

Objective-to-Assessment Alignment Pack

T02 · v0.1.3 · Teacher guide: worked alignments and repairs

Use this teacher-facing planner to check whether an actual student task elicits the learning named in an objective, produces observable evidence of it, and uses a criterion that recognizes the target. Work on one objective at a time and check local curriculum expectations yourself. The examples are invented Grade 6 illustrations, not a claim of universal grade or standards alignment.

Teacher directions and scope

Audience metadata: Grade 6 ELA pilot. Worked contexts are individually labeled Grade 6 ELA, Grade 6 mathematics and Grade 6 science. These examples do not establish fit for other grades, subjects or local curricula.

Estimated preparation: 5 minutes. Basis: Estimate to select one objective/task and gather its required text, problem or data; not tested.

Estimated colleague-practice use: 20 minutes. Basis: Estimate for a short colleague practice: 3 minutes directions, 7 minutes one worked case, 7 minutes to draft/check one alignment and 3 minutes debrief. Untested professional-use estimate; not student lesson time.

Read the objective and task as learners will encounter them. Do not align an objective to a topic label or verb alone: identify the thinking learners must actually do and the evidence that can show it.

The blank planner is a reusable tool. The separate teacher guide has six complete invented examples. The first three are matched alignments; the last three are purposeful mismatches with specific repairs.

All contexts are labeled Grade 6. The examples do not show that this pack is validated for every grade, subject or curriculum. Teachers must check local objectives, materials and constraints.

When a writing, speaking, language, calculation or other mode is itself part of the objective, include it in the criterion. Otherwise, do not let an unnecessary format rule hide evidence of the intended learning.

If the planned task or criterion changes, recheck the evidence against the objective. An accessible alternate response mode can preserve the target when response format is not the target; note separately what the alternate mode cannot demonstrate.

Short follow-up: after considering an invented or de-identified sample response, mark one checklist item that is not yet met and revise the task, evidence or criterion. Do not infer learner traits or outcomes from this planning tool.

Three worked alignments

Worked alignment 1 · T02-W1

Worked alignment 1: trace the Grade 6 ELA objective through the actual fictional-scene task to the evidence and criterion.

1 · Instructional context: Grade 6 ELA · infer a character's changing view of classmates' ideas · short invented fiction.

2 · Learning objective: After reading the scene, students infer how Ren's view of peer suggestions changes from the beginning to the end, cite one detail from each point and explain how the details support the inference.

3 · Actual student task: Read this invented scene: 'At first, Ren pushed Mina's folded-paper supports aside. "Mine works," Ren said. The bridge sagged. Mina asked, "May I show you a wider fold?" Ren tried it. The bridge held a stack of four counters. When classmates asked how, Ren said, "Mina spotted what I missed; I want to hear the next idea before I decide.'" Then answer: How does Ren's view of peer suggestions change? Use one early and one later detail and explain what each shows.

4 · Expected observable evidence: A response states Ren's earlier and later views, gives a relevant detail from each point in the scene, and connects both details to the inference.

5 · Sample response or product: One plausible response: Ren first dismisses Mina's suggestion, shown when Ren pushes it aside and says his bridge works. Later Ren says he wants to hear the next idea before deciding and credits Mina, showing a more open view. The attempt also helps the bridge hold four counters, supporting the change. A concise organizer with the same before/after evidence and reasoning can show the same learning.

6 · Criterion: Identify a supported change (or explain that Ren becomes more open to suggestions); use relevant early and later details; explain the link from details to inference. Accept paraphrase, labeled notes or another clear format. A response with only one time point is partial evidence, not a full demonstration.

7 · Alignment diagnosis: Match: the task explicitly asks learners to infer change across two time points, select details and explain them. The evidence and criterion require those same components, so a response can show the intended inference rather than only recall a plot event.

8 · Concrete repair or next check: No repair needed for this stated target. Check that the response includes both time points, relevant details and a reasoned link; do not require the sample wording or a fixed paragraph format.

Teacher note: The response is judged against the objective's change-and-evidence demand, not a preferred sentence. The story, characters and events are invented; this is an example, not a reported classroom outcome.

Worked alignment 2 · T02-W2

Worked alignment 2: check whether the Grade 6 mathematics task requires an area model and fraction multiplication, with consistent units.

1 · Instructional context: Grade 6 mathematics · multiply fractional side lengths to interpret rectangular area · quantities and model are invented instructional data.

2 · Learning objective: Use an area model and multiplication to find and explain the area of a rectangle whose side lengths are proper fractions of a unit.

