edTPA™

All Fields

Review of Low-Scoring edTPAs and Guidance for Re-Takes

October 2014

SCALE

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, & Equity

Audience:

edTPA candidates, faculty, program coordinators and clinical field supervisors/support providers

Purpose and Use:

This document has two purposes: 1) to guide faculty conversation and action to address low candidate performance and 2) to guide faculty/candidate conversations around re-take options. It presents common types of evidence that represent low-scoring portfolios, based on close examination of the rubrics, review of training benchmarks, and reports from trainers.

Faculty can use this document to collectively review and discuss low-scoring edTPAs to explore a pattern of low candidate performance on specific rubrics. After thinking about what is leading to low candidate scores, the collegial conversation can then turn to exploring solutions. These include discussions with other programs experiencing the same challenges, program modifications to strengthen their candidates' teaching in those areas or identification of unclear directions or phrasing that can be reported to SCALE.

Faculty and/or edTPA candidates can also use this document to review an edTPA portfolio with scores at Levels 1 and/or 2 to help identify potential candidate misunderstandings and/or errors that led to a low score. Explanations of low scores presented below are generic and can be adapted to any subject area by adapting the subject-specific emphasis found in each edTPA handbook. Each rubric has a bulleted list of generic explanations for levels 1 and 2. To begin, identify each low-scoring rubric that the candidate received. Next, review the corresponding rubric score explained below. Consider asking a question for each bullet point. For example, for rubric 1, did the central focus described by the candidate align with the standards and learning objectives identified? Review the "Subject-Specific Considerations" where applicable (e.g., Rubric 1, level 1 – Early Childhood).

Each rubric includes exceptions to the general scoring patterns for all fields except very low incidence areas (i.e., Agricultural Education, Business Education, Educational Technology Specialist, Family and Consumer Science, Health Education, Library Specialist, Literacy Specialist, and Technology and Engineering Education.) Candidates and faculty in these fields can this use this document of low-scoring rubric explanations as a guide, but should also consult their handbooks for requirements that differ from general patterns. NOTE: A separate "Review of Low-Scoring edTPAs and Guidance to Support Resubmissions" has been created for Special Education.

Recurring Term

One term, dimensions of content understanding, will appear throughout this document. Dimensions of content understanding are distinct parts of the subject-specific emphasis that is identified on page 1 of the handbook and included in the stem of the guiding question for many rubrics, including Rubric 1. For example, the three dimensions of content understanding for mathematics fields are 1) conceptual understanding; 2) procedural fluency; and 3) mathematical reasoning and/or problem solving.

Condition Codes:

This document does not provide guidance for addressing condition codes. If a Condition Code replaces a score for any rubric, the candidate can contact Pearson Customer Support to learn the reason why the condition code was assigned.

