edTPA®

Understanding Rubric Level Progressions

English as an Additional Language
Version 01

Candidate Support Resource

SCALE
Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, & Equity

Overview

edTPA's portfolio is a collection of authentic artifacts and evidence from a candidate's actual teaching practice. *Understanding Rubric Level Progressions* (URLP) is a KEY resource that is designed to describe the meaning behind the rubrics. A close read of the following URLP sections will help program faculty and supervisors internalize the criteria and level distinctions for each rubric.

This document is intended as a resource for program faculty and supervisors who are supporting candidates with edTPA. Faculty and supervisors are strongly encouraged to share this document with candidates and use it to support their understanding of the rubrics, as well as their development as new professionals. The *Understanding Rubric Level Progressions* is intended to enhance, not replace, the support that candidates receive from programs in their preparation for edTPA.

In the next section, we provide definitions and guidelines for making scoring decisions. The remainder of the document presents the score-level distinctions and other information for each edTPA rubric, including:

1. Elaborated explanations for rubric Guiding Questions

2. Definitions of key terms used in rubrics

3. Primary sources of evidence for each rubric

4. Rubric-specific scoring decision rules

5. Examples that distinguish between levels for each rubric: <u>Level 3</u>, <u>below 3</u> (Levels 1 and 2), and <u>above 3</u> (Levels 4 and 5).

Scoring Decision Rules

When evidence falls across multiple levels of the rubric, scorers use the following criteria while making the scoring decision:

1. **Preponderance of Evidence**: When scoring <u>each</u> rubric, scorers must make score decisions based on the evidence provided by candidates and how it matches the rubric level criteria. A <u>pattern</u> of evidence supporting a particular score level has a heavier weight than <u>isolated</u> evidence in another score level.

2. **Multiple Criteria**: In cases where there are two criteria present across rubric levels, greater weight or consideration will be for the criterion named as "primary."

3. **Automatic 1**: Some rubrics have Automatic 1 criteria. These criteria outweigh all other criteria in the specific rubric, as they reflect essential practices related to particular guiding questions. NOTE: Not all criteria for Level 1 are Automatic 1s.

ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE LEARNING SEGMENT FOCUS:

Candidate's instruction should support students' English language proficiency/development within meaningful content-based instruction.

Planning Rubric 1: Planning for English Language Development within Content-Based Instruction

EAL1: How do the candidate's plans build on each other and make connections between language competencies and content to support students' English language development in two or more of the four modalities (speaking, listening, reading, writing)?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how a candidate's plans build a learning segment of three to five lessons around a central focus. Candidates will explain how they plan to organize tasks, activities, and/or materials to align with the central focus and the standards/objectives. The planned learning segment must foster students' English language development using two or more modalities while making connections between language competencies (grammatical, discourse, pragmatic or metalinguistic) and content.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *Aligned*—Standards, objectives, instructional strategies and learning tasks are "aligned" when they consistently address language and content learning outcomes for students across the learning segment.

- *Significant content inaccuracies*—Content flaws in commentary explanations, lesson plans, or instructional materials that will lead to student misunderstandings and the need for reteaching.

- *Grammatical competence*—The ability to use correct vocabulary and sentence structures

- *Discourse competence*—the ability to produce coherent and cohesive written or spoken discourse (e.g., *paragraphs or conversations*) *that conforms to the norms of different genres (e.g., letter, essay, interview)*

- *Pragmatic competence*—The ability to use language appropriately in communication based on the context and the relationship between the speaker and writer and the listener and reader

- *Metalinguistic competence*—Knowledge of linguistic/grammatical concepts and functions, and the ability to use linguistic terminology to describe or discuss them

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Context for Learning Information

Planning Commentary **Prompt 1**

Strategic review of Lesson Plans & Instructional Materials

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	▪ N/A for this rubric
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	▪ Instructional focus is solely on vocabulary and/or grammar with no connections to the content. ▪ There are significant linguistic or content inaccuracies. ▪ Only content is addressed; there are no language objectives or competencies addressed.

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- Plans for instruction are **logically sequenced** to facilitate students' English language development in connection with content.

- Plans are presented in a linear sequence in which **each lesson builds on the previous one**(s) OR a nonlinear sequence, e.g., when a central theme is posed, such as food or family, and students develop English language proficiency by interpreting and/or interacting about the central theme using one or more modalities across the lessons.

- In addition, the sequencing of the plans supports students' English language development by connecting a language competency with content and focusing on one or more modalities. **These connections are explicitly written in the plans or commentary**, and how the connections are made is not left to the determination of the scorer.

- Be sure to pay attention to each component of the subject-specific emphasis (language competencies, content, and modalities).

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- Plans for instruction support student learning of facts and/or grammar and vocabulary but with **little or no** planned instruction to guide the development of students' English Language Proficiency in connection with content.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- The candidate is paying some attention to helping students develop language but the **connection** to content **is so fleeting or vague** that scorers are largely left to make sense of this on their own.

- One modality is superficially included, but doesn't seem to be developed or sustained across the learning segment.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,

- The candidate is focused on teaching memorization of grammatical rules or lists of vocabulary with little or no attention to assisting students in understanding the connections between language forms and language functions.

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

- Plans focus entirely on vocabulary and/or grammar without connections to content and no modalities are targeted.

- There is a <u>pattern</u> of significant linguistic or content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings. Linguistic or content flaws in the plans or instructional materials are significant and systematic, and interfere with student learning.

- Only content is addressed with no goals for students' language development.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above Level 3</u>:

- Learning tasks are designed to support students to make clear and **consistent** connections between language competencies and content.

- Consistent connections require students to routinely apply and practice language competencies in purposeful ways in relation to content throughout the learning segment.

- Multiple modalities are targeted with students practicing in one or more modalities.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- Plans show intentional and consistent connections between language competencies and content.

- Multiple modalities are clearly targeted and evident in instructional activities and/or materials in the lesson plans.

- Students are practicing in **one** language modality.

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,

- Learning tasks are designed to build toward **deep integration between** language competencies and content learning. This is demonstrated by plans where the content and targeted language competencies are consistently developed in explicit and meaningful relation to each other throughout the learning segment.

- Multiple modalities are clearly targeted and evident in instructional activities and/or materials in the lesson plans.

- Students are practicing **in more than one** language modality.

Planning Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs

EAL2: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students' development of English language in meaningful content-based instruction?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate plans to support students in relation to their characteristics. This includes using the candidate's understanding of students to develop, choose, or adapt instructional strategies, learning tasks, and materials.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *Planned Supports* include instructional strategies, learning tasks and materials, and other resources deliberately designed to facilitate student learning of the central focus.

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.

