



World Language

Understanding Rubric Level Progressions

October 2014

edTPA stems from a twenty-five-year history of developing performance-based assessments of teaching quality and effectiveness. The Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (Stanford and AACTE) acknowledges the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers for their pioneering work using discipline-specific portfolio assessments to evaluate teaching quality. This version of the handbook has been developed with thoughtful input from over six hundred teachers and teacher educators representing various national design teams, national subject matter organizations (AAHPERD, ACEI, ACTFL, AMLE, CEC, IRA, NAEYC, NAGC, NCSS, NCTE, NCTM, NSTA), and content validation reviewers. All contributions are recognized and appreciated.

This document was authored by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE).

Copyright © 2014 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved.

The edTPA trademarks are owned by The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. Use of the edTPA trademarks is permitted only pursuant to the terms of a written license agreement.

SCALE

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, & Equity

Understanding Rubric Level Progressions

World Language

edTPA

Fall 2014

edTPA portfolio is a collection of authentic artifacts and evidence from a candidate's actual teaching practice. *Understanding Rubric Level Progressions* is a KEY resource that is designed to describe the meaning behind the rubrics. A close read of the following 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 based on the "preponderance of evidence." The remainder of the document presents the score-level distinctions and other information for each edTPA Task, 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 decision rules for multiple criteria in a rubric
- 5) Automatic 1 criteria
- 6) Examples that distinguish between levels for each rubric: Level 3, below 3 (Levels 1 and 2), and above 3 (Levels 4 and 5).

Preponderance of Evidence

Decisions about a score level are based on the "preponderance of evidence" provided by candidates and its match to rubric level criteria. The interpretation of each criterion requires the application of professional judgment. The following guidelines are applied when making scoring decisions based on the "preponderance of evidence":

When evidence falls across score points, scorers should use the following criteria while making the scoring decision:

1. A pattern of evidence supporting a particular score level has a heavier weight than isolated evidence in another score level.
2. **Automatic 1 criteria** outweigh all other evidence for the specific guiding question, as they reflect foundational understandings related to particular rubrics. Note that not all criteria for Level 1 are Automatic 1s. Automatic 1s are identified in this document for applicable rubrics.

WORLD LANGUAGE LEARNING SEGMENT FOCUS:

Candidate’s instruction should support students to develop students’ communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s).

PLANNING RUBRIC 1: Planning for Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language	
WL1: How do the candidate’s plans build students’ communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s)?	
<p>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 develop students’ <u>communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s)</u>.</p>	
<p>Key concepts of rubric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aligned</i> – Standards, objectives, instructional strategies and learning tasks are “aligned” when they consistently address the same/similar learning outcomes for students. <p>World Language Terms Central to the edTPA:</p> <p>For the following terms from the rubric, see the handbook glossary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • communicative proficiency • language forms • language functions • meaningful cultural context(s) 	
<p>Primary Sources of Evidence:</p> <p>Context Information (for understanding and assessing candidate’s decisions)</p> <p>Planning Commentary Prompt 1</p> <p>Lesson Plans (standards, objectives, instructional strategies and learning tasks, resources)</p> <p>Key Instructional Materials (to help you understand the plans in more detail)</p>	
Unpacking Rubric Levels	
DECISION RULES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A for this rubric
AUTOMATIC 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant content inaccuracies • A pattern of misalignment between standards, objectives, learning tasks, and materials
Unpacking Rubric Levels	
Level 3	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance at <u>Level 3</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans for instruction are logically sequenced to facilitate students’ communicative proficiency. • 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 or cultural topic is posed, such as food or family, and students develop communicative proficiency to interpret and interact about the central theme and cultural topics in the target language. • In addition, the sequencing of the plans supports students’ communicative proficiency by connecting functions and forms of the target language, focusing on the interpretive AND either the interpersonal or presentational mode of communication. Connections are explicitly written in the plans or commentary, and how the connections are made is not left to the determination of the scorer.