Planning Rubrics - Rubric 1: Planning for Content Understandings

How do the candidate's plans build students' understanding of the dimensions of content understanding in the handbook, e.g., for the mathematics fields: conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem solving skills?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
Candidate's plans focus solely on one dimension of content understanding with no connections to other dimensions. There are significant content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings. **OR** Standards, objectives, and learning tasks and materials are not aligned with each other.	Plans for instruction support student learning of one dimension of content understanding with vague connections to the other dimensions.
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompts 1a, b, and c, and the lesson plans submitted (with a focus on the standards/objectives). Central Focus of Learning Segment and Alignment of Lesson Plans: • The central focus listed in the Planning Commentary does not align with the standards and/or objectives listed in each lesson plan. • Although each lesson presents a related topic, the lessons and/or commentary do not show the connection that the candidate is making between lessons to address a central focus. The lessons are presented as three separate entities with little connection made between the lessons rather than a coordinated learning segment with a central focus. • There is not enough information in the commentary and/or lesson plans to understand how each lesson addresses the central focus and/or each dimension of content understanding. Plans focus solely on one dimension of content understanding • The overall focus of the learning segment deals with only one dimension of content understanding, e.g., facts and procedures. • Although there may be some elements of other content dimensions, it is not clear to the scorer how those are being developed across the learning segment. • Instructional materials and/or assessments do not support the development of content dimensions beyond a single dimension.	Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompts 1a, b, and c, and the lesson plans submitted (with a focus on the standards/objectives). Central Focus of Learning Segment and Alignment of Lesson Plans: • All three lessons are related to the same central focus. • The standards, objectives, learning tasks, and materials are all related to the same central focus. Plans hint at the connection between learning of facts and procedures and one other content dimension: • The overall focus of the learning segment deals with facts, isolated skills, and/or procedures. • There are some elements of one other content dimension, but it is unclear how the candidate plans to make these connections with the students. • The commentary and lesson plans show a focus primarily on only one dimension of content understanding though there is some evidence that the candidate has built some connections to at least one other content dimension. • However, the commentary and lesson plans do not make it clear how the candidate makes the connection for the students between the dimension that is the focus and the other content dimension(s). <u>Subject-Specific Considerations</u> • Middle Childhood and Secondary Science: Students have opportunities planned to engage in scientific practices through inquiry, but there is

Automatic 1 (significant content inaccuracies or lack of alignment):
- There is a pattern of consistent content inaccuracies that would require re-teaching of any or all of the lessons.
- There is a significant misalignment between standards, objectives, learning tasks, and materials.

<u>Subject-Specific Considerations</u>
- Early Childhood:
  - Plans are not developmentally appropriate for the children described.
  - Plans focus on only one modality for learning

little attention to developing understanding of science concepts or in constructing scientific explanations of a phenomenon.

Planning Rubrics - Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs

How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students to develop the dimensions of content understanding in the handbook, e.g., for the mathematics fields: conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning and/or problem solving skills?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
There is little or no evidence of planned supports. OR Candidate does NOT attend to ANY INSTRUCTIONAL requirements in IEPs and/or 504 plans.	Planned supports are loosely tied to learning objectives or the central focus of the learning segment.
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review responses to Context for Learning and the Planning Commentary Prompts 2 a, b and 3 a, b, c (primary source). **Automatic 1 (no attention given to requirements in IEPs and 504 plans):** • Students with IEPs and/or 504 plans are listed in the Context for Learning document, but specific support for these students is not identified in Planning Commentary Prompts 3b or c or in the lesson plans. **Planned Supports:** • Planned support is not included or there is a very limited description in the commentary. • The candidate does not describe how the use of supports is appropriate for the needs of the whole class. **Connection of planned supports to learning objectives or central focus:** • The candidate lists support that is not related or marginally related to the learning objectives or central focus in the planning commentary and lesson plans. • It is not clear how the planned supports align with the central focus or learning objectives.	Review responses to Context for Learning and the Planning Commentary Prompts 2 a, b and 3 a, b, c (primary source). **Planned Supports:** • The candidate includes support that is only superficially related to the central focus in the planning commentary (modeling, word chart, work in pairs). • The supports are described generically (work in pairs, practice time). The candidate has not explained how the supports specifically address the learning objectives or central focus of the learning segment. **Connection of planned supports to learning objectives or central focus:** • The supports align with the learning objectives or the central focus, but are not appropriate for the needs of the whole class (e. g. 5th graders using counters to solve long division problems; 10th graders listening to the text being read aloud). • It is not clear how the supports listed will be helpful to students in meeting the learning objectives or central focus. <u>Subject-Specific Considerations</u> Early Childhood: Supports are loosely tied to learning objectives, and there is little accommodation in the presentation of learning experiences for children's different approaches to learning or needs.

