



# Rationale

## Standard 11: Lesson Planning

The program trains teacher candidates how to plan lessons.

**Standard applies to elementary and secondary programs.**

### Why this standard?

Planning how to adjust and enhance instruction to meet students' diverse needs lies at the heart of effective teaching. Teacher candidates should be able to demonstrate this skill in the assignments representing the culmination of their training. Good lesson plans address the needs of all students in a class, including those who are English language learners, have special needs or have already advanced beyond proficiency in a lesson objective. Teacher candidates should also learn to integrate technology to facilitate learning.

### What is the focus of the standard?

Requirements for all culminating assignments, such as those pertaining to the content of lesson plans used in student teaching, are examined to ensure that elementary and secondary teacher candidates must demonstrate that they know how to adjust their lesson planning to accommodate the needs of diverse students and employ technology effectively.

### Rationale

#### **Research base for this standard**

No “strong research”<sup>1</sup> exists on the importance of training teachers in lesson planning techniques.

#### **Other support for this standard**

This standard is grounded in common sense. One of the fundamental duties of teachers is to plan lessons for their classes, and so it follows that teacher candidates should learn to produce lesson plans while in their preparation programs. Because most classes include a range of students with diverse needs, it is both a legal requirement and a modern reality that teachers must adapt lessons to a variety of students. The education community has reached a consensus that teachers should be able to plan lessons for their students.

---

<sup>1</sup> NCTQ has created “research inventories” that describe research conducted within the last decade or so that has *general* relevance to aspects of teacher preparation also addressed by one or more of its standards (with the exceptions of the Outcomes and Evidence of Effectiveness standards). These inventories categorize research along two dimensions: design methodology and use of student performance data. Research that satisfies our standards on both is designated as “strong research” and will be identified as such. That research is cited here if it is *directly* relevant to the standard; strong research is distinguished from other research that is not included in the inventory or is not designated as “strong” in the inventory. Refer to the [introduction](#) to the research inventories for more discussion of our approach to categorizing research. If a research inventory has been developed to describe research that generally relates to the same aspect of teacher prep as addressed by a standard, the inventory can be found in the back of this standard book.

Despite this consensus, a recent survey of school staff found that just over one-third of new teachers (35 percent) were either not prepared or only somewhat prepared to select and adapt curriculum and instructional materials.<sup>2</sup>

While teacher preparation programs almost universally encourage teacher candidates to tailor instruction to students' "learning styles," methodologically sound research does not support the efficacy of attempts to do so.<sup>3</sup> In fact, Howard Gardner, who developed the theory of "multiple intelligences" (with which learning styles are often confused) asserts that learning styles are neither coherent nor supported by persuasive evidence.<sup>4</sup>

School district superintendents also support this standard.

---

<sup>2</sup> Coggshall, J. G., Bivona, L., & Reschly, D. J. (2012, August). *Evaluating the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs for support and accountability*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

<sup>3</sup> Pashler, H., McDaniel, M., Rohrer, D., & Bjork, R. (2009). Learning styles: Concepts and evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 9(3), 105-119. Retrieved March 3, 2013, from [http://www.psychologicalscience.org/journals/pspi/PSPI\\_9\\_3.pdf](http://www.psychologicalscience.org/journals/pspi/PSPI_9_3.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> Strauss, V., & Gardner, H. (2013, October 16). Howard Gardner: 'Multiple intelligences' are not 'learning styles.' *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from [www.washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com).