<p>Below 3</p>	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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' <u>communicative proficiency so that students will be able to use grammar and vocabulary to interpret and interact in the target language.</u> <p>What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the candidate is paying some attention to helping students understand grammar and vocabulary, but the connections to communication and cultural contexts are fleeting or vague, so that students are largely left to make sense of these on their own. Although other modes of communication may be included, the candidate predominantly focuses the learning segment on the interpretive mode of communication. <p>What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 the grammar and vocabulary (language forms) and the communicative purposes (language functions) they serve. <p>Automatic Score of 1 is given when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a <u>pattern</u> of significant content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings. Content flaws in the plans or instructional materials are significant and systematic, and interfere with student learning. Standards, objectives, learning tasks, and materials are not aligned with each other. There is a <u>consistent pattern of misalignment</u> across the plans. If one standard or objective does not align within the learning segment, this level of misalignment is not significant enough for a Level 1.
<p>Above 3</p>	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance above Level 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning tasks are designed to support students to make clear connections between language forms and functions of the target language in meaningful cultural context(s). Consistent connections require students to routinely apply language forms to purposefully communicate in all three modes of communication--interpretive, interpersonal, and presentational--in the target language throughout the learning segment. <p>What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> plans show intentional connections between language forms and functions of the target language, focusing on all three modes of communication (interpretive, interpersonal, and presentational) in meaningful cultural context(s). Consistent connections require students to apply language forms to purposefully communicate in all three modes of communication (interpretive, interpersonal, and presentational) in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s) throughout the learning segment. <p>What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, the candidate meets all of Level 4 AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> plans include activities and questions that will clearly support students in making these connections themselves. This includes plans that call for students to use, create, and reflect about language forms and functions for authentic communicative purposes in a meaningful cultural context, e.g., students creating and posting text online so that other students (including students from other communities/countries) can respond, or students creating posters/presentations, to be presented to larger audiences, involving reflection and comparisons between their own and others' cultural practices, products, and perspectives.

PLANNING RUBRIC 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs

WL2: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students' development of communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s)?

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
 Planning Commentary **Prompts 2 and 3**
 Lesson Plans
 Key Instructional and Assessment Materials

DECISION RULES

- N/A for this rubric

AUTOMATIC 1

- Support according to requirements in IEPs or 504 plans is completely missing.
- 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:

- Supports are related to the learning objectives and central focus.
- Candidate plans supports for students that address the learning needs of the whole class while assisting them in achieving the learning objectives. None of the supports are differentiated for any students other than those required in an IEP or 504 plan.
- Candidate addresses at least one of the requirements from IEPs and 504 plans as described in the Context for Learning Information.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3: Candidate plans insufficient supports to develop students' learning relative to the identified 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 IEPs or 504 plans.

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

- plans address at least one of the instructional requirements included in the IEPs and 504 plans. However, it is not clear that other planned supports will be helpful in supporting students to meet the learning objectives.
- The instructional supports would work for almost any learning objective. Therefore, supports are not closely connected to the learning objectives or central focus (e.g., check on students who are usually having trouble, without any specific indication of what the candidate might be checking for).

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.

	<p>Automatic Score of 1 is given when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.)
<p>Above 3</p>	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans address specific student needs through supports that will help students meet the learning objectives. • Candidate addresses at least one of the requirements from IEPs and 504 plans as described in the Context for Learning Information. <p>What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the 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). <p>What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the candidate meets Level 4 AND identifies possible common errors and misunderstandings associated with about the target language and the cultural practices associated with the target language, and describes specific strategies to identify and respond to them. • If the plans and commentary attend to common errors or 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

WL3: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?

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

DECISION RULES

- Criterion 1 (**primary**): Justification of plans using knowledge of students (prior academic learning and/or personal/cultural/community assets)
- 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

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- The candidate's justification of the learning tasks includes explicit connections to what students have already learned or knowledge of student' cultural backgrounds or personal lived experiences/interests.
- 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 not clearly made.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- 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 learning tasks makes some connection with what they know about students' prior academic learning OR personal/cultural/community assets. 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.

	<p>What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is no evidence that the candidate uses knowledge of students to plan. <p>Automatic Score of 1 is given when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate’s justification of learning tasks represents a deficit view of students and their backgrounds.
<p>Above 3</p>	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate’s justification not only uses knowledge of students – as both academic learners AND as individuals who bring in personal, cultural or community assets – but also uses research or theory to inform planning. <p>What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the evidence includes a balance of specific examples from students’ prior academic learning AND knowledge of students’ personal/cultural/community assets, and explains how the plans reflect this knowledge. The explanation needs to include explicit connections between the learning tasks and the examples provided. • The candidate explains how Second Language Acquisition/Teaching research or theory 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. <p>What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the candidate meets Level 4 AND explains how principles of Second Language Acquisition/Teaching research or theory 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: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Students’
Development of Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language**

WL4: How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to monitor students’ development of communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s)?