Planning Rubrics - Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning

How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
Candidate's justification of learning tasks is either missing OR represents a deficit view of students and their backgrounds.	Candidate justifies learning tasks with limited attention to students' prior academic learning OR personal/cultural/community assets.
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review responses to Context for Learning and the Planning Commentary Prompts 2 a, b and 3 a, b (primary source). **Automatic 1 (deficit view of students and their backgrounds):** • The candidate attributes low academic performance to the students' cultural or linguistic backgrounds, the challenges they face outside of school, or lack of family support. • The candidate states or infers that the students will not perform well because of their backgrounds (cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, etc.), and this is reflected in low performance expectations or a lack of appropriate support. **Justification of learning tasks through students' prior academic learning OR personal/cultural/community assets:** • There is no evidence that the candidate has considered the particular class during the planning. • There is no evidence that students' prior learning OR personal/cultural/community assets were used in planning the learning tasks or materials.	Review responses to Context for Learning and the Planning Commentary Prompts 2 a, b and 3 a, b (primary source). **Justification of learning tasks through students' prior academic learning:** • There is limited evidence that the candidate has considered the particular class during the planning. • There is mention of students' prior academic learning, but it is general and not clearly connected to the planned learning tasks or materials. **Justification of learning tasks through personal/cultural/community assets:** • There is mention of students' prior personal/cultural/community assets, but it is not clearly connected to the planned learning tasks or materials.

Planning Rubrics - Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands

How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key learning task?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
Language demands[1] identified by the candidate are not consistent with the selected language function[2] OR task. OR Language supports are missing or are not aligned with the language demand(s) for the learning task.	Candidate identifies vocabulary (and/or symbols, in some fields – need to look at first bullet in Planning commentary 4c for field-specific language) as the major language demand associated with the language function. Attention to additional language demands is superficial. Language supports primarily address definitions of vocabulary and/or symbols.
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompt 4 a-d (primary source), Lesson Plans, and Instructional Materials. Language function identified: • The candidate does not identify a language function in Prompt 4a. See specific language functions as suggested in the handbook. Some examples are describe, compare-contrast, evaluate, and justify Language demands (vocabulary/symbols, syntax, or discourse – consult planning commentary 4c for field-specific list) identified: • The language demands do not align with the language function listed in Planning Commentary 4a. For example, If candidate lists justify as the language function it does not align with the key vocabulary demands of "similar to" and "different" and the syntax such as "The use of figurative language is similar in that the author … The use of figurative language is different in that the author … • The language demands do not align with the language task listed in Planning Commentary 4b. In commentary 4b, the candidate explains a learning task from the learning segment and so the language demands listed in 4c need to match with the learning task.	Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompt 4 a-d (primary source), Lesson Plans, and Instructional Materials. Language demands (vocabulary/symbols, syntax, or discourse - consult planning commentary 4c for field-specific list) identified: • Vocabulary and/or terminology (specific to the central focus) is the primary language demand identified in Planning Commentary 4c. • Other language demands may be identified superficially (alluded to, but not specifically identified in enough detail to understand them). Language Supports: • The language supports are limited to such things as a word chart, writing definitions, or showing pictures of vocabulary. The supports do not address use of the language function or other language demands. Subject-Specific Considerations Early Childhood: Vocabulary identified is only vaguely aligned with the learning experience or central focus.

---

[1] Language demands include: language function, vocabulary, syntax, and discourse (organizational structures, text structure, etc.).

[2] Language function refers to the learning outcome (verb) selected in prompt 4a (e.g., categorize, describe…).

Language Supports:
- The language supports are not identified in Planning Commentary 4d. Language supports must be specific to supporting the students' use of language. Some examples are word charts, sentence frames, realia, and teaching modeling. The candidate may list content support (use of base 10 blocks), that is related to the learning task, but does not provide language support.
- The language supports do not address the language demands for the language function and/or learning task that is listed in Planning Commentary 4a and/or 4b If the candidate lists describe as the language function, yet the word chart and sentence frames are vocabulary and syntax that aligns with justify, the language supports do not address the language function.