Scoring Decision Rules

▶ **Multiple Criteria**	■ N/A for this rubric
▶ **AUTOMATIC 1**	■ Planned support according to requirements in IEP or 504 plans is completely missing. (If there are no students with IEP/504 plans, then this criterion is not applicable)

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- Candidate explains how planned supports for students address the learning needs of the whole class while assisting them in achieving the learning objectives.
- Candidate addresses at least one of the requirements from IEPs and 504 plans
- Planned supports address issues of prior literacy, schooling, or culture as described in the Context for Learning Information or commentary.
- Requirements must be explicitly addressed in the commentary and/or the Planning Task 1 artifacts. List of requirements and/or accommodations in the Context for Learning Information document is not sufficient by itself.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>: Candidate plans insufficient supports to develop students' learning relative to the identified learning objectives or the central focus. Evidenced by ONE or more of the following:

- Candidate does not plan supports for students.

- Planned supports are not closely tied to learning objectives or the central focus.

- Plans do not reflect ANY instructional requirements in IEP or 504 plans.

- Evidence does not address issues of prior literacy, schooling, or culture.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- Plans address at least one of the requirements set forth in IEPs and 504 plans. However, it is not clear that other planned supports will be helpful in supporting students to meet the learning objectives.

- Plans address issues of prior literacy, schooling, or culture. However, it is not clear that planned supports will be helpful in supporting the class as a whole to meet the learning objectives.

- The supports would work for almost any learning objective. Therefore, the supports are not closely connected to the learning objectives or central focus (e.g., pair high and low students during partner work without a specific description of how that supports students with a specific need, check on students who are usually having trouble, without any specific indication of what the candidate might be checking for, such as students' interactions in the target language).

- Supports are tied to learning objectives within each lesson, but there is no central focus.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,

- Evidence of intentional support for students' needs as described by the candidate is absent.

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

- If IEP/504 requirements are described in the Context for Learning or commentary but none are included in the planned support, then the rubric is scored as an Automatic Level 1, regardless of other evidence of support for the whole class or groups or individuals in the class. If the candidate describes one or more of the IEP or 504 plan requirements for any student in the lesson plans or commentary, then the score is determined by the Planned Support criterion. **(If there are no students with IEPs or 504 plans, then this criterion is not applicable.)**

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above Level 3</u>:

- Plans address specific student needs (beyond those required in IEP and 504 plans) by including scaffolding or structured supports that are explicitly selected or developed to help individual students and groups of students with similar needs to gain access to content and meet the learning objectives.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- Candidate explains how the supports tied to the learning objectives are intended to meet specific needs of individuals or groups of students with similar needs, in addition to the whole class. Supports should be provided for more than one student—either more than one individual or for a specific group of students with similar needs (e.g., more instruction in a prerequisite skill).

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, the candidate meets Level 4 AND

- ALSO identifies possible common errors or developmental language needs and misunderstandings associated with the central focus, and describes specific strategies to identify and respond to them.

  - If the plans and commentary attend to errors or developmental language needs and misunderstandings without also satisfying Level 4 requirements, this is not sufficient evidence for Level 5.

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

EAL3: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate justifies the ways in which learning tasks and materials make content meaningful to students, by drawing upon knowledge of individuals or groups, as well as research or theory.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *Deficit thinking* is revealed when candidates explain low academic performance based primarily on students' cultural or linguistic backgrounds, the challenges they face outside of school or from lack of family support. When this leads to a pattern of low expectations, not taking responsibility for providing appropriate support, or not acknowledging any student strengths, this is a deficit view.

For the following terms from the rubric, see the handbook glossary:

- *prior academic learning*
- *assets* (personal, cultural, community assets)

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Planning Commentary **Prompts 2 and 3**

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	■ Criterion 1 (**primary**): Justification of plans using knowledge of students— i.e., prior academic learning **AND/OR** assets (personal, cultural, community)
	■ Criterion 2: Research and theory connections
	■ Place greater weight or consideration on criterion 1 (justification of plans using knowledge of students).
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	■ Deficit view of students and their backgrounds
	■ Justification is unrelated to demands of content or language learning needs of learners.

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- *Primary Criterion*: The candidate explains how the learning tasks are explicitly connected to the students' prior academic knowledge OR knowledge of students' assets (personal, cultural, community). Assets include students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds, interests, community or family resources and personal experiences.

- *Secondary Criterion*: The candidate refers to research or theory in relation to the plans to support student learning. The connections between the research/theory and the tasks are superficial/not clearly made. They are not well connected to a particular element of the instructional design.

- If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 3, the rubric is scored at Level 3 **regardless of the evidence for the secondary criterion**.

- If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 4, and candidate has NO connection to research/theory, the rubric is scored at Level 3.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:

- There is a limited amount of evidence that the candidate has considered his/her particular class in planning.

OR

- The candidate justifies the plans through a deficit view of students and their backgrounds.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- The candidate's justification of the language tasks makes some connection with what they know about students' language learning needs OR assets (personal, cultural, community) OR with an example of how language tasks meet the demands of the content area. These connections are not strong, but are instead vague or unelaborated, or involve a listing of what candidates know about their students in terms of prior knowledge or background without making a direct connection to how that is related to planning.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,

- There is no evidence that the candidate uses knowledge of students to plan.

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

- Candidate's justification of language tasks:

  - includes a pattern representing a deficit view of students and their backgrounds. (See the explanation of deficit thinking listed above under Key Concepts of Rubric.)

  - is unrelated to the demands of the content area or the language learning needs of the learners.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:

- Candidate's justification of language tasks uses knowledge of students as language learners, knowledge of students as individuals who bring in personal, cultural, or community assets and an example of how the tasks meet the demands of the content area. Candidate also uses research or theory to inform planning.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- The evidence includes specific examples from language learning need **AND** knowledge of students' assets (personal, cultural, community) **AND** examples of how language tasks meet demands of the content area. Candidate explains how the plans reflect all of this knowledge. The explanation needs to include **explicit connections** between the learning tasks and the examples provided.

- The candidate explains how research or theory relevant to ELL education informed the selection or design of at least one learning task or the way in which it was implemented. The connection between the research or theory and the learning task(s) must be explicit.

- Scoring decision rules: To score at Level 4, the candidate must meet the primary criterion at Level 4 and make at least a fleeting, relevant reference to research or theory (meet the secondary criterion at least at Level 3).

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, the candidate meets Level 4 **AND**

- Explains how principles of research or theory relevant to ELL education support or **set a foundation** for their planning decisions.

  - The justifications are explicit, well articulated, and demonstrate a thorough understanding of the research/theory principles that are clearly reflected in the plans.

Planning Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands

EAL4: How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key content learning activity?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question focuses on how the candidate describes the planned instructional supports that address the identified language demands for the learning task.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

Use the definitions below and the subject-specific Academic Language handout to further clarify concepts on Rubric 4.

- **language demands**—Specific ways that academic language must be used by students in order to participate in content-learning tasks through reading, writing, listening, and/or speaking to demonstrate their disciplinary understanding. For EAL this includes language functions, vocabulary, and language competencies.