3 · Actual student task: A rectangular paper planter is $\frac{3}{4}$ metre long and $\frac{2}{3}$ metre wide. Draw a reference square that represents 1 metre by 1 metre, with total area 1 square metre. Divide it into 4 equal columns and 3 equal rows. Mark 3 of the 4 columns to represent the planter's $\frac{3}{4}$ -metre length and 2 of the 3 rows to represent its $\frac{2}{3}$ -metre width. Their overlap represents the planter. Write a multiplication equation, report the planter's area in square metres, and explain how the overlap represents the product.

4 · Expected observable evidence: The learner gives a labeled 1 m by 1 m reference square with a 4-by-3 equal-part grid, shows the six-cell overlap of three fourths and two thirds, writes $(\frac{3}{4}) \times (\frac{2}{3})$, finds $\frac{6}{12} = \frac{1}{2}$ square metre and explains that each cell is $\frac{1}{12}$ square metre.

5 · Sample response or product: One plausible product: a square labeled 1 m on each side has $4 \times 3 = 12$ equal cells, each representing $\frac{1}{12} \text{ m}^2$. Marking 3 of 4 columns and 2 of 3 rows leaves 6 cells in the overlap. That overlap represents the $\frac{3}{4}$ -metre by $\frac{2}{3}$ -metre planter. $(\frac{3}{4}) \times (\frac{2}{3}) = \frac{6}{12} = \frac{1}{2}$, so its area is $\frac{1}{2}$ square metre. A student may reverse the grid orientation if labels and overlap remain consistent.

6 · Criterion: Reference whole is labeled 1 m by 1 m (1 m^2); model dimensions and labels match $\frac{3}{4}$ m and $\frac{2}{3}$ m; overlap is 6 of 12 equal parts; equation and simplified area $\frac{1}{2} \text{ m}^2$ agree; explanation links overlap to multiplication and area. Allow a differently oriented, correctly labeled area model and any equivalent calculation method. A correct product without a model is partial evidence for this objective.

7 · Alignment diagnosis: Match: learners must construct/interpret a fraction area model, multiply the side lengths and explain the overlap. The requested diagram, equation, value, unit and explanation each reveal part of the objective; merely recalling a rule would not complete the task.

8 · Concrete repair or next check: No repair needed. Verify the 1 m^2 reference whole, 4-by-3 partition, six-cell overlap, $\frac{6}{12} = \frac{1}{2}$ result and square-unit label. Accept a differently oriented diagram when its labels and shaded intersection are consistent.

Teacher note: Calculation check: $\frac{3}{4} \times \frac{2}{3} = \frac{6}{12} = \frac{1}{2}$; a 4-by-3 partition contains 12 equal cells and the overlap contains $3 \times 2 = 6$. The planter is an invented context, not a claim about a real object.

Worked alignment 3 · T02-W3

Worked alignment 3: check the Grade 6 science comparison against the explicitly simulated three-trial data.

1 · Instructional context: Grade 6 science · compare repeated measurements for two paper-helicopter designs · all values below are explicitly simulated instructional data.

2 · Learning objective: Given three simulated descent-time measurements for each of two designs, calculate and show each mean to the nearest tenth, use the means to state which recorded average time is shorter and by how much, support the comparison with both values and units, and note one limitation of this small dataset.

3 · Actual student task: Fictional data only: Design A times are 4.2 s, 4.0 s and 4.4 s. Design B times are 3.8 s, 4.5 s and 3.7 s. Show how you calculate each mean to the nearest tenth. State which design has the shorter recorded mean time and by how many seconds; cite both means with units; and name one limitation supported by the table.

4 · Expected observable evidence: The product shows each mean calculation, a comparison using both means and seconds, the difference between the means, and one cautious statement tied to there being only three simulated trials for each design.

5 · Sample response or product: One plausible product: A mean = $(4.2 + 4.0 + 4.4) / 3 = 12.6 / 3 = 4.2$ s. B mean = $(3.8 + 4.5 + 3.7) / 3 = 12.0 / 3 = 4.0$ s. B's recorded mean is 0.2 s shorter. Because the table has only three trials per design, another small set could produce different means. This compares the supplied data; it does not claim either design is generally better.

6 · Criterion: Both means and units are correct to the nearest tenth; comparison identifies B as 0.2 s shorter on these data; limitation is tied to the three-trial sample or measurement process. Accept equivalent arithmetic layouts and cautious limitations grounded in the task. A comparison without supporting mean calculations is partial evidence.

7 · Alignment diagnosis: Match: the task explicitly requires visible mean calculations, comparison with both values and their difference, and a limitation. Each requested part is visible in the product and named in the criterion. Because the values are labeled simulated, no real experiment or general scientific finding is being claimed.

