Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment (MoPTA)

Task 3: Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Rubric for Step 1: Planning the Lesson (textboxes 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
A response at the 1 level provides *minimal* evidence that effectively demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify a learning theory/method, learning goal(s), and standards to guide planning; to select a content focus and identify related content that students have previously encountered as well as identify difficulties students may encounter; to select different instructional strategies connected to the learning goal(s) and to use individual, small-group, and/or whole-group instruction; to design learning activities that address student strengths and needs and are influenced by classroom demographics; and to identify materials, resources, and technology to enhance instruction and student learning.	A response at the 2 level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify a learning theory/method, learning goal(s), and standards to guide planning; to select a content focus and identify related content that students have previously encountered as well as identify difficulties students may encounter; to select different instructional strategies connected to the learning goal(s) and to use individual, small-group, and/or whole-group instruction; to design learning activities that address student strengths and needs and are influenced by classroom demographics; and to identify materials, resources, and technology to enhance instruction and student learning.	A response at the 3 level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify a learning theory/method, learning goal(s), and standards to guide planning; to select a content focus and identify related content that students have previously encountered as well as identify difficulties students may encounter; to select different instructional strategies connected to the learning goal(s) and to use individual, small-group, and/or whole-group instruction; to design learning activities that address student strengths and needs and are influenced by classroom demographics; and to identify materials, resources, and technology to enhance instruction and student learning.	A response at the 4 level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify a learning theory/method, learning goal(s), and standards to guide planning; to select a content focus and identify related content that students have previously encountered as well as identify difficulties students may encounter; to select different instructional strategies connected to the learning goal(s) and to use individual, small-group, and/or whole-group instruction; to design learning activities that address student strengths and needs and are influenced by classroom demographics; and to identify materials, resources, and technology to enhance instruction and student learning.

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Missouri Educator Gateway Assessments

Rubric for Step 1 (continued)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal* and/or *ineffective* throughout the response for Step 1. Evidence may also be missing.	The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 1.	The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 1.	The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 1.

Response for Textbox 3.1.1

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • a *misinformed* learning theory that guides the planning process • *minimal* inclusion of both Missouri and national standards to guide the planned learning activities • *minimal* connections of content to the students' prior knowledge • *minimal* identification of difficulties students may have, with an *inappropriate* plan to address those difficulties	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • a *cursory* learning theory that guides the planning process • *partial* inclusion of both Missouri and national standards to guide the planned learning activities • *inconsistent* connections of content to the students' prior knowledge • *limited* identification of difficulties students may have, with a *partial* plan to address those difficulties	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • an *appropriate* learning theory that guides the planning process • *effective* inclusion of both Missouri and national standards to guide the planned learning activities • *informed* connections of content to the students' prior knowledge • a *relevant* identification of difficulties students may have, with a *relevant* plan to address those difficulties	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • a *significant* learning theory that guides the planning process • *detailed* inclusion of both Missouri and national standards to guide the planned learning activities • *thorough* connections of content to the students' prior knowledge • *in-depth* identification of difficulties students may have, with a *thorough* plan to address those difficulties

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Response for Textbox 3.1.2

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
For **textbox 3.1.2,** a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:	For **textbox 3.1.2**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:	For **textbox 3.1.2,** a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:	For **textbox 3.1.2**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:
• *little or no* instructional strategies to promote student engagement and enhance learning, with *disconnected* rationales for the choice of each strategy	• *partial* instructional strategies to promote student engagement and enhance learning, with *loosely connected* rationales for the choice of each strategy	• *informed* instructional strategies to promote student engagement and enhance learning, with *appropriate* rationales for the choice of each strategy	• *significant* instructional strategies to promote student engagement and enhance learning, with *thorough* rationales for the choice of each strategy
• *little or no* connection of the instructional strategies to the learning goal(s) to facilitate student learning	• a *vague* connection of the instructional strategies to the learning goal(s) to facilitate student learning	• an *effective* connection of the instructional strategies to the learning goal(s) to facilitate student learning	• a *consistent* connection of the instructional strategies to the learning goal(s) to facilitate student learning
• *minimal* reasons for the choice of groupings (individual, small group, and/or whole group) to facilitate student learning	• *incomplete* reasons for the choice of groupings (individual, small group, and/or whole group) to facilitate student learning	• *logical* reasons for the choice of groupings (individual, small group, and/or whole group) to facilitate student learning	• *insightful* reasons for the choice of groupings (individual, small group, and/or whole group) to facilitate student learning