- **language functions**—Language functions refer to what speakers do and accomplish by using language in meaningful contexts. Common interpersonal language functions include greeting, expressing likes and dislikes, making requests, giving and receiving information, initiating and ending conversations, and so on. Common academic language functions include defining, summarizing, classifying, comparing/contrasting, explaining, arguing, interpreting, and evaluating ideas.

- **language competencies**—Language competencies include grammatical, discourse, pragmatic and metalinguistic competencies. Grammatical competence focuses on accurate use of vocabulary and grammar/structure. Discourse competence focuses on coherence (e.g., organization of ideas) and cohesion (e.g., appropriate transitions & pronouns) in spoken or written discourse appropriate for a specific genre. Discipline-specific discourse has distinctive features or ways of structuring oral or written language (text structures) that provide useful ways for the content to be communicated. Pragmatic competence refers to the use of speech acts (e.g., making a request) appropriate to specific social contexts (e.g., writing to the city council in a formal style, but to a good friend in a casual style). Metalinguistic competence refers to the understanding of linguistic terms and concepts, and the ability to talk about them and use them. In instructional context, this may refer to how we bring students' attention to features of language and to the use of strategies to develop language skills.

- **vocabulary/key phrases**—Words and phrases that are used within disciplines including: (1) words and phrases with subject-specific meanings that differ from meanings used in everyday life (e.g., table); (2) general academic vocabulary used across disciplines (e.g., compare, analyze, evaluate); and (3) subject-specific words defined for use in the discipline.

- **language supports**—The scaffolds, representations, and pedagogical strategies teachers intentionally provide to help learners understand and use the concepts and language they need to learn within disciplines. The language supports planned within the lessons in edTPA should directly support learners to understand and use identified language demands (vocabulary, language functions, and language competencies) to deepen content understandings.

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	▪ Criterion 1: Language demands identified
	▪ Criterion 2 (**primary**): Language supports
	▪ Place greater weight or consideration on criterion 2 (language supports).
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	▪ None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at <u>Level 3</u>:

- General supports are planned and described, though not in specific detail, for students' application of any two or more of the language demands (vocabulary/key phrases, language functions, language competencies).

  - Language supports must go beyond providing opportunities for students to practice using the language demands either individually or with other students within the learning segment. Examples of general language supports include describing and defining the function, modeling vocabulary or any one of the language competencies, providing an example with little explanation, questions and answers about a language demand, whole group discussion of a language demand, or providing pictures to illustrate vocabulary.

- The candidate may inaccurately categorize a language demand (e.g., identifies grammatical competency as pragmatic competency), but does describe general supports for two of the language demands required of students within the learning task. For example:

  - "For pragmatic competence, before students write their letter to the Mayor, I will review a sample letter with the class to identify common grammar errors to watch for such as punctuation, capitalization and incomplete sentences. To develop vocabulary, we will create a list of common terms we may use in our letters and discuss their meanings as a class." This example would be scored at a level 3 because there are supports for two language demands, vocabulary and grammatical competence, even though the candidate categorizes punctuation and capitalization (grammatical competency) as pragmatic competency.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:

- The candidate has a superficial view of academic language and provides supports that are misaligned with the demands or provides support for only one language demand (vocabulary/key phrases, function, or competency).

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- The primary focus of support is on only one of the language demands with little attention to any of the other language demands.

- Support may be general, (e.g., discussing, defining or describing a language demand), or it may be targeted, (e.g., modeling a language demand while using an example with labels). Regardless, the support provided is limited to one language demand.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,

- There is a pattern of misalignment between the language demand(s) and the language supports identified. For example, the language function is listed as compare/contrast, but the language task is that the students will be adding two three-digit numbers and explaining what strategy they used. The candidate plans and provides a support for correct grammar usage within student explanations.

OR

- Language supports are completely missing.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:

- The supports specifically address the language function, vocabulary/key phrases, and at least one other language demand (grammatical, discourse, pragmatic, or metalinguistic competence) in the context of the chosen task.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- The candidate identifies specific planned language supports and describes how supports address each of the following: vocabulary/symbols, the language function, and at least one other language demand (grammatical, discourse, pragmatic, or metalinguistic competence).

- Supports are focused (e.g., provide structures or scaffolding) to address specific language demands, such as sentence starters (syntax or function); modeling how to construct an argument, explanation, or paragraph using a think aloud (function, or other language competencies); graphic organizers tailored to organizing text (function or other language competencies); identifying critical elements of a language function using an example; or more in-depth exploration of vocabulary development (vocabulary mapping that includes antonym, synonym, student definition and illustration).

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, the candidate meets all of Level 4 **AND**

- The candidate includes and explains how one or more of the language supports are either designed or differentiated to meet the needs of students with differing language needs.

Planning Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Students' Development of English Language

EAL5: How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to monitor students' development of English language in content-based instruction?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses the alignment of the assessments with the standards and objectives and the extent that assessments provide multiple forms of evidence to monitor student progress throughout the learning segment. It also addresses required adaptations from IEPs or 504 plans. The array of assessments should provide evidence of students' development of English language proficiency.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *assessment (formal and informal)*—"[R]efer[s] to all those activities undertaken by teachers and by their students …that provide information to be used as feedback to modify teaching and learning activities." Assessments provide evidence of children's prior knowledge, thinking, or learning in order to evaluate what children understand and how they are thinking. Informal assessments may include, for example, children's questions and responses during their learning experiences and teacher's anecdotal observations of children as they work or perform. Formal assessments may include, for example, samples of children's writing, drawing, painting, photos, project work, and performance tasks.

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

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	▪ N/A for this rubric
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	▪ None of the assessment adaptations required by IEPs or 504 plans are made. (If there are no students with IEPs or 504 plans, then this criterion is not applicable).

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- The planned assessments provide evidence of students' development of English language proficiency <u>at various points</u> within the learning segment.

- Requirements from the IEP or 504 plan must be explicitly addressed in the commentary and/or the Planning Task 1 artifacts. List of assessment requirements and/or accommodations in the Context for Learning Information document is not sufficient by itself.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:

- The planned assessments will yield limited or insufficient evidence to monitor development of English language proficiency during the learning segment.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- Assessments will produce evidence of student learning, but evidence is limited.

- Examples of limited assessments include a single assessment or assessments that only evaluate students' ability to memorize grammatical forms and list vocabulary words in isolation of a meaningful context.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,

- Assessments do not provide evidence of students' English language development.

- Assessments only focus on content learning without providing any evidence of students' development of English language proficiency.

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

- If there is NO attention to ANY <u>assessment-related</u> IEP/504 plan requirements (e.g., more time; a scribe for written assignments) either in the commentary or the Planning Task 1 artifacts, the score of 1 is applied; otherwise the evidence for the other criteria will determine the score. **(If there are no students with IEPs or 504 plans, then this criterion is not applicable.)**

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:

- The array of assessments provides consistent evidence of students' development of English language proficiency in the content area throughout the learning segment.