The Guiding Question addresses the alignment of the assessments to the standards and objectives and the extent to which 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 communicative proficiency in the target language.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

N/A

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Context for Learning Information (required supports, modifications, or accommodations for assessments)
 Planning Commentary **Prompt 4**
 Lesson Plans (assessments)
 Assessment Materials

DECISION RULES

- 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 communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s) at various points within the learning segment.
- The assessments must provide evidence of communicative proficiency of the target language focusing on the interpretive AND either the interpersonal OR presentational mode of communication

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- The planned assessments will yield insufficient evidence to monitor development of communicative proficiency in the target language.

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.
- Although assessments may provide some evidence of student learning, they do not monitor all areas of learning across the learning segment.

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

- the assessments only focus on memorization of grammar and vocabulary items without providing any evidence of students' development of communicative proficiency in the target language.

	<p>Automatic Score of 1 is given when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there is NO attention to ANY <u>assessment-related</u> IEP/504 plan requirements (e.g., more time; a scribe for written assignments), 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.)
<p>Above 3</p>	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The array of assessments provides consistent evidence of students’ development of communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s). • Assessment evidence will allow the candidate to determine students’ progress toward developing communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s). <p>What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s) for the central focus. “Multiple forms of evidence” means that different types of evidence are used – e.g., interpret a variety of texts in the target language, ability to interact with others in oral and written forms in the target language, and ability to present information to larger audiences in the target language, both in written and oral forms—and not that here is only one type of evidence on homework, exit slips, and the final test. • The array of assessments provides evidence to track student progress toward developing the communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s) defined by the standards and learning objectives. • This evidence is collected for all three modes of communication: interpersonal, presentational, and interpretive. <p>What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

WL5: How does the candidate demonstrate a positive learning environment that supports students' engagement in learning?

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 Clip(s)

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.**

DECISION RULES

- N/A

AUTOMATIC 1

- None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance at <u>Level 3</u>: In the clip(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate's interactions with students are respectful, demonstrate rapport (evidence of relationship between teacher 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. • The environment described in the commentary, and verified with video evidence, shows that the candidate facilitates a positive 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	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>: The clip(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not exhibit evidence of positive relationships and interactions between teacher and students. • Reveal a focus on classroom management and maintaining student behavior and routines rather than engaging students in learning.

	<p>What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> although clip(s) reveal the candidate’s respectful interactions with students, there is an emphasis on candidate’s rigid control of student behaviors, discussions and other activities in ways that limit and do not support learning. <p>What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1, there are two ways that evidence is scored:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The clip(s) reveal evidence of candidate-student or student-student interactions that discourage student contributions, disparage the student(s), or take away from learning. 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.
<p>Above 3</p>	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>: The clip(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reveal a positive learning environment that includes tasks/discussions that challenge student thinking and encourage respectful student-student interaction. <p>What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the learning environment supports learning tasks that challenge students by promoting 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., to discuss ideas respectfully with each other. <p>What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the learning environment encourages students to express, debate, and evaluate differing perspectives on the target language and culture with each other. Perspectives could be from curricular sources, students’ ideas, and/or lived experiences.

INSTRUCTION RUBRIC 6: Engaging Students' Target Language Communication

WL6: How does the candidate actively engage students in developing communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s)?

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate provides video evidence of engaging students in tasks and discussions to develop their understanding of communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s).

Key Concepts of Rubric:

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

- *Engaging students in learning*
- *Assets (personal/cultural/community)*

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Video Clip(s)

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.**

DECISION RULES

- Criterion 1 (**primary**): Engagement in learning tasks
- Criterion 2: Connections between students' academic learning and/or personal/cultural/community assets and new learning
- Place greater weight or consideration on the criterion 1 (engagement in learning tasks).

AUTOMATIC 1

- None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- The clip(s) show that the students are engaged in language tasks that provide opportunities for students to develop communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s).
- The clip(s) show the candidate **making connections** to students' prior experiences and academic learning to help them develop language as well as cultural skills and knowledge of the target language. Although these content understandings are evident in conversations, they are addressed at a cursory level.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- Students are participating in tasks that provide little opportunity to develop communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s).