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Response for Textbox 3.1.3

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *little or no* identification and discussion of appropriate learning activities planned for the lesson • a *minimal* connection between the learning activities and how they address student strengths and needs • an *ineffective* connection between the classroom demographics and the design of the learning activities	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *limited* identification and discussion of appropriate learning activities planned for the lesson • a *limited* connection between the learning activities and how they address student strengths and needs • a *partial* connection between the classroom demographics and the design of the learning activities	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *effective* identification and discussion of appropriate learning activities planned for the lesson • an *appropriate* connection between the learning activities and how they address student strengths and needs • an *appropriate* connection between the classroom demographics and the design of the learning activities	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • an *extensive* identification and discussion of appropriate learning activities planned for the lesson • a *thorough* connection between the learning activities and how they address student strengths and needs • an *insightful* connection between the classroom demographics and the design of the learning activities

Response for Textbox 3.1.4

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following: • an *illogical* choice of materials and resources to support instruction, with an *ineffective* rationale for each choice	Response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following: • a *limited* choice of materials and resources to support instruction, with a *vague* rationale for each choice	Response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following: • a *logical* choice of materials and resources to support instruction, with an *appropriate* rationale for each choice	Response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following: • a *significant* choice of materials and resources to support instruction, with an *extensive* rationale for each choice

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Missouri Educator Gateway Assessments

Response for Textbox 3.1.4 (Continued)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
• an *ineffective* choice of technology planned for use in the lesson with *little or no* connection to the enhancement of instruction or student learning	• a *cursory* choice of technology planned for use in the lesson, with a *limited* connection to the enhancement of instruction and student learning	• an *effective* choice of technology planned for use in the lesson, with a *logical* connection to the enhancement of instruction and student learning	• a *significant* choice of technology planned for use in the lesson, with a *thorough* connection to the enhancement of instruction and student learning

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Rubric for Step 2: The Focus Students (textboxes 3.2.1 and 3.2.2)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
A response at the 1 level provides *minimal* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs; to identify the learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson for each Focus Student; to plan to collect evidence that will show each Focus Student's progress toward the learning goal(s); to differentiate instructional strategies and learning activities, adapt learning goal(s), add or adapt materials, resources, and technology to engage each of the Focus Students and facilitate their learning; and to determine how the teacher candidate and each Focus Student will know if he or she achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson. The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal* and/or *ineffective* throughout the response for Step 2. Evidence may also be missing.	A response at the 2 level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs; to identify the learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson for each Focus Student; to plan to collect evidence that will show each Focus Student's progress toward the learning goal(s); to differentiate instructional strategies and learning activities, adapt learning goal(s), add or adapt materials, resources, and technology to engage each of the Focus Students and facilitate their learning; and to determine how the teacher candidate and each Focus Student will know if he or she achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson. The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 2.	A response at the 3 level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs; to identify the learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson for each Focus Student; to plan to collect evidence that will show each Focus Student's progress toward the learning goal(s); to differentiate instructional strategies and learning activities, adapt learning goal(s), add or adapt materials, resources, and technology to engage each of the Focus Students and facilitate their learning; and to determine how the teacher candidate and each Focus Student will know if he or she achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson. The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 2.	A response at the 4 level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs; to identify the learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson for each Focus Student; to plan to collect evidence that will show each Focus Student's progress toward the learning goal(s); to differentiate instructional strategies and learning activities, adapt learning goal(s), add or adapt materials, resources, and technology to engage each of the Focus Students and facilitate their learning; and to determine how the teacher candidate and each Focus Student will know if he or she achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson. The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly* connected throughout the response for Step 2.

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Response for Textbox 3.2.1

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *little or no* identification of each Focus Student's learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson, with *ineffective* rationales • an *ineffective* plan to collect evidence to show the progress of each Focus Student toward the learning goal(s)	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *cursory* identification of each Focus Student's learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson, with a rationale that *lacks detail* • a *limited* plan to collect evidence to show the progress of each Focus Student toward the learning goal(s)	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *accurate* identification of each Focus Student's learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson, with an *appropriate* rationale • an *informed* plan to collect evidence to show the progress of each Focus Student toward the learning goal(s)	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *detailed* identification of each Focus Student's learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson, with an *insightful* rationale • a *significant* plan to collect evidence to show the progress of each Focus Student toward the learning goal(s)

Response for Textbox 3.2.2

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *ineffective* adaptation of the learning goals to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning • *minimal* differentiation of instructional strategies **and** learning activities to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning, with an *ineffective* rationale for the differentiation	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *cursory* adaptation of the learning goals to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning • *vague* differentiation of instructional strategies **and** learning activities to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning, with a rationale for the differentiation that *lacks detail*	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *informed* adaptation of the learning goals to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning • *appropriate* differentiation of instructional strategies **and** learning activities to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning, with an *appropriate* rationale for the differentiation	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *insightful* adaptation of the learning goals to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning • *significant* differentiation of instructional strategies **and** learning activities to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning, with an *extensive* rationale for the differentiation