- Assessment evidence will allow the candidate to determine students' continual progress toward developing English language proficiency in the content area.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- There are multiple forms of evidence, not just the same kind of evidence collected at different points in time or in different settings, to monitor student development of English language proficiency for the central focus. "Multiple forms of evidence" means that different types of evidence are used to demonstrate English language proficiency in the content area—e.g., interpret texts, ability to interact with others in oral and written forms of English language, ability to present information to larger audiences in English, both in written and oral forms—and not that there is only one type of evidence on homework, exit slips, and the final test.

- The array of assessments provides evidence to track student progress across the lessons toward developing the English language proficiency as defined by the standards and learning objectives.

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, the candidate meets Level 4 AND

- Describes how assessments are targeted and explicit in design to allow individuals or groups with specific needs to demonstrate their learning without oversimplifying the content.

- The strategic design of assessments goes beyond, for example, allowing extra time to complete an assignment or adding a challenge question.

Instruction Rubric 6: Learning Environment

EAL6: How does the candidate demonstrate a positive learning environment that supports students' English language development within content-based instruction?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses the type of learning environment that the candidate establishes and the degree to which it fosters respectful interactions between the candidate and students, and among students.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *Respect*—A positive feeling of esteem or deference for a person and specific actions and conduct representative of that esteem. Respect can be a specific feeling of regard for the actual qualities of the one respected. It can also be conduct in accord with a specific ethic of respect. Rude conduct is usually considered to indicate a lack of respect, ***disrespect***, whereas actions that honor somebody or something indicate respect. Note that respectful actions and conduct are culturally defined and may be context dependent. **Scorers are cautioned to avoid bias related to their own culturally constructed meanings of respect.**

- *Rapport*—A close and harmonious relationship in which the people or groups understand each other's feelings or ideas and communicate well.

For the following term from the rubric, see the handbook glossary:

- *Learning environment*

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Video Clips

Instruction Commentary **Prompt 2**

Note that for the Instruction Task, the commentary is intended to provide context for interpreting what is shown in the video. Candidates sometimes describe events that do not appear in the video or conflict with scenes from the video—**such statements should not override evidence depicted in the video**.

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	▪ N/A
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	▪ None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at <u>Level 3</u>: In the clips:

- The candidate's interactions with students are respectful, demonstrate rapport (evidence of relationship between candidate and students and/or ease of interaction that goes back and forth based on relevance or engaged conversation), and students communicate easily with the candidate.

- There is evidence that the candidate facilitates a positive learning environment wherein students are willing to answer questions and work together without the candidate or other students criticizing their responses.

- There is evidence of mutual respect among students. Examples include attentive listening while other students speak, respectful attention to another student's idea (even if disagreeing), working together with a partner or group to accomplish tasks.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>: The clips:

- Do not exhibit evidence of positive relationships and interactions between candidate and students.

- Reveal a focus on classroom management and maintaining student behavior and routines rather than engaging students in learning.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- Although clips reveal the candidate's respectful interactions with students, there is an emphasis on the candidate's rigid control of student behaviors, discussions and other activities in ways that limit and do not support learning in ways that limit and do not support learning.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1, there are **two different ways** that evidence is scored:

1. The clips reveal evidence of candidate-student or student-student interactions that discourage student contributions, disparage the student(s), or take away from learning.

2. The classroom management is so weak that the candidate is not able to, or does not successfully, redirect students, or the students themselves find it difficult to engage in learning tasks because of disruptive behavior.

Note: Classroom management styles vary. Video clips that show classroom environments where students are productively engaged in the learning task should not be labeled as disruptive.

Examples of this may include students engaging in discussion with peers, speaking without raising their hands, or being out of their seats.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>: The clips:

- Reveal a positive learning environment where students are willing to practice language AND that includes tasks/discussions that challenge student thinking and encourage respectful student-student interaction.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- The learning environment supports learning tasks that challenge students and promote higher-order thinking or application to develop new learning. There must be evidence that the environment is challenging for students. Examples include: students cannot answer immediately, but need to think to respond; the candidate asks higher-order thinking questions; students are trying to apply their initial learning to another context.

- The learning environment encourages and supports mutual respect among students, e.g., candidate reminds students to listen to and consider other's ideas.

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,

- The learning environment encourages students to express, debate, and evaluate differing perspectives with each other. Perspectives could be from curricular sources, students' ideas, and/or lived experiences.

Instruction Rubric 7: Engaging Students' English Language Development within Content-Based Instruction

EAL7: How does the candidate actively engage students in developing English language proficiency within content-based instruction?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate provides video evidence of engaging students in content-based language tasks and discussions to develop their English language proficiency.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

For the following terms from the rubric, see the handbook glossary:

- *Engaging students in learning*

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Video clips

Instruction Commentary **Prompt 3**

Note that for the Instruction Task, the commentary is intended to provide context for interpreting what is shown in the video. Candidates sometimes describe events that do not appear in the video or conflict with scenes from the video—**such statements should not override evidence depicted in the video**.

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	■ N/A
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	■ None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at <u>Level 3</u>:

- The clips show that the students are engaged in language tasks that provide opportunities for students to develop English language proficiency in content-based instruction that involves one or more modalities and one or more competencies.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:

- Students are participating in tasks that provide little opportunity to develop English language proficiency.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- Students are participating in tasks that limit their opportunity to develop English language proficiency. This may be due to the structure of the learning task, the way in which it is implemented, or its vague relation to the development of language in content-based instruction.
- Instruction focuses either on one competency OR one modality—but not both.
- In addition, the candidate may refer to students' learning from prior units, but the references are indirect or unclear and do not facilitate new learning.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,

- The learning tasks seen in the video clips focus entirely on grammar rules or vocabulary with no attention to a modality, and therefore provide no opportunity to develop language proficiency.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:

The language tasks as seen in the clips are structured to engage students in ways that:

- Integrate the development of English language proficiency with content-based instruction using **multiple** modalities and **at least one** competency
- Deepen communicative language proficiency

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- The language tasks in the clips integrate the development of English language development with content-based instruction using **two or more** modalities and **at least one** competency.

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, the candidate meets Level 4 AND

- Has students engaged in language and/or practicing language tasks that lead them to deepen and extend their communicative proficiency in English in meaningful academic context(s). Students are clearly extending their linguistic repertoire and engaging in the language task in deep ways.

Instruction Rubric 8: Deepening Students' English Language Development within Content-Based Instruction

EAL8: How does the candidate elicit student responses to promote students' English language proficiency within content-based instruction?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how, in the video clips, the candidate brings forth and builds on student responses to guide learning; this can occur during whole class discussions, small group discussions, or consultations with individual students.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *Significant content inaccuracies*—Content flaws within processes or examples used during the lesson will lead to student misunderstandings and the need for reteaching.

