### Planning Rubrics – Rubric 1: Planning for Literacy Learning

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Context for Learning Information; Planning Commentary Prompt 1; strategic review of Lesson Plans and Instructional Materials

#### How do the candidate’s plans build students’ understanding of an essential literacy for comprehending OR composing text and the skills that support that strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s plans for instruction focus solely on literacy skills without connections to any essential literacy strategy for comprehending or composing text. <strong>OR</strong> There are significant content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings. <strong>OR</strong> Standards, objectives, and learning tasks and materials are not aligned with each other.</td>
<td>Candidate’s plans for instruction support student learning of skills with vague connections to the essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text. <strong>LOOK FORs:</strong> Learning tasks - Are candidate-directed - Focus on skills/facts/procedures/conventions - Limit students’ opportunities to develop the essential literacy strategy <strong>LOOK FORs:</strong> Learning tasks - Are aligned with learning outcomes - Build skills/facts/procedures and the essential literacy strategy (but may be unbalanced)</td>
<td>Candidate’s plans for instruction build on each other to support learning of - the essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text - With clear connections to related skills. <strong>LOOK FORs:</strong> Learning Tasks - Are sequenced in a learning progression across lessons - Build connections between the essential literacy strategy and skills/facts/procedures/conventions - Support students to apply skills/strategy and understand the relationship between reading/writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LOOK FORs:</strong> Learning Tasks</th>
<th><strong>LOOK FORs:</strong> Learning Tasks</th>
<th><strong>LOOK FORs:</strong> Learning Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Are candidate-directed</td>
<td>- Are aligned with learning outcomes</td>
<td>- Are sequenced in a learning progression across lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus on skills/facts/procedures/conventions</td>
<td>- Build skills/facts/procedures and the essential literacy strategy (but may be unbalanced)</td>
<td>- Build connections between the essential literacy strategy and skills/facts/procedures/conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limit students’ opportunities to develop the essential literacy strategy</td>
<td>- Support students to apply skills/strategy and understand the relationship between reading/writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Text representing key differences between adjacent score levels is shown in bold. Evidence that does not meet Level 1 criteria is scored at Level 1.

5 See edTPA handbooks for the subject-specific understandings
Evidence:

**Evaluation:** (Check one): _______ Emerging _______ Proficient _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
# Planning Rubrics - Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Context for Learning Information (required supports, modifications, or accommodations); Planning Commentary Prompts 2 and 3; strategic review of Lesson Plans and Instructional Materials to clarify planned supports

## How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students’ literacy learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence of planned supports.</td>
<td>Planned supports are loosely tied to learning objectives or the central focus of the learning segment.</td>
<td>Planned supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus with attention to the characteristics of the class as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4 plus: Supports include specific strategies to identify and respond to common developmental approximations or misconceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate does not attend to ANY INSTRUCTIONAL requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOOK FORs:
- Planned supports are superficially aligned with learning outcomes (e.g., some lessons address additional outcomes or miss key outcomes related to the central focus)
- are limited or missing
- do not address any IEP/504 instructional requirements

### Evidence:

### LOOK FORs:
- Planned supports are aligned with learning outcomes
- are appropriate for the needs of the whole class

### Evidence:

### LOOK FORs:
- Planned supports are designed to scaffold learning for a variety of students (e.g., English learners, struggling readers, underperforming or gifted students)
- identify and respond to developmental approximations or potential misconceptions

### Evidence:
Evaluation: (Check one): _______ Emerging _______ Proficient _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
### Planning Rubrics - Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Planning Commentary Prompts 2 and 3

#### How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s justification of learning tasks is either <strong>missing OR represents a deficit view</strong> of students and their backgrounds.</td>
<td>Candidate justifies learning tasks with <strong>limited attention</strong> to students' prior academic learning OR personal, cultural, or community assets.</td>
<td>Candidate justifies why learning tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using examples of students' prior academic learning OR personal, cultural, or community assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOOK FORs:</strong> Justification for plans includes</td>
<td><strong>LOOK FORs:</strong> Justification for plans includes</td>
<td><strong>LOOK FORs:</strong> Justification for plans includes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superficial descriptions of students' prior learning OR lived experiences/assets</td>
<td>concrete, specific connections between tasks and prior learning (academic OR lived experiences/assets)</td>
<td>concrete, specific connections between tasks and prior learning (academic AND lived experiences/assets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pervasively negative portrayal of students' backgrounds, educational experiences, or family/community characteristics (e.g., exclusive focus on student needs or gaps without acknowledging strengths)</td>
<td>surface-level discussion of theory or research</td>
<td>grounded discussion of theory or research (e.g., goes beyond “name dropping”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence:**
The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
## Planning Rubrics - Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands

### PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:
Planning Commentary Prompt 4a-d; strategic review of Lesson Plan as noted in commentary prompt 4b

**How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key literacy learning task?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language demands(^5) identified by the candidate are <strong>not consistent with the selected language function(^6) OR task.</strong> OR Language supports are missing or are not aligned with the language demand(s) for the learning task.</td>
<td>General language supports address use of two or more language demands (vocabulary, function, syntax, discourse).</td>
<td>Level 4 plus: Language supports are designed to meet the needs of students with different levels of language learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOOK FORs:**
- Only one language demand supported.
- Mismatch between language demands and
  - language function
  - language supports
  - learning task

**Supports are not included**

**Evidence:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOOK FORs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- General language supports address two or more language demands (function, vocabulary, syntax, discourse).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOOK FORs:**
- Supports are strategically designed to address vocabulary, language function and syntax/discourse.
- Supports are differentiated for students with varying language needs.
Evaluation: (Check one): _______ Emerging _______ Proficient _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.

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

6 Language function refers to the learning outcome (verb) selected in prompt 4a (e.g., analyze, interpret...
### Planning Rubrics - Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Context for Learning Information (required supports, modifications, or accommodations for assessments); Planning Commentary Prompt 5; assessment materials; strategic review of Lesson Plans

**How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to monitor students' use of the essential literacy strategy to comprehend OR compose text and related skills?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The assessments only provide evidence of students' use of skills. <strong>OR</strong> Candidate does not attend to ANY ASSESSMENT requirements in IEPs or 504 plans.</td>
<td>The assessments provide limited evidence to monitor students' use of the essential literacy strategy <strong>OR</strong> related skills during the learning segment.</td>
<td>The assessments provide evidence to monitor students' use of the essential literacy strategy <strong>AND</strong> related skills during the learning segment. Level 4 plus: The assessments are strategically designed to allow individuals or groups with specific needs to demonstrate their learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOOK FORs:**

- Majority of Assessments
  - provide minimal evidence of subject-specific understandings (e.g., only rote responses of facts or skills)
  - are not aligned with full scope of subject-specific outcomes
  - No IEP/504 requirement for assessment adaptations/modifications is addressed

- **LOOK FORs:**
  - Majority of Assessments
  - provide evidence of the essential literacy strategy and skills

- **LOOK FORs:**
  - All from Proficient and…
  - Assessments
    - provide multiple forms of evidence of the full range of skills and the essential literacy strategy
    - are used in each lesson
    - are differentiated so students show understandings in various ways

**Evidence:**
The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
## Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 6: Learning Environment

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Video Clip(s) 1 and/or 2; Instruction Commentary Prompt 2

**How does the candidate demonstrate a positive literacy learning environment that supports students’ engagement in learning?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The clips reveal evidence of disrespectful interactions between teacher and students or between students. OR Candidate allows disruptive behavior to interfere with student learning.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The candidate demonstrates rapport with and respect for students. AND Candidate provides a positive, low-risk learning environment that reveals mutual respect among students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The candidate demonstrates respect for students.</td>
<td>The candidate demonstrates rapport with and respect for students. AND Candidate provides a positive, low-risk learning environment that reveals mutual respect among students.</td>
<td>The candidate demonstrates rapport with and respect for students. AND Candidate provides a challenging learning environment that promotes mutual respect among students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOOK FORs:</td>
<td>LOOK FORs:</td>
<td>LOOK FORs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respect for students (e.g., attentive listening to student responses)</td>
<td>• Rapport (e.g., candidate shows positive interactions with students)</td>
<td>• Rapport (e.g., candidate shows positive interactions with students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disrespectful interactions</td>
<td>• Mutual respect (e.g., respect shared between students and candidate)</td>
<td>• Encourages mutual respect among students (e.g., actively shares expectations for respect between students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disruptive behaviors (e.g., behaviors that interfere with lesson flow and engagement)</td>
<td>• Low risk (e.g., students ask and answer questions openly)</td>
<td>• Challenging (e.g., high-order questions, such as, “What’s another way to think of that? Why? Who has another perspective?”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Controlling or directive environment (e.g., students engage in candidate-led tasks with little discussion or interaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Perspectives (e.g., express alternative responses or perspectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal support for learning goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence:**
**Evaluation:** (Check one): _______ Emerging    _______ Proficient    _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
### Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 7: Engaging Students in Learning