Subject-Specific Considerations
- Early Childhood – Vocabulary identified is not developmentally appropriate or is significantly misaligned with the central focus or learning experience.
- Physical Education – includes symbols, signals, and key phrases as part of the vocabulary cluster.
- Secondary Mathematics – includes Mathematical Precision as a language demand
- Technology and Engineering Education – includes Visual Representation as a language demand
- World Language and Classical Language – this rubric is not included, and prompts 5-13 will be one number lower for World Language and Classical Language.

Planning Rubrics - Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning

How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to monitor students' development in the different dimensions of content understanding in the handbook, e.g., e.g., for the mathematics fields: conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem solving skills?

Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
The assessments only provide evidence of students' development in one dimension of content understanding. OR Candidate does not attend to ANY ASSESSMENT requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.	The assessments provide limited evidence to monitor students' • Progress toward developing one or more of the different dimensions of content understanding during the learning segment.
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	**Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score**
Review responses to the Context for Learning Information (required supports, modifications, or accommodations for assessments), Planning Commentary Prompts 2 and 5 (primary in light of Context for Learning), Lesson Plans (assessments), and Assessment Materials. **Automatic 1 (no attention to ANY ASSESSMENT requirements in IEPs and 504 plans):** • Assessment modifications for students with IEPs and/or 504 plans are listed in the Context for Learning document, but none of that support is described in Planning Commentary Prompts 5a and b or in the lesson plans. **Plans to monitor dimensions of content understandings:** • The assessments only focus on one dimension of content understanding without providing evidence of other dimensions of content understanding. **Subject-Specific Considerations** • Early Childhood – Assessments focus on evidence from only one mode of learning. • World Language (Rubric 4) – The assessments planned will provide no evidence of students' communicative proficiency in the target language.	**Review responses to** the Context for Learning Information (required supports, modifications, or accommodations for assessments), Planning Commentary Prompts 2 and 5 (primary in light of Context for Learning), Lesson Plans (assessments), and Assessment Materials **Plans to monitor dimensions of content understandings:** • Assessments will allow for limited evidence of student learning (single assessment, **mostly** only one content dimension). • The assessments do not measure student learning across **all** dimensions of content understanding. **Subject-Specific Considerations** • Early Childhood – While assessments do provide evidence from more than one mode of learning, the evidence from the different modalities is limited. • World Language (Rubric 4) -- The assessments planned will provide only limited evidence of students' communicative proficiency in the target language.

Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 6: Learning Environment

How does the candidate demonstrate a respectful learning environment that supports students' engagement in learning?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
The clip(s) reveal evidence of **disrespectful interactions** between teacher and students or between students. **OR** Candidate allows **disruptive behavior** to interfere with student learning.	The candidate **demonstrates respect for students**. **AND** Candidate provides a **learning environment that serves primarily to control student behavior**, and **minimally supports the learning goals**.
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source) and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 3. **Disrespectful interactions between candidate and students or between students:** • Video shows evidence of disrespectful interactions between candidate and students (e.g., sarcastic remarks) or between students (e.g., interrupting, talking over each other) through the video clip(s) that go unaddressed by the candidate. • Students are not welcome or allowed to ask questions or contribute ideas. **Disruptive behavior that interferes with student learning** • The students' behavior disrupts or disturbs the lesson so that student learning is impacted negatively. • The candidate is not able to manage classroom behavior and student learning is impacted. • Students do not have an opportunity to learn because of distractions of other students as seen in the video clip(s). **Subject-Specific Considerations** • Middle Childhood and Secondary Science, Physical Education – Safety hazards that pose a danger to students are seen in the video clip(s) that are not addressed by the candidate.	Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source) and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 3. **Respect for students:** • Respect for students is seen (calling on student by name, asking students to contribute ideas or model key skills), but the majority of the lesson focuses on classroom management. **Controlling learning environment that minimally supports learning goals** • Candidate focuses much of the lesson on classroom management and there is little time directed specifically to the learning goals.

Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 7: Engaging Students in Learning

How does the candidate actively engage students in developing understanding of specific content understandings?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	**Level 2 Rubric Language**
In the clips, **students are participating in tasks that are vaguely or superficially related to the central focus.** There is little or no evidence that the candidate **links students' prior academic learning or personal, cultural, or community assets with new learning.** **OR** **Links cause student confusion.**	Students are **participating** in learning tasks **focusing primarily on one dimension of content understanding with little attention to developing understanding of other dimensions OR (in some fields) on formulaic application of one or more dimensions of content understanding.** Candidate makes vague or superficial links between **prior academic learning and new learning.**
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	**Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score**

Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source) and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 2.
 	
Tasks that are vaguely or superficially related to the central focus:
• Video clip(s) show evidence of students engaged in a task that is not related to the central focus of the learning segment.
• The students have limited opportunities to participate in a learning task as the candidate is lecturing/presenting information without any student interaction.
 	
No links between new learning and students' prior academic learning and new learning
• During the video clip(s) the candidate does not make links to the students' prior academic learning **OR** to the students' experiential backgrounds.
• Candidate makes links to prior learning or experiential backgrounds that are not related to the lesson shown in the video clip(s).
• Candidate attempts to make links to prior learning or experiential backgrounds, but students are confused by the links.
 	
Subject-Specific Considerations
• Early Childhood –
  ➤ Learning experiences in the video focus on only one mode or learning.
  ➤ Learning experiences are developmentally inappropriate.
• Middle Childhood and Secondary Science – Students are not asked to construct an evidence-based argument about the real world phenomenon.
	Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source) and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 2.
	
	Participation without engagement in understanding concepts:
	• Video clip(s) show students participating in a learning task that may focus on one dimension of content understanding, but does not develop understanding in other dimensions.
	• Students are participating in a learning task that focuses on step-by-step procedures with little opportunity to build understanding of additional content dimensions.
	
	Vague links between prior academic learning and new learning:
	• Any links between prior academic learning and new learning are not clearly made for the students.
	
	Subject-Specific Considerations
	• Early Childhood – Children are participating in language and literacy learning experiences in the video that draw upon at least one modality of learning. However, there is only vague support for the active nature of children's learning.
	• Middle Childhood and Secondary Science – Students are constructing a scientific argument about the real world phenomenon, but are not providing evidence to support the argument.

Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 8: Deepening Student Learning

How does the candidate elicit responses to promote thinking and develop understanding of one or more of the content dimensions (varies by field, e.g., for elementary mathematics, it is mathematical concepts)?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
The candidate does most of the talking and students provide few responses. OR Candidate responses include **significant content inaccuracies** that will lead to student misunderstandings.	Candidate **primarily asks surface-level questions** and evaluates student responses as **correct or incorrect**.
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source) and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 4a. **Automatic 1 (significant content inaccuracies):** • The candidate makes frequent significant statements that include content inaccuracies related to the central focus and/or key standard for the learning segment. • The content inaccuracies seen in the video clip(s) would require the lesson to be retaught to clarify any misunderstandings. **Candidate does most of the talking:** • In the video clip(s), the candidate does most of the talking and there are very limited opportunities for the students to respond to questions the candidate poses. • The candidate does not pose questions that require student responses OR the candidate poses questions but does not allow time to students to respond. **Subject-Specific Considerations** • Physical Education – Candidate is monitoring what students do but is not doing anything to reinforce or improve competencies.	Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source) and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 4a. **Nature of candidate questions (few, surface-level)** • In the video clip(s), the candidate asks questions that require factual, simple responses such as yes, no responses, numerical response, or other one-two word responses. • The candidate asks few questions of the students during the video clip(s). • Candidate's questions seen in the video clip(s) are not guiding or building students' understanding of the specified content dimension(s). **Evaluation of student responses (correct or incorrect):** • In the video clip(s), the candidate responds to the students only by acknowledging responses with an agreement or correction. **Subject-Specific Considerations** • Physical Education – Candidate is responding to what students are doing, but the responses are not helpful in improving competencies. • World Language (Rubric 7) – Candidate questions in the video are directed only at correct usage of grammar and vocabulary.