8 · Concrete repair or next check: No repair needed. Check both sums, division by three, units and the 0.2-second difference. Keep the conclusion limited to the supplied simulated trials; do not infer which design is universally faster.

Teacher note: Arithmetic check: A totals 12.6 seconds and has mean 4.2 seconds; B totals 12.0 seconds and has mean 4.0 seconds. The means differ by 0.2 seconds. These are simulated values, not observed classroom results.

Three mismatch examples and repairs

Mismatch 1 · T02-M1

Mismatch 1: diagnose the original Grade 6 ELA task that records letter recognition instead of evidence about a character's changing view, then repair it.

1 · Instructional context: Grade 6 ELA · infer a character's changing view of classmates' ideas · same invented scene as worked case W1.

2 · Learning objective: After reading the invented Ren scene, infer how Ren's view of peer suggestions changes from beginning to end, cite one detail from each point and explain the connection.

3 · Actual student task: Original task: Read this invented scene: 'At first, Ren pushed Mina's folded-paper supports aside. "Mine works," Ren said. The bridge sagged. Mina asked, "May I show you a wider fold?" Ren tried it. The bridge held a stack of four counters. When classmates asked how, Ren said, "Mina spotted what I missed; I want to hear the next idea before I decide."' Circle each word containing the letter e and write the total number of circled words.

4 · Expected observable evidence: Original expected product: a marked copy with e-containing words circled and a numeral giving their count. It contains no required claim about Ren's view or supporting details.

5 · Sample response or product: Original product description: the page has some or all e-containing words marked and a count. Even a completely accurate count says nothing about whether the learner inferred Ren's change in view.

6 · Criterion: Original criterion can check whether the marked words contain e and whether the count matches the marks. That criterion does not assess a before/after inference, textual details or reasoning.

7 · Alignment diagnosis: Mismatch: letter recognition/counting is the wrong evidence for the objective. The student can complete the task accurately without interpreting Ren or using either story detail; the shared story context does not make the task aligned.

8 · Concrete repair or next check: Repair the prompt: 'How does Ren's view of peer suggestions change from the beginning to the end? State the earlier and later view, use one relevant detail from each point in the scene, and explain how those details support your inference.' Expected evidence is the two-part inference, two details and link. Score those qualities; accept accurate paraphrase or a labeled organizer. This makes the learner perform the objective rather than count letters.

Teacher note: The original task has an answer, but it measures a different skill. Repair addresses the actual evidence gap rather than changing the objective. The scene remains invented.

Mismatch 2 · T02-M2

Mismatch 2: diagnose why the original Grade 6 mathematics vocabulary prompt is below the fraction-addition objective's demand, then repair it.

1 · Instructional context: Grade 6 mathematics · add fractions with unlike denominators and explain equivalence · quantities are an invented context.

2 · Learning objective: Use equivalent fractions to add two fractions with unlike denominators in a context and explain how the equivalent parts preserve the total.

3 · Actual student task: Original task: For $\frac{2}{3}$ metre and $\frac{3}{4}$ metre, write what the numerator and denominator mean in each fraction.

4 · Expected observable evidence: Original expected product: definitions identifying the numerator and denominator of $\frac{2}{3}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$. It does not require equivalent fractions, addition or a total length.

5 · Sample response or product: Original product description: a note that 2 is the numerator and 3 the denominator in $\frac{2}{3}$, and 3 is the numerator and 4 the denominator in $\frac{3}{4}$, with suitable definitions. This can be correct while leaving the objective unshown.

6 · Criterion: Original criterion can check accurate numerator/denominator vocabulary. It cannot show whether the learner can represent the fractions with a common denominator, add them or explain the sum.

7 · Alignment diagnosis: Mismatch: the original prompt is mathematically related but below the objective's demand. Definitions only elicit recall; a learner can meet that prompt without doing the target operation or explaining equivalence.

8 · Concrete repair or next check: Repair the prompt: 'A project uses $\frac{2}{3}$ metre of blue cord and $\frac{3}{4}$ metre of green cord. How many metres are used altogether? Show equivalent fractions with a common denominator, add them, simplify, and explain why the equal-sized parts can be combined.' Expected work: $\frac{8}{12} + \frac{9}{12} = \frac{17}{12} = 1 \frac{5}{12}$ metres, with an explanation of twelfths. Criterion checks equivalent fractions, a consistent sum and unit, and the explanation. The computation now requires the stated objective.

