring understanding statement(s) and essential questions are well written, "kid friendly," and will guide, intrigue and keep the students focused on the unit goal. | ☐ Same as the "B" level with an even clearer sense that students will see a vital connection to their learning beyond the classroom. |

COMMENTS on Fred Fischer's Unit: **Fred Fischer's response to "What do I want the students to understand long after they leave my classroom?" is to the point and explains what is important to know and remember years from now.   The essential questions that will be posted in Mr. Fischer's classroom are appropriate for the grade level.  The last essential question, though, ("Does your vote really count?") can be answered with a "yes" or "no" and is not engaging and thought provoking.   Remember, if a question is too specific, or could be answered with a few words or a sentence, it is probably not a good essential question.  Changing that essential questions would bump this from a "B" to an "A."**

| 3. Instructional Goal(s) | ☐ The goal(s) is not well formed. And/Or there is not a good match between the need and the goal. | ☐ The instructional goal(s) is not well-formed and/or is written more like a measurable objective or a brief description. And/Or the evidence of the match between the need and the goal is not strong. | ☐ The goal(s) is generally aligned with the need and well-formed with only minor improvement possibilities. | ☒ The goal(s) is aligned with the need and exceptionally well-formed. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**COMMENTS on Fred Fischer's Unit: Mr. Fischer did a nice job in writing the goal--it is stated broadly and describes the overall educational target without getting too specific and overlapping with the objectives.**

| 4. Learning Objectives | ☐ Learning objectives are written incorrectly and/or do not match the instructional goal(s). | ☐ Learning objectives are appropriately aligned but many are not well-written in terms of verb choice and/or the criteria of audience, behavior, condition, and degree. | ☒ Learning objectives are appropriately aligned with very minor improvements needed. May be missing one or two criteria (audience, behavior, condition, degree). | ☐ Learning objectives are appropriately aligned and are exceptionally well-written to include all necessary criteria (audience, behavior, condition, degree). |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**COMMENTS on Fred Fischer's Unit: Mr. Fischer wrote some good learning objectives. He made good "verb" choices (e.g. identify, demonstrate) that can be measured. He avoided the use of what are commonly referred to as "bad" verbs that can't be measured such as "students will learn or understand." Mr. Fischer's objectives include the audience, behavior, condition but some lacked the degree to which it can be carried out. For example: There are many good websites on objective writing and he can check out - http://tlt.its.psu.edu/suggestions/research/Write_Objectives.shtml**

| 5. Student Assessments | ☐ It is unclear how one would determine if the learner achieved the learning objectives. | ☒ The assessment methods are identified but vague or limited. | ☐ Multiple methods of assessment are identified and include some authentic characteristics. | ☐ Multiple and authentic assessment methods are identified. There is a learner role in the assessment process. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**COMMENTS on Fred Fischer's Unit: Although Fred Fischer has chosen a nice, varied selection of assessments, he does not give enough information about his assessment strategies. Examples of quiz questions and/or prompts to assess factual recall would help move this to a B. Using students in the process of determining criteria for the rubrics (or another assessment piece) associated with the student products would be needed to score an "A."**

| 6. Teaching and Learning Strategies | ☐ The overall strategies are not identified or do not match the analysis. | ☐ The overall strategies are identified and appropriate but are not explained in sufficient detail. | ☒ The strategies are identified and appropriate. Details on cooperative learning, inquiry-based, problem-based, and/or project-based learning illustrate how these strategies elevate student learning. | ☐ Same as the "B" level with increased explanation and examples that illustrate a thorough understanding of the variety of engaged learning strategies. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**COMMENTS on Fred Fischer's Unit: Mr. Fischer does a good job of explaining how the three different strategies of problem, inquiry, and project-based learning align with the goal and objectives. He includes the specific question used to begin the investigation of the problem. Mr. Simon could also relate the use of these strategies to authentic learning or connecting the students to their "real world" since many of these seniors can vote in an election. He failed to mention the variety of cooperative learning strategies that are described in the student activities.**