How does the candidate use subject-specific pedagogy?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
The candidate pays **little or no attention to specified elements of content or uses inappropriate pedagogy for developing desired competencies.** **OR** Materials used in the clips include **significant content inaccuracies** that will lead to student misunderstandings.	Candidate makes **vague or superficial use of subject-specific pedagogy** to help students understand specified elements of content understanding.
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source) and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 4b. **Automatic 1 (significant content inaccuracies).** • The candidate uses inappropriate subject-specific pedagogy for the learning task evident in the video clip(s). • In the video clip(s), the candidate uses subject-specific pedagogy in a way that will lead to significant content inaccuracies. **Learning tasks focus on specified content understanding or pedagogy.** • Learning tasks in the clip(s) are inappropriate for the specified content focus. • In the video clip(s), the candidate does not show the use of subject-specific pedagogy connected to the specified content focus for this rubric.	Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source) and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 4b. **Superficial use of subject-specific pedagogy in clips to help students understand subject-specific concepts.** • The candidate uses an appropriate subject-specific pedagogy in the video clip(s) to help students understand a subject-specific concept. • In the video clip(s, the use of subject-specific pedagogy may be mentioned or modeled for the students, but it is not an integral part of the lesson. • There is a presence of the subject-specific pedagogy in the video clip(s) and there may be mention of the use of subject-specific pedagogy in the commentary and/or lesson plan, but during the video clip(s) it is not evident that the candidate/students are using the subject-specific pedagogy. **Subject-Specific Considerations** • Physical Education – Learning tasks are appropriate, but support for developing competencies is limited to instructional cues/prompts.

Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness

How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
Candidate suggests **changes unrelated to evidence of student learning.**	Candidate proposes changes **to teacher practice that are superficially related to student learning needs** (e.g., task management, pacing, improving directions).
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 5 (primary source) and Video Clip(s). **Proposed changes and relationship to lesson(s) seen in video:** • The proposed changes discussed in the commentary are not related to the lesson(s) seen in the video clip(s). • The proposed changes discussed in the commentary are not related to student learning (classroom environment, student behavior).	Review responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 5 (primary source) and Video Clip(s). **Superficial connections between changes to teacher practice and collective learning needs:** • The proposed changes discussed in the commentary **are related** to the lesson(s) seen in the video clip(s). • The proposed changes focus on teaching practice that will probably improve student learning, but not the specific student learning seen in the video clip(s); changes are more about improving general teacher practice than about meeting specific learning needs. The changes might be such things as asking additional higher-order questions without providing examples, improving directions, or including more group work without indicating how the group work will address specific learning needs. • The proposed changes may focus only on the needs of an individual student rather than the collective learning needs of the class.

Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 11: Analysis of Student Learning

