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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of the class:** | Travels | |
| **Target audience:** | 10° Grade | |
| **Communicative student-centred objective(s):** | Grammar: The principal Objective in this class is that the student can development grammatical skills and use the language in real situations such as Trips.  Usability (listening, speaking, reading, writing): As a learning outcome, the student is expected to be able to have the basics of communication in English, such as being able to listen to a podcast in English and understand the main ideas, engage in conversation with native or C2 speakers, read books or blogs, and finally be able to write with good spelling in English.  Attitudinal: Students are expected to actively participate in all activities provided by the teacher throughout the class and encourage teamwork to obtain a healthy coexistence within the classroom. | |
| **Teacher-centred objective:** | *As a teacher I expect from my students that after the class they have the confidence and the ability for making a good conversation with the vocabulary learned at class.* | |
| **Grammar content and vocabulary** | *Vocabulary about travels and places.* | |
|  | | |
| **Class** | | |
| **Description of activities:** | | **Describe the ISTE standard you are working on** |
| Warm-up: Watch a video about the cheapest places in the world to travel and then discuss where would you like to go and why. | | Global collaborator |
| Follow up: After that they are going to do a roleplay, using the vocabulary about the topic (travel). | | Creative communicator |
| Wrap up: Finally, 20 minutes making the questions and clearing up doubt. | | Creative communicator, critical thinker. |
| **Assessment:**  Evaluation: The questions and the roleplay are part of the evaluation process, using grades between 1.0 and 5.0. | | |

Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very good**  **(5)** | **Good**  **(4-3)** | **Needs Improvement**  **(2-1)** | **Your score** |
| **Formulation of objectives** | Clear and accurate distinction between teacher and student-centred objectives. Objectives are functional in communicative terms. | Either one objective is not clear and accurate, or the distinction between teacher and student-centred objectives is fuzzy. There seems to be an attempt to write objectives in functional terms. | Distinction between teacher and student-centred objectives is not clear. It is not possible to identify the functional aspect of the objective. |  |
| **Accomplishment of objectives** | The activities clearly lead to the accomplishment of the objectives. | Just some activities seem incoherent with the objectives, but others seem somewhat coherent with the objectives. | Any of the activities does not seem to lead to the accomplishment of the objectives. |  |
| **Description of activities** | Activities are sequenced and structured based on planning design and ICT is included. | Activities are structured on planning, but it lacks ICT in it. | Activities appear but there is not coherence and structure in there. ICT doesn’t show up. |  |
| **Coherence, connection and process approach in the development of activities** | The flow of the activities is of a process nature, where each activity connects with the next/others, and all are coherent. | There is some evidence of a process approach. Connections and coherence are visible, although questionable at times. | Activities seem isolated in themselves. The connection and coherence of the sequence is not clear. |  |
| **Scope of activities** | Activities deal with sufficient aspects of language learning (the 4 skills but Transition just listening - speaking, grammar and vocabulary). | Activities deal with some aspects and there is room to include more. | Activities do not explore the full scope of language learning. |  |
| **Description of the ISTE Standard** | Complete and easy to understand. | Some elements seem to be missing/confusing. | Explanation is not sufficient to understand the teacher’s intentions. |  |
| **Depth of pedagogical justification** | Well substantiated with theoretical concepts and critical thinking. Coherent justification. | There is some evidence of theory influencing practice. Coherence is sometimes questionable. | Teacher’s intentions are somewhat explained without theoretical substantiation. |  |
| **Assessment** | Teachers independently locate at least 2 reliable, interesting samples to evaluate EACH of their classes or activities. | Teachers independently locate at least 1 reliable, interesting sample to evaluate EACH of their classes or activities. | Teachers didn`t show any reliable or interesting samples to evaluate their classes or activities. |  |