| 7. Developing/ Selecting Instructional Materials/ Activities | ☐ The instructional materials/activities are not aligned with the instructional goals, objectives and analyses or the quantity is not acceptable. | ☐ The instructional materials/activities are aligned and minimally acceptable. The explanations are vague or hard to follow. It would be difficult for another teacher to implement this based on the information provided. | ☐ The instructional materials/activities are aligned and the explanations are acceptable. Specifics such as websites used or other examples are provided. Minor improvements could be made by providing more examples, more details on context, grouping, assessment, tools, etc. | ☒ The instructional materials/activities are aligned and the explanations are exceptional. A comprehensive explanation is provided – allowing for easy implementation by another teacher. Specific examples are plentiful within the explanation. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

COMMENTS on Fred Fischer's Unit: **Mr. Fischer explained the implementation steps in detail. Reading the student learning activities gives one a vision of what is happening in the classroom. The activities are well aligned with Mr. Fischer's objectives and what we know from the assessment area. The activities descriptions are fairly comprehensive and include examples, including a links to specific resources.**

| 8. Implementation, Student Projects, and Review | ☐ The final unit was not implemented. | ☐ The unit was implemented and at least one student product is available. | ☐ The unit was implemented and multiple student products provide a good illustration of the process. | ☒ Same as "B" level with a "tips" reflection on what worked and what didn't. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

COMMENTS on Fred Fischer's Unit: **Mr. Fischer submitted two student products that reflected the skills and learning experienced in the classroom. The survey with graphs that represented the data on voting that was submitted from the culminating student learning activity was authentic and mirrored a real world document that might show up on any legislator's desk. Mr. Fischer provided a wonderful reflection in the "High Points, Tips, and Lessons Learned during implementation:" section at the bottom of the template. Clearly, his feedback on what went well and what didn't will be valued and appreciated by other teachers who may be interested in implementing the unit.**

| 9. Technology Use and Integration | ☐ There is little evidence of technology use or integration. | ☐ The technology use and integration is limited and exists at the entry level. | ☐ The technology use and integration is appropriate and exists at the adaptation level. | ☒ The technology use and integration is exceptional and exists at the transformation level. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

COMMENTS on Fred Fischer's Unit: **The technology tools used is very appropriate for the age level. The focus is on the curriculum content and not on the technology tools. Mr. Fischer used the internet with specific links to seek current information that is not available in the classroom resources. The students determined as group how they wished to present the data collected to the local district legislative representatives which creates a wonderful transformational, student-centered learning environment.**

| 10. Grammar & Spelling | ☐ Very frequent grammar and/or spelling errors. | ☐ Six or more errors. | ☐ Very few errors (5 or less). | ☒ All grammar and spelling are correct. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. Timeliness | ☐ TWT interim review was never requested or was requested after April 30, 2005 and/or final project submitted more than one week late (after June 10th). | ☐ TWT interim review was requested late - between April 7th and April 30th, 2005 and/or final project submitted up to one week late (by June 10th). | ☐ TWT interim review requested up to two days late (April 6th) and/or final project submitted up to two days late (on June 4th or 5th). | ☒ TWT interim review was requested on or before the April 4, 2005 deadline and the final project was submitted on time (on or before June 3rd). |
| **Total Score** | **27** | | | |

| | | **\* If a rubric category from rows 1-9 is designated an "F" the entire project is deemed unacceptable.** |

## Grading Guidelines:

| A | 30-33 points | **Consistently Exceptional Performance – All work illustrates the highest quality and is beyond what is assigned in terms of amount and quality.** |
|---|---|---|
| B | 22-29 points | **Fully Satisfactory Performance – All assigned work is completed and the quality exceeds the minimum expectations.** |
| C | 11-21 points | **Minimum Performance – The amount and/or quality of work is less than expected on one or more course deliverables.** |
| F | <11 points | **Unacceptable Performance** |