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

- students are participating in rote tasks that primarily focus on memorization and/or repetition of grammatical rules and/or vocabulary items and provide little opportunity to develop communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s).
- The structure of the learning task or the way in which it is implemented constrains student development of communication in the target language.
- 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.

	<p>What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the learning tasks seen in the video clip(s) have little relation to the central focus identified. • In addition, either the candidate is not using students’ prior academic learning and personal/cultural/community experiences to build new learning OR the links do not make sense to the students, so they are unable to use them.
<p>Above 3</p>	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The learning tasks as seen in the clip(s) are structured to engage students to develop communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s). • Connections between students’ prior academic learning and personal/cultural/community experiences – in and out of school – support the new learning. <p>What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the learning tasks in the clip(s) include structures or scaffolding that promote the learning of language forms and functions of the target language in meaningful cultural context(s), focusing on either the interpersonal or presentational mode of communication. Students must interact with the content in ways that are likely to either extend initial understandings or surface misunderstandings that the candidate can then address. • In addition, the candidate draws upon not only prior academic learning, but also students’ knowledge and experience from outside school to develop new learning. <p>What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the candidate meets Level 4 AND the learning tasks as seen in the clip(s) are structured or scaffolded so that students will develop and use the target language in ways that are appropriately challenging directly related to new learning. • In addition, the candidate encourages students to connect and use their prior academic and personal/cultural/community knowledge and experiences to support new learning.

INSTRUCTION RUBRIC 7: Deepening Student Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language

WL 7: How does the candidate elicit student responses to promote their communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s)?

The Guiding Question addresses how, in the video clip, 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*

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Video Clip(s)

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.**

DECISION RULES

- N/A for this rubric

AUTOMATIC 1

- Pattern of **significant content inaccuracies** or a significant error in content that is core to the central focus or a key standard for the learning segment

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- The candidate prompts students to offer responses that require thinking **that requires going beyond the correct usage of grammar and vocabulary of the target language** by asking questions that will lead students to make connections between the language forms and functions they serve, e.g., “What is X used for?,” “When/In what situations do we use X?,” etc. Some instruction may be characterized by initial questions focusing on facts to lay a basis for later higher-order questions in the clip.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- In the clip(s), classroom interaction provides students with limited or no opportunities to think and learn.

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

- the candidate asks questions that elicit right/wrong or yes/no answers and do little to encourage students to think about the content being taught.

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

- there are few opportunities shown in the clip(s) that students were able to use the target language to express self, ideas, feelings, experiences and/or opinions.

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.

<p>Above 3</p>	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the clip(s), the candidate uses student ideas and thinking to develop students’ communicative proficiency in the target language or their abilities to evaluate their own learning. <p>What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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’ communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s). • 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. <p>What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is evidence in the clip(s) that the candidate structures and supports student-student conversations and interactions that facilitate students’ ability to evaluate and self-monitor their learning.
---------------------------	---

INSTRUCTION RUBRIC 8: Subject-Specific Pedagogy

WL 8: How does the candidate promote comparisons and connections between students' prior experiences and knowledge and the new cultural practices, products, and perspectives of the target language?

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate uses comparisons between the students' prior experiences and knowledge and the target language's cultural practices, products, and perspectives to develop new understandings of the target language and culture.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *Cultural practices, products, and perspectives* -- According to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages standards (1999), cultural practices refer to patterns of behavior accepted by a society and deal with aspects of culture such as rites of passage, norms for politeness, the use of space, etc. Cultural practices represent the knowledge of "what to do when and where." Cultural practices involve the creation and use of cultural products, such as paintings, literary works, folk tales, movies, vases, chopsticks, a system of education, books, food, etc. Cultural perspectives refer to values and beliefs. Practices and products reflect the perspectives of the culture(s) studied.

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Video Clip(s)

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.**

DECISION RULES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A for this rubric
AUTOMATIC 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials used in the clip(s) include significant linguistic and/or cultural inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings.