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Video Clip(s) 1 and/or 2; Instruction Commentary Prompt 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does the candidate actively engage students in integrating strategies and skills to comprehend OR compose text?</th>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are <strong>participating in tasks</strong> that are vaguely or superficially related to the central focus.</td>
<td>Students are <strong>participating in learning tasks</strong> focusing primarily on skills with little attention to the essential literacy strategy for comprehending <strong>OR</strong> composing text.</td>
<td>Students are <strong>engaged in learning tasks</strong> that address their understanding of <strong>the essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text AND related skills.</strong></td>
<td>Students are engaged in learning tasks that <strong>integrate</strong> their understanding of <strong>the essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text AND related skills.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is <strong>little or no evidence</strong> that the candidate links students’ prior academic learning or personal, cultural, or community assets with new learning.</td>
<td>Candidate makes vague or superficial links between prior academic learning and new literacy learning.</td>
<td>Candidate links prior academic learning to new literacy learning.</td>
<td>Candidate links prior academic learning <strong>AND</strong> personal, cultural, or community assets to new literacy learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOOK FORs:</strong></td>
<td><strong>LOOK FORs:</strong></td>
<td><strong>LOOK FORs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Loose connection between tasks and central focus</td>
<td>- Tasks focus on subject-specific understandings</td>
<td>- Tasks integrate/deepen subject-specific understandings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tasks focus on low-level content (e.g., facts in isolation)</td>
<td>- Links (i.e., candidate connects previous instruction/learning to new content)</td>
<td>- Links (i.e., candidate or students connect new learning with prior instruction/learning <strong>AND</strong> lived experiences/assets)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Evaluation: (Check one): _______ Emerging    _______ Proficient    _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
### Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 8: Deepening Student Learning

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Video Cclip(s) 1 and/or 2; Instruction Commentary Prompt 4a

**How does the candidate elicit student responses to promote thinking and apply the essential literacy strategy AND related skills to comprehend OR compose text?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate does most of the talking and the students provide few responses. OR Candidate responses include significant content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings.</td>
<td>Candidate elicits student responses to support use of • the essential literacy strategy OR • related skills to comprehend OR compose text.</td>
<td>Level 4 plus: Candidate facilitates interactions among students so they can evaluate their own abilities to apply the essential literacy strategy in meaningful reading or writing contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOOK FORs**
- Surface-level questions (e.g., one-word answers)
- Candidate talk (e.g., lecture only)
- Consistent or egregious content inaccuracies

**LOOK FORs**
- Questions prompt some higher-order thinking related to the essential strategy or skills

**LOOK FORs:**
- Questions build on student thinking about the essential strategy and related skills.
- Interactions among students (e.g., students respond to and build on peer comment).
- Students evaluate their own abilities.