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Video Clips

Instruction Commentary **Prompt 4a**

Note that for the Instruction Task, the commentary is intended to provide context for interpreting what is shown in the video. Candidates sometimes describe events that do not appear in the video or conflict with scenes from the video—**such statements should not override evidence depicted in the video**.

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	▪ N/A for this rubric
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	▪ Pattern of **significant content inaccuracies** that are core to the central focus or a key learning objective for the learning segment

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at <u>Level 3</u>:

- The candidate elicits student responses that encourage and extend English language development within content-based instruction involving one modality and one competency, e.g., by asking students to "say more" or "give an example," or "repeat and add on." If language proficiency allows, prompts would be higher order to elicit more complex linguistic responses.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:

- In the clips, classroom interactions provide students with limited or no opportunities to elaborate on their responses in order to develop English language proficiency.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- The candidate asks questions that elicit single word answers and do little to encourage students to think about the content being taught or to elaborate. Students are not asked to rephrase using complete utterances and single-word answers are accepted.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,

- There is little to no opportunity shown in the clips that students were able to use English to express ideas, experiences, and/or opinions—instead the teacher does most of the prompting and responding even though students have the linguistic resources to respond.

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

- There is a pattern of significant content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings.

- The candidate makes a significant error in content (e.g., introducing an inaccurate definition of a central concept before students work independently) that is core to the central focus or a key standard for the learning segment.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:

- In the clips, the candidate uses student ideas and thinking to develop students' English language proficiency in one or more modalities and competencies within content-based instruction or their abilities to evaluate their own learning.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- The candidate follows up on student responses to encourage the student or his/her peers to explore or build on the ideas expressed.

- The candidate uses this strategy to develop students' English language proficiency within one or more modalities and competencies.

- Examples of "building on student responses" includes referring to a previous student response in developing a point or an argument; calling on the student to elaborate on what s/he said; posing questions to guide a student discussion; soliciting student examples and asking another student to identify what they have in common; asking a student to summarize a lengthy discussion or rambling explanation; and asking another student to respond to a student comment or answer a question posed by a student to move instruction forward.

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, the candidate meets all of Level 4 **AND**

- There is evidence in the clips that the candidate structures and supports student-student conversations and interactions that facilitate students' ability to evaluate and self-monitor their learning in meaningful academic contexts.

Instruction Rubric 9: Subject-Specific Pedagogy

EAL9: How does the candidate promote comparisons and connections between the content being taught and the students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds, experiences, and prior academic knowledge?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate provides opportunities for students to make connections between the content being taught and students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds, experiences and prior knowledge.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- N/A

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Video Clips

Instruction Commentary **Prompt 4b**

Note that for the Instruction Task, the commentary is intended to provide context for interpreting what is shown in the video. Candidates sometimes describe events that do not appear in the video or conflict with scenes from the video—**such statements should not override evidence depicted in the video**.

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	■ N/A for this rubric
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	■ N/A

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- In the clips, candidate's instruction provides opportunities for students to demonstrate an understanding of the relation between the content being learned and their own language (including home language), culture, experiences, and/or prior academic knowledge.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- In the clips, the candidate is providing limited to no opportunities for students to demonstrate an understanding of the connections between the content and their own language (including home language), culture, experiences, and/or prior academic knowledge.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- In the clips, candidate's instruction provides limited opportunities for students to demonstrate an understanding of the relation between the content being taught and their own language (including home language), culture, experiences, and/or prior academic knowledge.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,

- Candidate's instruction neglects to provide opportunities for students to demonstrate an understanding of the relation between the content being taught and their own language (including home language), culture, experiences, and/or prior academic knowledge.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:

- Candidate's instruction provides purposeful opportunities for students to demonstrate an understanding of the explicit relations between the content being taught and their own language (including home language), culture, experiences, and/or prior academic knowledge.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- In the clips, candidate's instruction includes meaningful opportunities for students to show that they understand how they content they are learning is directly related to their own language (including home language), culture, experiences, backgrounds, and/or prior academic knowledge. Such tasks might include strategically asked questions, opportunities for reflection, or semantic mapping with peers that provide opportunities for students to explicitly share the connections between their content understanding, their backgrounds and/or their prior knowledge.

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, in the clips, the candidate meets Level 4 **AND**

- Language tasks provide multiple entry points for students to make meaningful connections between content taught and their backgrounds (cultural and linguistic and experiences) and/or prior academic knowledge.

Instruction Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness

EAL10: How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate examines the teaching and learning in the video clips and proposes what s/he could have done differently to better support the needs of diverse students. The candidate justifies the changes based on student needs and references to research and/or theory.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- N/A

Primary Sources of Evidence:
Instruction Commentary **Prompt 5**
Video Clips (for evidence of student learning)

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	■ Criterion 1 (**primary**): Proposed changes
	■ Criterion 2: Connections to research/theory
	■ Place greater weight or consideration on criterion 1 (proposed changes).
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	■ None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at <u>Level 3</u>:

- *Primary criterion*: The proposed changes address the central focus and the candidate explicitly connects those changes to the learning needs of the class as a whole.

    - Proposed changes noted by the candidate should be related to the lessons that are seen or referenced in the clips, but do not need to be exclusively from what is seen in the clips alone. This means that since only portions of the lessons will be captured by the clips, candidates can suggest changes to any part of the lesson(s) referenced in the clips, even if those portions of the lesson(s) are not depicted in the clips.

- *Secondary criterion*: The candidate refers to research or theory in relation to the plans to support student learning. The connections between the research/theory and the tasks are vague/not clearly made.

- If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 3, the rubric is scored at Level 3 **regardless of the evidence for the secondary criterion**.

- If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 4, and candidate has NO connection to research/theory, the rubric is scored at Level 3.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:

- The changes proposed by the candidate are not directly related to student learning.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- The changes address improvements in teaching practice that mainly focus on how the candidate structures or organizes learning tasks, with a superficial connection to student learning. There is little detail on the changes in relation to either the central focus or the specific learning that is the focus of the video clips. Examples include asking additional higher-order questions without providing examples, improving directions, repeating instruction without making significant changes based on the evidence of student learning from the video clips, or including more group work without indicating how the group work will address specific learning needs.

- If a candidate's proposed changes have nothing to do with the central focus, this rubric cannot be scored beyond a Level 2.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,

- The changes are not supported by evidence of student learning from lessons seen or referenced in the clips.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:

- The proposed changes relate to the central focus and explicitly address individual and collective needs that were within the lessons seen in the video clips.

- The changes in teaching practice are supported by research and/or theory relevant to ELL education.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- The changes clearly address the learning needs of individuals in addition to the learning needs of the whole class in the video clips by providing additional support and/or further challenge in relation to the central focus. Candidate should explain how proposed changes relate to individuals' needs.

- The candidate explains how research or theory relevant to ELL education is related to the changes proposed. Candidates may cite research or theory in their commentary, or refer to the ideas and principles from the research; either connection is acceptable, as long as they clearly connect the research/theory to the proposed changes.