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance at <u>Level 3</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the clip(s), candidate's instruction provides opportunities for students to demonstrate an understanding of the relationship among the practices, products, and perspectives of the culture(s) studied and the students' own experiences and knowledge.
Below 3	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the clip(s), the candidate is not developing students' target language communicative proficiency. <p>What distinguishes a Level 2 from a Level 3: At Level 2,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the candidate's instruction provides limited opportunities for students to demonstrate an understanding of the relationship among the practices, products, and perspectives of the culture(s) studied. <p>What distinguishes a Level 1 from a Level 2: At Level 1,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the candidate provides limited opportunities (as opposed to no opportunities) for students to demonstrate an understanding of the relationship among the practices, products, and perspectives of the culture(s) studied.

	<p>Automatic Score of 1 is given when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate’s instruction does not address comparisons among the practices, products, and perspectives of the culture(s) studied. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials used in the clip(s) include significant linguistic and/or cultural inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings.
<p>Above 3</p>	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate’s instruction provides purposeful opportunities for students to demonstrate an understanding the relationship among the practices, products, and perspectives of the culture(s) studied and to make explicit connections to their own experiences and knowledge. <p>What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the clip(s), candidate strategically asks questions and/or engages students in language tasks that require reflection and discussion about the relationship among the practices, products, and perspectives of the culture(s) studied and students’ own experiences and knowledge. <p>What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the clip(s), the candidate meets Level 4 AND structures and supports student-student conversations to help them evaluate their own understandings of the cultural practices, products, and perspectives of the target language while encouraging the use of the target language both within and beyond the school setting for personal enjoyment, advancement, and enrichment.

INSTRUCTION RUBRIC 9: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness

WL 9: How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs?

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate examines the teaching and learning in the video clip(s) 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:

Video Clip(s) (for evidence of student learning)
Instruction Commentary **Prompt 5**

DECISION RULES

- 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 Level 3:

- The proposed changes in teaching practice relate to the central focus and address specific learning needs of the whole class from the lessons that were depicted in the video clip(s). Proposed changes noted by the candidate should be related to the lessons that are seen or referenced in the clip(s), but do not need to be exclusively from what is seen in the clip(s) alone. This means that since only portions of the lessons implemented will be captured by the clip(s), candidates can suggest changes to any part of the lesson(s) referenced in the clip(s), even if those portions of the lesson(s) are not depicted in the clip(s).
- 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 not clearly made.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- 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 clip(s). Examples include asking additional higher-order questions without providing examples, improving directions, 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 seen in the clip(s).

Above 3	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed changes relate to the central focus and address individual and collective needs that were within the lessons seen in the video clip(s). • The changes in teaching practice are supported by Second Language Acquisition/Teaching research and/or theory. <p>What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the changes proposed are clearly related to individual and collective learning needs that were seen in the video clip(s). • The candidate explains how Second language Acquisition/Teaching research and/or theory 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. <p>What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the candidate meets Level 4 AND explains how principles of Second Language/Teaching research and/or theory 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 10: Analysis of Student Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language

WL10: How does the candidate analyze evidence of student development of communicative proficiency?

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

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *Aligned* – 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:

Evaluation criteria

Student work samples

Assessment Commentary **Prompt 1**

DECISION RULES

- 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 Level 3:

- The analysis is an accurate listing of what students did correctly and incorrectly, and is aligned with the summary.
- Some general differences in learning across the class are identified.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

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

	<p>Automatic Score of 1 is given when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 criteria to evaluate student performance on the learning objectives.
<p>Above 3</p>	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>: The analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the analysis describes patterns across the class in terms of what students know and are able to do and where they need to improve. • Specific examples from work samples are used to demonstrate the whole class patterns. • 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 underlying content understandings, misunderstandings, or partial understandings that are contributing to the quantitative differences. <p>What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 for individuals or groups (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.

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC 11: Providing Feedback to Guide Student Development of Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language

WL11: What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?

The Guiding Question addresses the evidence of feedback provided to the focus students. 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 the learning objectives.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *Significant content inaccuracies* – see Automatic 1 explanation
- *Developmentally inappropriate feedback* – Feedback addressing concepts, skills, or procedures well above or below the content assessed (without clearly identified need) OR feedback that is not appropriate for the developmental level of the student (e.g., lengthy written explanations for young children or English learners).

