

Practical Lesson-Planning Pack

Classroom copy · 1 October 2026

Fictional Grade 6 ELA planning example. Use the separate blank planner for a new lesson and the separate student copy for the reading/tasks.

Completed planner 1 of 2 • goal and evidence

Field 1 • Context and curriculum

One More Place: noticing a change in attitude. Illustrative Grade 6 ELA, 45 minutes. Curriculum focus: explain a character inference using details from fiction. No jurisdiction-specific standard has been checked or claimed; teacher must match the local curriculum before use.

Field 2 • Learning objective

After reading One More Place, students will independently explain how Leila's attitude toward other people's ideas changes, using one early and one later detail and explaining how each supports their inference. The text remains available.

Field 3 • Evidence and look-fors

Collect each learner's independent response (writing, labeled notes, or an individual oral explanation). Look for a defensible before/after inference (criterion 1), two accurate relevant details from different parts (criterion 2), and a link between each detail and the inference (criterion 3). Use the 0–2 criterion descriptions in this guide; no mastery cutoff is implied.

Field 4 • Starting-point check

Within the 0–5-minute opening in field 6, show the separate Open seats warm-up before the main story. Ask for one observable action and one inference it might support. Look for a distinction between the stated action and a clue-linked interpretation. If needed, clarify with the separate model; do not use a Leila-story detail for this check.

Field 5 • Materials and preparation

Prepare one three-page student copy per learner, the two-page blank planner for teacher use, this teacher guide, pencils and a board/display. Read all three original texts and the keys; choose response options before copying. Estimated preparation: 15 minutes, based on reading the pack and preparing copies, not a timed trial.

Completed planner 2 of 2 • teaching and decisions

Field 6 • Opening and model

0–5 min: introduce the purpose and use the separate Open seats warm-up before reading One More Place; collect Starting check and listen for action/inference distinction. Then read the main story. 5–13 min: show the model vignette about Mara, speak the reasoning in the worked model, and point out how two details support a change. Ask learners to locate the two details; distinguish the text from the reader's inference. These timings are estimates.

Field 7 • Guided and independent application

13–25 min: pairs attempt about Owen, then discuss why the details support an inference. Use questions such as “Which action shows that?” rather than supply Leila's answer. 25–33 min: each learner completes Independent response with the main story open, without a partner selecting evidence. 33–40 min: learners check for a change, two details and two explanation links, then revise their own work. Do not display the independent key. Include transitions within these intervals; collection is in field 9.

Field 8 • Access and participation

For difficulty organizing an explanation, offer the blank response frame under “Independent response • use the story” in the student copy. Learners still choose their interpretation and both details. Read the text aloud on request; allow an individual oral explanation or labeled notes. Oral work can show the targeted reasoning, but not independent written composition; a read-aloud does not establish independent decoding. Follow locally agreed supports without treating this pack as an individualized plan.

Field 9 • Closure and next decision

40–45 min: collect every independent response, including a brief teacher transcription of any oral response. Ask learners to mark the link they want feedback on. After class, inspect criterion 1–criterion 3 separately. If a detail is present without reasoning, plan a short exercise explaining why that detail supports an inference; do not infer a whole reading level from this response.

Field 10 • If ready / support needed / time lost

If ready: after collecting I01, invite the learner to propose a different defensible interpretation and test it against the same details in a later conference. If more support is needed: revisit the separate Mara model and offer the blank frame; record any additional help given on I01. If 15 minutes are lost: use Worked 30-minute option, omit extended sharing and the separate revision interval, and protect eight minutes for the same independent response plus two minutes to collect it.

Field 11 • After-lesson note

Not yet taught: this is an invented planning example, not a classroom report. After teaching, record which of criterion 1–criterion 3 needs attention, the evidence that led to that decision and a next task. Do not enter predicted scores or student names in this sample.

Teaching the example • practice guidance

Read all three original texts in the student copy before teaching. Share only the intended Mara model; withhold the independent Leila key.

• Starting check

An observable action is that Jules places two extra chairs beside the puzzle table and sets out a 'Join us' card. One plausible inference is that Jules hopes other players will join the game.