How does the candidate analyze evidence of student learning for the dimensions of content understanding in the handbook, e.g., for the mathematics fields: conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning and/or problem solving skills?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
The analysis is **superficial or not supported** by either student **work samples** or **the summary of student learning.** OR The evaluation criteria, learning objectives, and/or analysis are **not aligned with each other.**	The analysis **focuses on what students did right OR wrong** and is **consistent with the summary.**
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 1 a-d (primary source), Student Work Samples, and Evaluation Criteria. **Automatic 1 (significant misalignment between evaluation criteria, learning objectives, and/or analyses, including lack of evaluation criteria)** • The candidate does not include evaluation criteria in the portfolio (Evaluation Criteria uploaded as a separate document). • The learning objectives/standards and the evaluation criteria are not aligned with the assessment and/or student work sample that are included in the portfolio. **Support for analysis from work samples and/or summary of learning** • The analysis focuses on an assessment that is not included in the portfolio. • Focus students complete assessments with different foci (This does not include an assessment that is modified to meet specific student needs). • The analysis does not report on what can be seen in the student work samples OR the summary of student learning. • The analysis is superficial, focusing on trivial rather than important information from the student work samples. **Subject-Specific Considerations** • Physical Education – In addition to the reasons mentioned above, either there is no documented student data (i.e., rating scale, rubric, or game performance instrument) or the analysis is contradicted by the documented student data provided.	**Review responses to** the Assessment Commentary Prompt 1 a-d (primary source), Student Work Samples, and Evaluation Criteria. **Support for analysis from summary of learning** • The analysis dos not note any differences in student learning evident in the summary. **Focus of analysis (right/wrong)** • The analysis focuses only on errors OR strengths, not showing the complete picture of student learning from the summary and student work samples. • The analysis provides a limited picture of the student work samples by focusing on only right OR wrong answers. **Subject-Specific Considerations** • Early Childhood – Analysis focuses on children's strengths OR needs. It is supported by the sources of evidence and the summary of learning. • Physical Education – The analysis relies on qualitative observation or anecdotal evidence without any reference to documented student data (i.e., rating scale, rubric, or game performance instrument.) • World Language (Rubric 11) – Feedback focuses only on errors in language forms of the target language.

Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Learning

What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
Feedback is unrelated to the learning objectives OR is developmentally inappropriate. OR Feedback contains significant content inaccuracies. OR No feedback is provided to one or more focus students.	Feedback is general and addresses needs AND/OR strengths related to the learning objectives.
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompts 1a and 2 a-b (primary source), Student Work Samples, and Evidence of oral or written feedback. Automatic 1 - significant content inaccuracies: • The feedback on the student work contains significant content inaccuracies that could confuse a student. Automatic 1 - No feedback is provided to one or more focus students. • Feedback is not provided for all three focus students. Relationship of feedback to learning objectives: • The feedback on the student work is not related to the learning objectives. It consists only of comments such as be neater, show your work, check your answers. Feedback is developmentally appropriate: • Feedback is not appropriate for the developmental level of students taught in the learning segment, e.g., written feedback to a student who cannot yet read or vocabulary and grammatical structures used that is well above grade-level.	Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompts 1a and 2 a-b (primary source), Student Work Samples, and Evidence of oral or written feedback. Feedback is general: • The feedback on the student work samples is general, yet related to the learning objectives. • The feedback will not provide specific information to the student to improve student learning, e.g., checkmarks, points deducted/partial credit, grades, or scores. No other comments are provided to help the student understand what was done well or poorly. • Feedback is too vague to help the students understand specifically what they did correctly or incorrectly. Feedback is given on needs AND/OR strengths: • The feedback on the student work is general for needs, strengths, or both.

Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 13: Student Use of Feedback

How does the candidate provide opportunities for focus students to use the feedback to guide their further learning?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
Opportunities for applying feedback are **not described**. OR Candidate **provides limited or no feedback to inform student learning**	Candidate **provides vague explanation for how focus students will use feedback**.
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 2 c (primary source) and Evidence or oral or written feedback. Opportunities for students to apply feedback. • Candidate does not describe opportunities provided for students to apply the feedback. • The opportunities described in the commentary are not related to the assessment on which students received feedback. Limited or no feedback to inform student learning: • Feedback is not provided for one or more student work samples (Rubric 12 is scored a 1 for that reason) and so any opportunities described cannot be connected back to the student feedback. • Feedback provided for student work samples is general and so opportunities to use the feedback are limited.	Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 2 c (primary source) and Evidence or oral or written feedback. Opportunities for students to use feedback: • The candidate provides only a general comment about the students using the feedback, e.g., apply to the next assignment or on the unit test. Subject-Specific Considerations • Physical Education –The candidate may provide feedback but move on before seeing that the correction is made.