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Student work samples

Evidence of feedback (written, audio/video)

Assessment Commentary **Prompts 1a, 2a-b**

DECISION RULES

- N/A

AUTOMATIC 1

- Feedback with significant content inaccuracies
- No evidence of feedback for one or more focus students

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- The feedback is specific enough to assist the focus students in understanding specific strengths OR needs for improvement related to language forms of the target language. The candidate **MUST** provide students with qualitative feedback about their performance that is aligned with the specific learning objectives. Checkmarks, points deducted, grades, rubric language marked or scores are not enough to meet Level 3, even if they distinguish errors from correct responses.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- Evidence of feedback is general, unrelated to the learning objectives, developmentally inappropriate, or missing for one or more students.

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

- feedback is related to the learning objectives, but is too vague to assist the focus students in understanding specific strengths or needs for improvement.
- Feedback focuses only on identifying errors in language forms of the target language.

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

- Feedback is not related to the learning objectives.
- Developmentally inappropriate feedback that is not attuned to students' actual levels of proficiency in the target language

	<p>Automatic Score of 1 is given when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback includes content inaccuracies that will misdirect the student(s). • There is no evidence of feedback for one or more focus students.
<p>Above 3</p>	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback is specific, accurate, related to objectives, and addresses students' strengths AND needs related to the language functions and forms of the target language. <p>What distinguishes a Level 4 from a Level 3: At Level 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accurate, specific feedback addresses both strengths and needs related to the development of communicative proficiency in the target language. <p>What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the candidate meets Level 4 AND describes how s/he will help students look for patterns in the feedback to identify the most important areas of strength and continued focus and/or use feedback to monitor their own learning.

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC 12: Student Use of Feedback

WL12: How does the candidate provide opportunities for focus students to use the feedback to guide the development of communicative proficiency in the target language?

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate explains how they expect the focus students to use feedback in order to improve their learning.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

N/A

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Evidence of feedback (written, audio/video)

Assessment Commentary **Prompt 2c**

DECISION RULES

- N/A for this rubric

AUTOMATIC 1

- None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- Candidate uses specific points of feedback given to the focus students and describes how these students can use and connect the feedback to improve language forms of the target language.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- Opportunities for applying feedback are superficially described or absent.

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

- the description of how focus students will use feedback is very general or superficial. Details about how the students will apply the feedback are missing.

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

- opportunities for applying feedback are not described **OR**
- there is **NO** evidence of feedback for Rubric 11.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:

- Support for students to apply feedback is described in enough detail to understand either how students will develop communicative proficiency by making connections between language functions and forms in the target language **OR** how the candidate will support students to generalize feedback to future assignments or contexts.

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

- the candidate describes planned or implemented support for students to apply feedback on strengths and weaknesses to make connections between language functions and forms in the target language to develop further develop their communicative proficiency. This can be corrections of misunderstandings or partial understandings or extensions of learning related to the learning objectives.

	<p>What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5,</p>
--	--

- the candidate meets Level 4 AND describes planned or implemented support for students to apply feedback in ways that will prepare or guide them during future learning opportunities in different contexts or topics.

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC 13: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

WL13: 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 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 should also address the whole class, groups with similar needs, and/or individual students.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

N/A

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Student work samples

Evidence of oral or written feedback

Assessment Commentary **Prompts 1 and 3**

DECISION RULES

- 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 at Level 3:

- 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 the standards and learning objectives that were assessed. The candidate refers to research or theory when describing the next steps. The connections between the research/theory and the next steps are not clearly made.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- 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' communicative proficiency in the target language.

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

- the next steps are related to the analysis of student learning and the standards and learning objectives assessed.
- The 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 either the central focus or the specific learning that is the focus of the video clip(s). 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.

	<p>What distinguishes Level 1 from Level 2: There are three ways that evidence is scored at Level 1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.”
<p>Above 3</p>	<p>Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next steps are directly focused on specific student learning needs related to improving their interpretive as well as either their interpersonal and/or presentational modes of communication, and are supported by research and/or theory. <p>What distinguishes Level 4 from Level 3: At Level 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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’ communicative proficiency in interpretive as well as either interpersonal OR presentational modes of communication in the target language. • The candidate discusses how the research or theory 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. <p>What distinguishes Level 5 from Level 4: At Level 5,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the next steps are clearly aimed at supporting specific student needs for <u>both</u> individuals and groups with similar needs related to the development of students’ communicative proficiency in interpretive, interpersonal, AND presentational modes of communication in the target language. • The candidate explains how principles or research or theory 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.