Teacher note: Calculation check: $\frac{2}{3} = \frac{8}{12}$ and $\frac{3}{4} = \frac{9}{12}$; the sum is $\frac{17}{12} = 1 \frac{5}{12}$ metres. The cord lengths are invented instructional quantities.

Mismatch 3 · T02-M3

Mismatch 3: identify why the original Grade 6 ELA scoring rule rewards format rather than the inference objective, then repair the task/criterion pair.

1 · Instructional context: Grade 6 ELA · infer a character's changing view of classmates' ideas · same invented scene as worked case W1.

2 · Learning objective: Infer Ren's changing view of peer suggestions, cite one relevant detail from early and late in the scene, and explain how the details support the inference.

3 · Actual student task: Original task: Read this invented scene: 'At first, Ren pushed Mina's folded-paper supports aside. "Mine works," Ren said. The bridge sagged. Mina asked, "May I show you a wider fold?" Ren tried it. The bridge held a stack of four counters. When classmates asked how, Ren said, "Mina spotted what I missed; I want to hear the next idea before I decide.'" Explain in a response how Ren's view changes. Include one early detail, one later detail and the reasoning that links them. A paragraph, bullets or labeled organizer may be used.

4 · Expected observable evidence: The task can elicit a before/after inference with two relevant details and explanation. The planned scoring rule, however, accepts only exactly five sentences, the exact phrase 'peer collaboration' and error-free punctuation; it rejects bullets or other accurate wording.

5 · Sample response or product: Plausible accurate product at risk of rejection: 'At first Ren pushes Mina's idea away. Later Ren says he wants to hear the next idea before deciding. That change shows Ren is more open to classmates' suggestions.' This is three clear sentences and does not use the required phrase, but it gives both time points and an explanation.

6 · Criterion: Original criterion: exactly five complete sentences, exact phrase 'peer collaboration' and perfect punctuation. Those demands measure length, vocabulary choice and mechanics that are not in the objective; the criterion can reject valid inference evidence.

7 · Alignment diagnosis: Mismatch: the prompt's thinking demand can fit, but the scoring rule makes format and one preferred phrase decide success. An accurate supported inference can be rejected even though it demonstrates the objective.

8 · Concrete repair or next check: Repair the criterion: score the earlier/later inference, relevant detail from each point and reasoning link. Accept the paragraph, bullets or labeled organizer already allowed by the task. Do not require five sentences or the exact phrase unless those are independently stated learning targets.

Teacher note: This case locates the mismatch in the criterion and response constraints, not in the objective verb. The repaired criterion accepts varied wording while preserving the same inference evidence.

Review checklist

- [] T02-C01 · The objective states the intended learning and the actual grade, subject and context are named.
- [] T02-C02 · The actual task requires the target thinking/action; a matching verb or shared topic alone does not count.
- [] T02-C03 · The prompt includes the information, text, problem, data, directions and response choices needed to understand what learners will do.
- [] T02-C04 · Expected evidence is observable and names what a learner produces, says or does; task completion alone is not treated as learning evidence.
- [] T02-C05 · The sample response/product is possible from the supplied task and materials, plausible for the stated context, and accurate where it includes facts or calculations.
- [] T02-C06 · The criterion checks target-relevant qualities and makes useful partial evidence visible without adding an unrelated format or wording rule.
- [] T02-C07 · The task demand is sufficient for the objective's level of thinking; it does not stop at recall or completion when explanation, comparison or transfer is targeted.
- [] T02-C08 · A proposed repair names the exact change and resolves the identified gap while keeping the objective and its important evidence intact.
- [] T02-C09 · Material factual claims, calculations, units, data provenance and reuse rights have been checked; fictional examples and simulated data are labeled, and no unsupported standards claim is added.

Adaptation and transfer

Support · Support for the barrier of a crowded form or limited typing time: draft brief phrases in fields 1–6, use arrows to connect objective → task → evidence, then finish diagnosis, revision and checklist. A teacher may dictate their own planning notes or use the editable DOCX. This changes the mode of tool completion, not the student's target or evidence; a student response-mode change must be checked against the local objective.

Extension · Transfer extension: keep one objective fixed but change the task format or stimulus (for example, paragraph to labeled organizer, or one supplied data set to a second invented data set). Complete fields 3–8 again. Explain which evidence still demonstrates the objective, what the criterion must change, and what the new task can no longer show. The reasoning, not extra items, is the extension.

Sources and limits

The examples and data are original, invented instructional examples. The science times are simulated; no physical trials or classroom outcomes are reported. Fraction calculations are checked in the T02 source ledger. No third-party text/assets, reading-level labels or standards claims are included.

Original T02 teacher tool; fictional and simulated examples are labeled in the teacher guide.