- Scoring decision rules: To score at Level 4, the candidate must meet the primary criterion at Level 4 and make at least a fleeting, relevant reference to research or theory (meet the secondary criterion at least at Level 3.

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, the candidate meets Level 4 AND

- Explains how principles of research or theory relevant to ELL education support or frame the proposed changes. The justifications are explicit, well articulated, and demonstrate a thorough understanding of the research/theory principles that are clearly reflected in the explanation of the changes.

Assessment Rubric 11: Analysis of Students' Development of English Language Proficiency through Content-Based Instruction

EAL11: How does the candidate analyze evidence of student learning of English language proficiency through content-based instruction?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses the candidate's analysis of student work to identify patterns of learning across the class.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *Aligned*—The assessment, evaluation criteria, learning objectives, and analysis are aligned with each other.

- *Evaluation criteria*—Evaluation criteria should indicate differences in level of performance, e.g., a rubric, a checklist of desired attributes, points assigned to different parts of the assessment. Summative grades are not evaluation criteria. Evaluation criteria must be relevant to the learning objectives, though they may also include attention to other desired features of the assessment response, e.g., neatness, spelling.

For the following term from the rubric, see the handbook glossary:

- *Patterns of learning*

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Assessment Commentary **Prompt 1**

Student work samples

Evaluation criteria

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	▪ N/A for this rubric
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	▪ Significant misalignment between evaluation criteria, learning objectives, and/or analysis

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at <u>Level 3</u>:

- The analysis is an accurate listing of what students did correctly and incorrectly.

- The analysis is aligned with the evaluation criteria and/or assessed learning objectives.

- Some general differences in learning across the class are identified.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:

- The analysis is superficial (e.g., primarily irrelevant global statements) or focuses only on partial data (on right or wrong answers for language within content).

- The analysis is contradicted by the work sample evidence.

- The analysis is based on an inconsistent alignment with evaluation criteria and/or standards/objectives.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: There are **two different ways** that evidence is scored at Level 2:

1. Although aligned with the summary, the analysis presents an incomplete picture of student learning by only addressing either successes or errors related to language within content.

2. The analysis does not address students' development of communicative proficiency in the target language.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: There are **two different ways** that evidence is scored at Level 1:

1. The analysis is superficial because it ignores important evidence from the work samples, focusing on trivial aspects.

2. The conclusions in the analysis are not supported by the work samples or the summary of learning.

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

- There is a significant lack of alignment between evaluation criteria, learning objectives, and/or analysis.

- A lack of alignment can be caused by a lack of relevant evaluation criteria to assess student performance on the learning objectives.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>: The analysis:

- Identifies patterns of learning (quantitative and qualitative) that summarize what students know, are able to do, and still need to learn.

- Describes patterns for the whole class, groups, or individuals.

- Is supported with evidence from the work samples and is consistent with the summary.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- The analysis describes consistencies in performance (patterns) across the class in terms of what students know and are able to do and where they need to improve.

- The analysis goes beyond a listing of students' successes and errors, to an explanation of student understanding in relation to their performance on the identified assessment. An exhaustive list of what students did right and wrong, or the % of students with correct or incorrect responses, should be scored at Level 3, as that does not constitute a pattern of student learning. A pattern of student learning goes beyond these quantitative differences to identify specific content understandings or misunderstandings, or partial understandings that are contributing to the quantitative differences.

- Specific examples from work samples are used to demonstrate the whole class patterns. An example is, "All students made use of the provided sentence frames. I think these sentence frames were a good support strategy for all students, but especially for Student A, our newcomer. Student A is able to use "I predict that Mary will …" and "I think maybe Mary will…" in his reader's response letter. Only two of the nine students were able to use sequence signal words accurately in their summaries. Most students were like Student C, who only used "then" over and over, signally that many students are still struggling with how to choose the correct sequence signal words when writing summaries.

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,

- The candidate uses specific evidence from work samples to demonstrate qualitative patterns of understanding. The analysis uses these qualitative patterns to interpret the range of similar correct or incorrect responses from individuals or groups (e.g., quantitative patterns), and to determine elements of what students learned and what would be most productive to work on. The qualitative patterns may include struggles, partial understandings, and/or attempts at solutions. An example would be "All students made use of the provided sentence frames to write their summaries. For half of the students, the sentence frames allowed them to write responses that were accurate in content and followed sentence structures. For 25% of the students, they were able to finish the sentence frames with the content they wanted but often struggled with completing the sentence structure accurately. For example, Student B shared that, "I predict Mary will ran home to bully get away from." As can been seen in this sample, the verb tense is past and the order of the words in the sentence does not make sense yet, but the intent of the content is clear—get away from the bully. In terms of using sequence signal words, 20% of the students were able to use sequence signal words accurately in their summaries. Student B is one of the two. He uses "first," "then" "after a while" and even incorporates "meanwhile" and "shortly after" which **were all** covered in class and part of the work bank. However, the other 80% of the students were like Student C, who only used "then" over and over, signally that most students are still struggling with how to choose the correct sequence signal words when writing summaries."

Assessment Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Student Development of English Language Proficiency through Content-Based Instruction

EAL12: What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students on their strengths and areas for improvement?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses the evidence of feedback provided to the focus students in relation to the development of English Language Proficiency within content-based instruction. Feedback may be written on the three student work samples or provided in a video/audio format. The feedback should identify what students are doing well and what needs to improve in relation to English language proficiency within content.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *Significant content and/or language inaccuracies*—Inaccuracies in the feedback are significant and systematic, and interfere with student learning

- *Developmentally inappropriate feedback*—Feedback addressing concepts, skills, or procedures well above or below the content and/or language objectives assessed (without clearly identified need) OR feedback that is not appropriate for the English language proficiency level of the student

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Assessment Commentary **Prompts 2a–b**

Evidence of feedback (written, audio/video)

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	■ N/A
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	■ One or more systematic errors in the feedback that will mislead student(s) in significant ways ■ No evidence of feedback for one or more focus students
► **Preponderance of Evidence**	■ You must apply the preponderance of evidence rule when the focus students receive varying types of feedback. For example, when the candidate provides feedback on both strengths and needs for 2 out of the 3 focus students, this example would be scored at a Level 4 according to the preponderance of evidence rule.