**Evidence:**

---

EVALUATION RUBRIC ELEMENTARY LITERACY 2015
Evaluation: (Check one): _______ Emerging  _______ Proficient  _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
### Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 9: Subject-Specific Pedagogy

**PRIMARY SOURCES FOR EVIDENCE:** Video Clip 1 (engagement of students while candidate models the essential literacy strategy); Video Clip 2 (supporting students to practice and apply the essential literacy strategy); Instruction Commentary Prompt 4b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>How does the candidate support students to learn, practice, and apply the essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text in a meaningful context?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate does not teach students how to use the essential literacy strategy to support comprehension OR composition of text. OR There is a clear mismatch between or among strategies, skills, and students’ readiness to learn. OR Materials used in the clips include significant content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOOK FORs:**

**Evidence:**
Evaluation: (Check one): _______ Emerging _______ Proficient _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
### Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Video Clips 1 and 2 (for evidence of student learning); Instruction Commentary Prompt 5

**How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students’ varied learning needs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate suggests changes unrelated to evidence of student learning.</td>
<td>Candidate proposes changes that address students’ collective learning needs related to the central focus.</td>
<td>Candidate proposes changes that address individual and collective learning needs related to the central focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed changes</td>
<td>Candidate makes superficial connections to research and/or theory.</td>
<td>Candidate makes connections to research and/or theory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOOK FORs:**
- Proposed changes
  - address candidate’s own behavior without reference to student learning
  - suggest “more practice” or time to work on similar or identical tasks without revision
  - address problems with student behavior and how to “fix” the behavior

**LOOK FORs:**
- Proposed changes
  - address gaps in whole class learning/understanding
  - re-engage students in new, revised, or additional tasks
  - include surface-level discussion of research or theory (e.g., name drop or use a term without connection to own practice)

**LOOK FORs:**
- All from Proficient and...

**Proposed changes**
- are concrete, specific, and elaborated
- address gaps in student learning for different students in different ways (e.g., modified tasks or different resources/materials, extra scaffolding with candidate or peer)
- are grounded in principles from theory or research (e.g., go beyond name dropping or jargon)

**Evidence:**

**Evaluation: (Check one):** _______ Emerging _______ Proficient _______ Advanced

*The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.*
### Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 11: Analysis of Student Learning

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Assessment Commentary Prompt 1; student work samples; evaluation criteria

**How does the candidate analyze evidence of student learning related to the essential literacy strategy and related skills?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The analysis is <strong>superficial or not supported</strong> by either student work samples or the summary of student learning. OR The evaluation criteria are not aligned with the learning objectives and/or analysis. OR The analysis is not aligned with the learning objectives.</td>
<td>The analysis focuses on what students did right <strong>OR</strong> wrong. <strong>AND</strong> Analysis includes some differences in whole class learning.</td>
<td>Analysis uses specific examples from work samples to demonstrate patterns of learning consistent with the summary. <strong>AND</strong> Patterns of learning are described for whole class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOOK FORs:**
- Lists correct **OR** incorrect answers
- Claims unsupported by work samples or the summary
- No alignment between assessment and objectives

**LOOK FORs:**
- Lists correct **AND** incorrect answers
- Lists some areas where whole class excelled or struggled

**LOOK FORs:**
- Describes students’ understandings and struggles citing specific evidence (e.g., “As demonstrated in sample 3…”)
- Learning trends related to individual or group understandings/misunderstandings (e.g., scores on essay question lower for ELLs; struggled with taking and supporting a position beyond personal opinions)

**Evidence:**
Evaluation: (Check one): _______ Emerging  _______ Proficient  _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
## PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Assessment Commentary Prompt 2a-b; evidence of written, audio, or video feedback

### What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Feedback is general and addresses needs AND/OR strengths related to the learning objectives.</td>
<td>Feedback is specific and addresses either needs OR strengths related to the learning objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level 4 plus:** Feedback for one or more focus students
- provides a strategy to address an individual learning need OR
- makes connections to prior learning or experience to improve learning.

**LOOK FORs:**
- General feedback on needs AND/OR strengths (e.g., "Good detail!"
- Unequal feedback given (e.g., 1 sample with feedback and 1 sample without)
- No relation to objectives or analysis
- Feedback is inaccurate (e.g., numerous or essential items are marked incorrect when correct or vice versa)

**LOOK FORs:**
- Specific feedback connected to objectives (e.g., "As you explain the context, remember to include ")
- Feedback addresses strengths OR needs

**LOOK FORs:**
- Specific feedback addresses strengths AND needs
- At least one focus student receives feedback to address a specific learning need or feedback to connect to previous learning.