How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
Candidate identifies language use that is superficially related or unrelated to the language demands (function,[3] vocabulary and additional demands). OR Candidate does not address students' repeated misuse of vocabulary. OR Candidate's description or explanation of language use is not consistent with the evidence submitted.	Candidate describes how students use vocabulary associated with the language function.
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 3 (primary source) and Student Work Samples and/or Video evidence. Automatic 1 (inattention to repeated misuse of vocabulary by students): • In the video clips or work sample, there is frequent misuse of vocabulary that the candidate does not address or correct. Automatic 1 (description or explanation of language use is not consistent with the evidence submitted): • The language use described in the commentary does not match the evidence in the video clip(s) or work sample(s). Evidence of language use identified by candidate: • The candidate does not cite any evidence of language use. A vague reference to the video clip(s) or work samples may be included, e.g., "The assessments show that students could use the language function", but no specific evidence is cited. • The candidate describes language use that is not related to the language function and demands as described in the Planning Commentary. • The candidate describes his/her own use of academic language, not the students' use.	Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 3 (primary source) and Student Work Samples and/or Video evidence. Evidence of language use identified by candidate: • The candidate's description of students' language use is limited to vocabulary that is associated with the language function. This can be failure to use targeted vocabulary, attempts to use it, or actual use. • The candidate does not explain how students' use of the vocabulary is related to learning or the language function. Subject-Specific Considerations • Early Childhood --- Instead of the above, there is a description of how the children are introduced to the vocabulary associated with the learning experience. • In some fields, it can be vocabulary and/or symbols. If so, this is clearly specified in the rubric in the handbook.

---

[3] The selected language function is the verb identified in the Planning Commentary Prompt 4a (categorize, describe, interpret, etc.).

- The language use described is not consistent with the video clips and/or the language function identified in Planning Commentary 4a.

Subject-Specific Considerations
- Early Childhood – In addition, candidate does not support children's use of the vocabulary in the evidence of language use cited.
- Physical Education – includes symbols, signals, and key phrases as part of the vocabulary cluster.
- Secondary Mathematics – includes Mathematical Precision as a language demand
- Technology and Engineering Education – includes Visual Representation as a language demand
- World Language and Classical Language – this rubric is not included.

Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?	
Level 1 Rubric Language	Level 2 Rubric Language
Next steps **do not follow** from the analysis. OR Next steps are **not relevant to the standards and learning objectives** assessed. OR Next steps are **not described in sufficient detail** to understand them.	Next steps primarily **focus on changes to teaching practice that are superficially related to student learning needs, for example, repeating instruction, pacing, or classroom management issues.**
Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score	Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score
Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompts 1a, d and 4 (primary source), Student Work Samples and Evidence of written or oral feedback. Next steps related to analysis: • The candidate describes next steps that are not related to student learning needs identified in the analysis of student learning (Assessment Commentary Prompt 1d). Relationship of next steps to standards/learning objectives: • The candidate describes next steps that are not related to the standards/learning objectives. Description of next steps: • The candidate does not provide enough detail when describing next steps. There should be a clear enough description of the instructional steps that the scorer would understand what will happen in the classroom. The next steps may be very general, such as more practice, go over the test, or start the next unit. Research/theory • References to research or theory are either missing or not relevant to the next steps proposed.	Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 1a, d and 4 (primary source), Student Work Samples and Evidence of written or oral feedback. Description of next steps: • The next steps propose general support that is not related to student learning needs associated with the learning objectives assessed, such as use more representations, allow more practice problems, or allow the students to work in pairs to solve problems. Next steps focus on teaching practice: • The candidate describes next steps that relate to general teaching practices rather than student learning needs. For example, repeating instruction without describing what the candidate will do differently, changing how long the lessons are or how many lessons there should be, changing the directions students were given. • The next steps superficially relate to the student learning needs in terms of the standards/learning objectives. Research/theory • References to research or theory are either missing or not relevant to the next steps proposed.