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at <u>Level 3</u>:

- The feedback identifies <u>specific</u> strengths OR needs for improvement. At Level 3, the candidate MUST provide the focus students with qualitative feedback, which addresses English language proficiency OR content. Specific feedback includes such things as pointing to the student's use of a strategy, or language within content, use of the identified language function for a learning task, or a specific linguistic feature evaluated in the oral presentation or written discourse.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:

- Evidence of feedback is general, unrelated to the assessed learning objectives (i.e., relevant English Language proficiency or content), developmentally inappropriate, inaccurate, or missing for one or more focus students.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- Although the feedback is related to the English Language proficiency or content, it is also vague and does not identify specific strengths and/or needs for improvement. At Level 2, general feedback includes identifying what each focus student did or did not do successfully with little detail, e.g., checkmarks for correct responses, points deducted, and comments such as, "Watch out for verb tenses!" that are not linked to a specific strength or need. General feedback does not address the specific error or correct solution (e.g., "Check your work" or "Yes!"). Feedback that is limited to a single remark, such as identifying the total percent correct (86%), an overall letter grade (B), or one comment such as "Nice work!" with no other accompanying comments or grading details does not meet the Level 2 requirement and should be scored at a Level 1. Those examples of a single piece of feedback do not even provide any general feedback to focus students that is related to the learning objectives.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: There are **two different ways** that evidence is scored at Level 1:

1. Feedback is not related to the learning objectives.
2. Feedback is not developmentally or linguistically appropriate.

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

- Feedback includes content and/or language inaccuracies that will misdirect the learning of focus student(s).

- There is no evidence of feedback for the analyzed assessment for one or more focus students. This includes when there is only a description of feedback rather than actual feedback (video, audio, or written) presented to the focus student(s).

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:

- Feedback is specific, related to English language proficiency **within** content, and addresses students' strengths AND needs.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- Specific feedback addresses both strengths AND needs related to English language proficiency **within** content. For example, "You did a great job explaining the cause-and-effect relationship in this article. You used phrases such as "as a result," "therefore," and "consequently." Remember to use correct punctuation to connect sentences when you use these phrases so that you do not end up with run-on sentences."

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, the candidate meets Level 4 AND

- The feedback for at least one focus student includes:

    - A strategy to address a specific learning need, including the need for a greater challenge. For example, "When you are asked to predict what is going to happen next in the story, use your prior knowledge and the contextual clues to help you make inferences. What clues does the author give you in the text? What has the character done far that might be a clue? What clues do the illustrations share? What do you know about such situations that might help you make a good prediction based on all of the information from the text you gathered? Use these kinds of questions to help you make predictions."

    OR

    - A meaningful connection to experience or prior learning. For example, the candidate refers back to a prior lesson: "Remember we talked about making text-to-self connection in our previous lesson? Can you write about a situation in your own life that is similar to what (name of the main character) experiences in this story?"

Assessment Rubric 13: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback

EAL13: How does the candidate support focus students to understand and use the feedback to guide <u>their</u> development of English language proficiency in content-based instruction?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate explains how they will help focus students understand and use the feedback provided in order to improve their English language proficiency within content-based instruction.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- N/A

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Assessment Commentary **Prompt 2c**

Evidence of Oral or Written Feedback

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	■ N/A for this rubric
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	■ None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at <u>Level 3</u>:

- Candidate describes <u>how</u> the focus students will understand **OR** use feedback related to English language proficiency or content. This description needs to relate to the feedback given to one or more of the focus students.

- The description should be specific enough that you understand what the candidate and/or students are going to do. Otherwise, it is vague and the evidence should be scored at Level 2.

  - Example for **understanding** feedback: Candidate reviews work with whole class focusing on common mistakes that explicitly includes content that one or more focus students were given feedback on.

  - Example for **using** feedback: Candidate asks focus students to revise work using feedback given and resubmit revised work.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:

- Opportunities for understanding or using feedback are superficially described or absent.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- The description of how the focus students will understand or use feedback is very general or superficial. Details about <u>how</u> the students will understand or use the feedback are missing, making the description not very clearly related to English language proficiency or content. For example, "The focus students will get their work back. The feedback will tell them what they did right and wrong when solving the problem. They will solve another similar problem next week," or, e.g., description discusses whole class understanding or use of feedback without explicit attention to feedback given to one or more focus students.

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,

- Opportunities for understanding or using feedback are not described **OR**

- There is NO evidence of feedback for **two** or more focus students.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:

- Support for the focus students to understand **AND** use feedback is described in enough detail to understand how it will help students improve on their strengths and weaknesses of English language proficiency in content.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- The candidate describes planned or implemented support for the focus students to understand and use feedback on their strengths OR weaknesses to help improve their learning of English language proficiency within content. For example, a candidate may work with focus students in a small group and reteach several concepts they struggled with on their assessment (as noted by feedback given), using a graphic organizer to further develop understanding of each concept (such as a T-chart or concept map). Next, students would be given an opportunity to revise their responses involving those concepts, using the graphic organizer to support their revisions. This example shows how a candidate can help focus students understand their feedback in relation to misunderstandings and support them in using that feedback to enhance learning in relation to objectives assessed. This type of planned support could take place with the whole class as long as explicit attention to one or more of the focus student's strengths or weaknesses is addressed in relation to the feedback given.

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, the candidate meets Level 4 **AND**

- Describes planned or implemented support for the focus students to understand and use feedback on their strengths AND weaknesses to help improve their learning of English language proficiency within content.

Assessment Rubric 14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Content Understanding

EAL14: How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate explains students' use of the identified language demands and how that use demonstrates and develops English language proficiency within content-based instruction.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

Use the definitions below and the subject-specific Academic Language handout to further clarify concepts on Rubric 14.

- **language demands**—Specific ways that academic language is used by students to participate in learning tasks through reading, writing, listening, and/or speaking to demonstrate their disciplinary understanding. For EAL this includes language functions, vocabulary, and language competencies.

- **language functions**—Language functions refer to what speakers do and accomplish by using language in meaningful contexts. Common interpersonal language functions include greeting, expressing likes and dislikes, making requests, giving and receiving information, initiating and ending conversations, and so on. Common academic language functions include defining, summarizing, classifying, comparing/contrasting, explaining, arguing, interpreting, and evaluating ideas. To help you find the functions in your learning segment, remember that functions are associated with verbs (i.e., actions) found in your learning objectives.

- **language competencies**—Language competencies include grammatical, discourse, pragmatic and metalinguistic competencies. Grammatical competence focuses on accurate use of vocabulary and grammar/structure. Discourse competence focuses on coherence (e.g., organization of ideas) and cohesion (e.g., appropriate transitions & pronouns) in spoken or written discourse appropriate for a specific genre. Discipline-specific discourse has distinctive features or ways of structuring oral or written language (text structures) that provide useful ways for the content to be communicated. Pragmatic competence refers to the use of speech acts (e.g., making a request) appropriate to specific social contexts (e.g., writing to the city council in a formal style, but to a good friend in a casual style). Metalinguistic competence refers to the understanding of linguistic terms and concepts, and the ability to talk about them and use them. In instructional context, this may refer to how we bring students' attention to features of language and to the use of strategies to develop language skills.

- **vocabulary/key phrases**—Words and phrases that are used within disciplines including: (1) words and phrases with subject-specific meanings that differ from meanings used in everyday life (e.g., table); (2) general academic vocabulary used across disciplines (e.g., compare, analyze, evaluate); and (3) subject-specific words defined for use in the discipline.