The chairs and card are stated actions; Jules's hope is not stated directly and must be inferred from those clues. Use this as a brief starting-point check, not as a score or evidence of overall mastery.

Accept another plausible inference tied to a stated action, such as Jules preparing the table for friends. Do not require the sample wording or infer more than this brief response shows.

Criterion 4 • starting-check look-for

Starting-check look-for (formative, not an independent-response score): names a stated action separately from a plausible inference linked to a clue. If either part is missing or they are conflated, clarify the distinction with a separate model before continuing.

Action: Jules places extra chairs and a card. Possible inference: Jules hopes others will join.

Accept a different clue-linked inference. This quick check does not support a grade, mastery, reading-level or diagnosis claim.

• the model vignette

The early detail is the hidden sketch; the later detail is Mara's offer to contribute. The model interprets these as hesitancy followed by willingness.

The miniature text lets the teacher demonstrate two evidence-to-inference links without completing the independent Leila task.

An attentive learner may see concern about interrupting rather than shyness. Accept that tentative reading if supported; the model is one example, not the only account.

Owen moves from frustration to a more playful, practical response. His frown after the card slips suggests annoyance; his soft laugh and attempt with folded paper suggest he can adjust and try again.

Both details are in paragraph 3. Their significance, not their mere presence, supports the inference.

Accept a supported shift toward patience, determination or experimentation. For this practice only, apply criterion 1 to Owen and criterion 2 to two moments within paragraph 3; it is not the independent Leila score.

For the guided discussion, criterion 1–criterion 3 describe the same kinds of reasoning but refer to Owen within paragraph 3. Only the independent response is scored against the Leila rubric.

Independent response • feedback rubric

Independent response uses Criterion 1–criterion 3 below. Describe the evidence in each criterion; sentence style and length are not criteria.

Criterion 1

Change in attitude: 2 = a defensible early-to-later contrast about Leila's response to others' ideas; 1 = one supported attitude or a vague change; 0 = no supported attitude inference.

Accept cautious-to-receptive or protective-of-her-plan-to-collaborative if the chosen details support it. Do not require the words used in the sample.

Criterion 2

Textual details: 2 = two accurate, relevant details, one early (paragraph 1 or 2) and one later (paragraph 4 or 5); 1 = one such detail, or two relevant details only from one stage; 0 = no accurate relevant detail.

Accept quotations, accurate paraphrases or clear paragraph references with enough detail to identify the action. Quotation marks and paragraph numbers are useful but not scored.

Criterion 3

Reasoning links: 2 = explains how each selected detail supports the claimed change; 1 = explains one link or leaves a link partly implicit; 0 = only lists details or gives unrelated reasoning.

Score meaning, not length, vocabulary, spelling or one sentence pattern. Oral explanations and labeled notes can demonstrate these criteria; record their mode.

Use Criterion 4 only as a formative starting-check look-for. It is separate from criterion 1–criterion 3 and is not a score, mastery decision or reading-level claim.

Use criterion 1–criterion 3 to describe this response, not to diagnose a learner, certify a reading level or declare mastery. A total out of six is optional; retain the criterion evidence.

After using the tool, revise one planning decision from actual work: identify a criterion needing attention, choose a short follow-up and name the evidence you will inspect next. Do not prefill results.

A later conference can explore a second interpretation after the independent response is collected. Ask whether its details support it; apply the same reasoning criteria, not extra length.

Independent response • worked answers

• One acceptable response

Leila begins reluctant to reconsider her own plan and becomes open to trying other people's suggestions. In paragraph 1 she presses the tape down after Owen suggests pairs, which makes her first arrangement seem settled. In paragraph 4 she asks him to try his pairs, showing she is willing to test his idea.

The inference is about her response to others' ideas, with one detail and explanation from each stage. It does not require claiming a permanent personality change.

Another defensible interpretation

Alternative: Leila changes from trusting only her own viewpoint to seeking another view. In paragraph 2 she says it looks fine from her position instead of moving the card; this dismisses Jo's concern. In paragraph 5 she asks Jo to check from the doorway and leaves cards untaped, suggesting she now expects feedback may change the arrangement.