Evidence:
Evaluation: (Check one): _______ Emerging    _______ Proficient    _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 13: Student Use of Feedback

PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Assessment Commentary Prompt 2c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does the candidate support focus students to understand and use the feedback to guide their further learning?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for using feedback are not described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>OR</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate provides limited or no feedback to inform student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generic description of focus students' understanding or use of feedback (e.g., “go over common errors in class”, “to use for upcoming exam”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No discussion of understanding or use of feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No feedback given on samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All from Proficient and…
Evidence:

Evaluation: (Check one): _______ Emerging _______ Proficient _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
### Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 14: Analyzing Students’ Language Use and Literacy Learning

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Assessment Commentary Prompt 3; evidence of student language use (student work samples and/or video evidence from Instruction Video clips or separate Language Use clip in Assessment)

How does the candidate analyze students’ use of language to develop content understanding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Candidate identifies student language use that is superficially related or unrelated to the language demands (function, vocabulary, and additional demands). | Candidate explains how students use only one language demand (vocabulary, function, syntax, or discourse). | Candidate explains and provides evidence of students’ use of:
  - the language function **AND**
  - one or more additional language demands (vocabulary, syntax, discourse). |
| Level 4 plus: Candidate explains and provides evidence of language use and content learning for students with varied needs. |

**LOOK FOR:***
- Lists use of only one language demand (function, vocabulary, syntax, discourse)
- Lists language use that is not connected to identified demands (e.g., identifies language use of grammar when demands are about summarizing information)
- Explains and provides evidence of students’ use of at least one more language demand (vocabulary, syntax, discourse)
- Explains and provides evidence for students with varied needs
- Language use clearly supports content understandings

Evidence:
Evaluation: (Check one): _______ Emerging _______ Proficient _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.

7 The selected language function is the verb identified in the Planning Commentary Prompt 4a (analyze, explain, interpret, etc.).

8 These are the additional language demands identified in the Planning Commentary Prompt 4c (vocabulary plus either syntax or discourse).
### Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Assessment Commentary Prompt 4**

How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next steps do not follow from the analysis. OR Next steps are not relevant to the learning objectives assessed. OR Next steps are not described in sufficient detail to understand them.</td>
<td>Next steps primarily focus on changes to teaching practices that are superficially related to student learning needs, for example, repeating instruction, pacing, or classroom management issues.</td>
<td>Next steps propose general support that improves student learning related to assessed learning objectives. Next steps are loosely connected with research and/or theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOOK FORs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Next steps provide targeted support to individuals AND groups to improve their learning relative to the essential literacy strategy OR related skills. Next steps are connected with research and/or theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next steps:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Next steps are justified with principles from research and/or theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do not make sense (e.g., students need more support on apply the essential literacy strategy and candidate focuses next steps on vocabulary definitions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are not aligned to learning objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Present vague information (e.g., &quot;will provide more support for objectives&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence:**
Evaluation: (Check one): _______ Emerging _______ Proficient _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
Mathematics Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 16: Analyzing Whole Class Understandings

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Mathematics Assessment Commentary Prompt 1a-c; evaluation criteria; summary of student learning for the whole class (graphic or narrative); blank copy of formative assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does the candidate analyze whole class evidence to identify patterns of student learning?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The evaluation criteria, learning objectives, summary and/or analysis are not aligned with each other. | Candidate identifies what students did right OR wrong related to  
- conceptual understanding,  
- procedural fluency,  
- mathematical reasoning/problem solving. | Candidate identifies what students did right AND wrong related to  
- conceptual understanding  
AND  
- procedural fluency or mathematical reasoning/problem solving. |
| | Candidate identifies and explicitly connects patterns of learning to  
- conceptual understanding  
AND  
- procedural fluency or mathematical reasoning/problem solving. | Level 4 plus:  
Candidate describes the relationship between or among patterns of learning. |
| There are significant content inaccuracies that affect analysis. | | |
| **LOOK FORs:** | **LOOK FORs:** | **LOOK FORs:** |
| - Lists what the students in the class did right OR wrong  
- Focuses on only one of the math dimensions:  
  - Conceptual understanding  
  - Procedural fluency  
  OR  
  - Mathematical Reasoning  
- Alignment is not clear between narrative and/or graphic summary, analysis, learning objectives and/or evaluation criteria | - Lists what the students did right AND wrong  
- Includes attention to only two of the mathematical dimensions:  
  - Conceptual understanding AND  
  - Procedural fluency or Mathematical Reasoning  
- Narrative and/or graphic summary aligns with analysis | All from Proficient and...  
- Describes students understandings and struggles in terms of two of the three dimensions  
  - Conceptual understanding  
  - Procedural fluency or Mathematical Reasoning  
- Provides specific examples from assessment in describing what students understand and struggled with  
- Shows how math understandings and struggles are related to each other. |
Evidence:

**Evaluation:** (Check one): _____ Emerging   _____ Proficient   _____ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
## Task 4 Mathematics Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 17: Analyzing Individual Student Work Samples

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Mathematics Assessment Commentary Prompt 2; three focus student work samples

### How does the candidate use student work to analyze mathematical errors, confusions, and partial understandings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The analysis is <em>not supported</em> by student work samples.</td>
<td>Candidate <em>uses evidence from the 3 focus student work samples to identify the specific</em> student struggles (errors, confusions, or partial understandings).</td>
<td>Candidate uses evidence from the 3 focus student work samples to <em>explain</em> the student struggles (errors, confusions, or partial understandings) in relation to the related mathematical concepts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LOOK FORs:
- Candidate selects work samples that do not align with identified struggle(s) from the analysis
- Uses examples from only one or two of the student work samples to identify the specific struggle
- Work samples do not show evidence of the struggle that the candidate addresses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOOK FORs:</th>
<th>LOOK FORs:</th>
<th>LOOK FORs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Specific examples from all three student work samples are included in the description of the specific student struggle(s)</td>
<td>- All from Proficient and...</td>
<td>- The explanation of student struggles connects the error(s) on the three student work samples to specific mathematical concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The evidence is consistently aligned with the identified area of struggle</td>
<td>- The analysis clearly shows how the student error(s) and/or partial understanding is specifically connected to math understanding/knowledge.</td>
<td>- The analysis points to specific math concepts and understandings that are causing the student struggle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence:**

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation: (Check one):</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.
### Task 4 Mathematics Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 18: Using Evidence to Reflect on Teaching

**PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE:** Mathematics Assessment Commentary Prompts 3 and 4; three focus student work samples from re-engagement lesson

**How does the candidate examine the re-engagement lesson to further student learning?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EMERGING PERFORMANCE</strong></th>
<th><strong>PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE</strong></th>
<th><strong>ADVANCED PERFORMANCE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate states whether or not the re-engagement strategy was effective without providing evidence from student work samples. OR What the candidate cites as evidence of student learning does not align with the student work samples. OR Targeted learning objective/goal is not aligned with the identified area of struggle.</td>
<td>Candidate states whether or not the re-engagement strategy was effective and provides superficial evidence from student work samples. Candidate uses evidence of student learning from the 3 student work samples to describe whether or not the re-engagement strategy was effective.</td>
<td>Candidate uses specific evidence of student learning from the 3 student work samples to evaluate whether or not the re-engagement strategy was effective. Level 4 plus: Candidate analyzes the change in student mathematical understanding or misconceptions using evidence from the re-engagement lesson.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOOK FORs:**
- The evidence from the student work samples is only vaguely connected to the candidate’s statement of effectiveness of the re-engagement strategy.
- The evidence of student learning aligns generally or does not align with the evidence from student work samples.
- The candidate does not state whether or not the re-engagement strategy was effective or not.

**LOOK FORs:**
- Evidence from the three student work samples aligns with the candidate’s description of whether or not the re-engagement was effective.

**LOOK FORs:**
- All from Proficient and...
  - Candidate provides specific evidence showing how the re-engagement lesson was and was not effective.
  - Candidate is specific about each student rather than a generic statement about the effectiveness of the re-engagement lesson.
  - The candidate compares the three students’ work samples to show how the each student specifically changed from the formative assessment to the assessment after the re-engagement lesson.

### Evidence:
Evaluation: (Check one): _______ Emerging    _______ Proficient    _______ Advanced

The "look-fors" are not exhaustive descriptions of the criteria on each rubric and should not be used as a checklist by candidates.