- **language supports**—The scaffolds, representations, and pedagogical strategies teachers intentionally provide to help learners understand and use the concepts and language they need to learn within disciplines. The language supports planned within the lessons in edTPA should directly support learners to understand and use identified language demands (vocabulary, language functions, and competencies) to deepen content understandings.

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Assessment Commentary **Prompt 3**

Evidence of Student Language Use (student work samples and/or video evidence)

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	■ N/A for this rubric
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	■ None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- The candidate explains and identifies evidence that the students used or attempted to use the language function AND one additional language demand (vocabulary/key phrases, grammatical, discourse, pragmatic, or metalinguistic competency). Note: The language demands discussed in the Assessment Commentary do not have to be the same as those discussed in Task 1.

- It is not sufficient for the candidate to reference an artifact and make a general statement, for example, "As seen in the work samples, the student used the vocabulary in their work." The candidate must explain how the students used the identified language and reference or identify an example of that use from the artifact, e.g., "In video clip 2 (1:10 to 1:45) Student 1 uses identified key vocabulary such as protagonist, conflict and resolution to summarize the story we just read."

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- The candidate's identification of student's language use is not aligned with the language demands or limited to one language demand.

What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,

- The candidate's description and/or evidence of students' language use is limited to only one language demand (vocabulary/key phrases, function, or grammatical, discourse, pragmatic, or metalinguistic competency).

What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,

- The candidate identifies language use that is unrelated or not clearly related to the language demands (function, vocabulary, and additional competencies) addressed in the Assessment commentary.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:

- Candidate identifies evidence of student use of the language function, vocabulary, and additional language demands (grammatical, discourse, pragmatic, or metalinguistic competency).

- Candidate explains how evidence of student language represents their development of content understandings, which may include growth and/or struggles with both understanding and expressing content understandings.

- Candidate explains and provides evidence of language use and content learning for students with distinct language needs.

What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,

- The candidate identifies and explains evidence that students are able to use the language function, vocabulary, and associated language competencies and explains how they will develop content learning. The explanation uses specific evidence from the video and/or work samples. The discussion of student language use demonstrates how this use develops content understandings.

- The candidate's analysis includes how evidence of student language use demonstrates growth and/or struggles in developing content understandings. For example, the candidate notes that, "All students could give a complete explanation using some commonly used vocabulary words, like character, conflict, plot (references video timestamps 4:35, 5:07 of video). Most of the students could write an essay comparing and contrasting literary elements (the language function). However, some of the students' explanations were incomplete (e.g., work sample for Student 2), not explaining how a specific literary element differs from one story to the other, suggesting that some students still need support to develop their ideas in writing in terms of how to structure their essays and how to use evidence from the text to support their statements. This was evident for Student 3 who claimed there were different elements, but did not explain what was different in any detail (See Work Sample 3 paragraph 1), nor use any information from the text to provide evidence for the differences. More scaffolding and organizational structures are needed to help students develop compare and contrast essays, including gathering the information needed prior to writing and then organizing their writing using that information."

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, the candidate meets Level 4 AND

- Explains and provides evidence that students with distinct language needs are using the language for content learning.

Assessment Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction of English Language with Content

EAL15: How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate uses conclusions from the analysis of student work and research or theory to propose the next steps of instruction. Next steps should be related to the standards/objectives assessed and based on the assessment that was analyzed. They also should address the whole class, groups with similar needs, and/or individual students.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- N/A

Primary Sources of Evidence:
Assessment Commentary **Prompt 4**

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**	▪ Criterion 1 (**primary**): Next steps for instruction
	▪ Criterion 2: Connections to research/theory
	▪ Place greater weight or consideration on criterion 1 (next steps for instruction).
► **AUTOMATIC 1**	▪ None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>at Level 3</u>:

- *Primary Criterion*: The next steps focus on support for student learning that is general for the whole class, not specifically targeted for individual students. The support addresses learning related to English language proficiency and the learning objectives that were assessed.

- *Secondary Criterion*: The candidate refers to research or theory when describing the next steps. The connections between the research/theory and the next steps are vague/not clearly made.

- If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 3, the rubric is scored at Level 3 **regardless of the evidence for the secondary criterion**.

- If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 4, and candidate has NO connection to research/theory, the rubric is scored at Level 3.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:

- The next steps are not directly focused on student learning needs that were identified in the analysis of the assessment.
- Candidate does not explain how next steps are related to the development of students'
- English language proficiency and the learning objectives.

What distinguishes Level 2 from Level 3: At Level 2,

- The next steps are related to the analysis of student learning and the learning objectives assessed.
- Next steps address improvements in teaching practice that mainly focus on how the candidate structures or organizes learning tasks, with a superficial connection to student learning. There is little detail on the changes in relation to the assessed student learning. Examples include repeating instruction or focusing on improving conditions for learning such as pacing or classroom management, with no clear connections to how changes address the student learning needs identified.

What distinguishes Level 1 from Level 2: There are **three different ways** that evidence is scored at Level 1:

1. Next steps do not follow from the analysis.
2. Next steps are unrelated to the standards and learning objectives assessed.
3. Next steps are not described in sufficient detail to understand them, e.g., "more practice" or "go over the test."

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:

- Next steps are based on the assessment results and provide scaffolded or structured support that is directly focused on specific student learning needs related to English language proficiency and learning objectives that were assessed.
- Next steps are supported by research and/or theory.

What distinguishes Level 4 from Level 3: At Level 4,

- The next steps are clearly aimed at supporting specific student needs for either individuals (2 or more students) **or** groups with similar needs related to the development of students' English language proficiency in relation to content standards and learning objectives. Candidate should be explicit about how next steps will strategically support individuals OR groups and explain how that support will address individuals' or groups' needs in relation to English language development in the content area.
- The candidate discusses how the research or theory relevant to ELL education is related to the next steps in ways that make some level of sense given their students and central focus. They may cite the research or theory in their discussion, or they may refer to the ideas from the research. Either is acceptable, as long as they clearly connect the research/theory to their next steps.
- Scoring decision rules: To score at Level 4, the candidate must meet the primary criterion at Level 4 and make at least a fleeting, relevant reference to research or theory (meet the second criterion at least at Level 3).

What distinguishes Level 5 from Level 4: At Level 5,

- The next steps are clearly aimed at supporting specific student needs for **<u>both</u>** individuals **<u>and</u>** groups with similar needs related to the development of students' English language proficiency in relation to content standards and learning objectives. Candidate should be explicit about how next steps will strategically support individuals AND groups and explain how that support will address individuals' AND groups' needs in relation to English language development in the content area.

- The candidate explains how principles of research or theory relevant to ELL education support the proposed changes, with clear connections between the principles and the next steps. The explanations are explicit, well articulated, and demonstrate a thorough understanding of the research or theoretical principles involved.