A cautious-to-receptive reading can earn full credit with supported details. A claim that she becomes completely confident or never listens to anyone needs more evidence than this text provides. Do not penalize a defensible alternative simply for differing from this example.

Criterion examples • partial evidence is useful

Criterion 1 • 2: Starts reluctant to change her own arrangement, then seeks and tries suggestions.

Criterion 1 • 1: She becomes more open. (The starting attitude is unclear.)

Criterion 2 • 2: She presses down the tape after Owen's suggestion (1); later she asks him to try pairs (4).

Criterion 2 • 1: She asks Jo to check from the doorway (5).

Criterion 3 • 2: Pressing the tape down treats her arrangement as settled; asking for pairs shows she is willing to test Owen's idea.

Criterion 3 • 1: Asking Jo for a check shows she now values another view.

Worked 30-minute option • worked shortened period

0–5 min • Read and starting check

Read the whole story and use one observation/inference pair; keep the reading available.

5–10 min • Focused model

Use the same Mara model once. Name the early detail, later detail and reasoning; omit extended audience sharing.

10–20 min • Focused guided practice

Pairs attempt Owen, followed by one supported explanation and a brief teacher check. Trim repeated whole-class sharing.

20–28 min • Protected independent response

Use the identical prompt, story, available response options and criterion 1–criterion 3 criteria. Do not trade this time for discussion.

28–30 min • Collect evidence

Collect every response or oral-response note. Move feedback and any revision to the next meeting. field 2–field 5, field 8 and field 11 remain as completed in the 45-minute plan. The objective, texts, independent prompt and rubric do not change.

Time saved: model 3 minutes, guided sharing 2, separate revision 7 and closure 3 = 15. The first independent attempt is still eight minutes.

The shorter version removes immediate revision and some discussion, so it offers less practice/feedback time. Compare first attempts fairly; do not claim equal outcomes or timed equivalence.

For an individual oral response, arrange a quiet place and brief transcription within the available time. If collection cannot finish, schedule completion and record it as pending.

Apply the shorter plan • access and follow-up

Field 1 • Context and curriculum: Same lesson, Grade 6 ELA and curriculum focus; available teaching time is now 30 minutes.

Field 6 • Opening and model: Read/check 0–5; model 5–10. Use the full main story and the same Mara model once; remove extended sharing.

Field 7 • Guided and independent application: Guided work 10–20; independent Independent response 20–28. Remove the separate seven-minute revision interval and shorten discussion.

Field 9 • Closure and next decision: Collect responses 28–30; inspect the same three criteria after class. Give feedback and offer revision at the next meeting.

Field 10 • If ready / support needed / time lost: The independent eight minutes and final two-minute collection are protected. If further time is lost, finish collecting individual evidence at the next meeting; mark the lesson evidence incomplete, rather than treat partner discussion as the independent response.

Using the optional frame

Barrier: Organizing an evidence-based explanation. This frame supplies organization, not an interpretation or evidence. A teacher-selected clue or partner-composed answer would reduce what the response shows about independent evidence selection.

Find the optional frame under “Independent response • use the story” in the student copy. Write above it or continue on plain paper; keep any continuation with the response.

Customize the local curriculum, text/task, available time, materials and participation options. This is a planning aid, not a required administrative form.

The Grade 6 ELA example in the separate teacher guide illustrates the fields. It is not a claim of standards alignment, validated reading level or classroom effectiveness.

Sources and use

Planning basis: choose evidence that shows the objective, and protect priority learning when time is shortened. References below support these general design choices; they do not evaluate this pack. No external text or asset is reproduced.

Original invented texts, sample responses and planning example for Practical Lesson-Planning Pack

[Copyable Lesson-Plan Template](#)

Planning reference: CMU Eberly Center, Align Assessments with Objectives.
<https://www.cmu.edu/teaching/designteach/design/assessments.html>

Planning reference: University of Michigan CRLT, Strategies for Effective Lesson Planning.
https://crlt.umich.edu/gsis/p2_5

All pack components and editable files are free to download. You may print, copy and adapt them for your own lesson planning and classroom use under Mentor Teaching's Terms of Use:
<https://mentorteaching.com/terms-of-use/>