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Response for Textbox 3.2.2 (continued)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
• *irrelevant* identification of materials, resources, and technology to add or adapt to engage both Focus Students and to facilitate their learning, with *little or no* rationale for the choices • a *misinformed* plan to determine how the teacher candidate and both Focus Students will know if the learning goal(s) are reached	• *partial* identification of materials, resources, and technology to add or adapt to engage both Focus Students and to facilitate their learning, with a *limited* rationale for the choices • an *incomplete* plan to determine how the teacher candidate and both Focus Students will know if the learning goal(s) are reached	• *accurate* identification of materials, resources, and technology to add or adapt to engage both Focus Students and to facilitate their learning, with an *appropriate* rationale for the choices • an *informed* plan to determine how the teacher candidate and both Focus Students will know if the learning goal(s) are reached	• *thorough* identification of materials, resources, and technology to add or adapt to engage both Focus Students and to facilitate their learning, with an *in-depth* rationale for the choices • an *insightful* plan to determine how the teacher candidate and both Focus Students will know if the learning goal(s) are reached

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Missouri Educator Gateway Assessments

Rubric for Step 3: Analyzing the Lesson (textboxes 3.3.1 and 3.3.2)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
A response at the 1 level provides *minimal* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning; to analyze how students demonstrated their understanding of the content presented; to analyze adjustments implemented during the lesson to support student engagement and learning; to analyze steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions; to analyze the impact that feedback provided while teaching had on student learning; to analyze the extent to which each of the Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson; and to analyze how the differentiation of the lesson helped each Focus Student meet the learning goal(s).	A response at the 2 level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning; to analyze how students demonstrated their understanding of the content presented; to analyze adjustments implemented during the lesson to support student engagement and learning; to analyze steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions; to analyze the impact that feedback provided while teaching had on student learning; to analyze the extent to which each of the Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson; and to analyze how the differentiation of the lesson helped each Focus Student meet the learning goal(s).	A response at the 3 level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning; to analyze how students demonstrated their understanding of the content presented; to analyze adjustments implemented during the lesson to support student engagement and learning; to analyze steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions; to analyze the impact that feedback provided while teaching had on student learning; to analyze the extent to which each of the Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson; and to analyze how the differentiation of the lesson helped each Focus Student meet the learning goal(s).	A response at the 4 level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning; to analyze how students demonstrated their understanding of the content presented; to analyze adjustments implemented during the lesson to support student engagement and learning; to analyze steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions; to analyze the impact that feedback provided while teaching had on student learning; to analyze the extent to which each of the Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson; and to analyze how the differentiation of the lesson helped each Focus Student meet the learning goal(s).
The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal and/or ineffective* throughout the response for Step 3. Evidence may also be missing.	The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited and/or vague* throughout the response for Step 3.	The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate and connected* throughout the response for Step 3.	The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful and tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 3.

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Missouri Educator Gateway Assessments

Response for Textbox 3.3.1

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *little or no* analysis of how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning, with *ineffective* evidence supporting the analysis • a *misinformed* analysis of how the students demonstrated their understanding of the presented content, with examples from the lesson and from student work providing *ineffective* support to the analysis • *illogical* adjustments implemented while teaching to support student engagement and learning, with *ineffective* examples to support the choices	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • a *partial* analysis of how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning, with *minimal* evidence supporting the analysis • an *inconsistent* analysis of how the students demonstrated their understanding of the presented content, with examples from the lesson and from student work that are *loosely connected* to the analysis • *uneven* adjustments implemented while teaching to support student engagement and learning, with *partial* examples to support the choices	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • an *informed* analysis of how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning, with *relevant* evidence supporting the analysis • a *complete* analysis of how the students demonstrated their understanding of the presented content with *appropriate* examples from the lesson and from student work supporting the analysis • *informed* adjustments implemented while teaching to support student engagement and learning, with appropriate examples to support the choices	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • a *significant* analysis of how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning, with *thorough* evidence supporting the analysis • an *in-depth* analysis of how the students demonstrated their understanding of the presented content, with *insightful* examples from the lesson and from student work supporting the analysis • *well-defined* adjustments implemented while teaching to support student engagement and learning, with *thorough* examples to support the choices

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Response for Textbox 3.3.1 (Continued)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
• *irrelevant* steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions to impact student engagement and learning • *trivial* feedback provided during the lesson to facilitate student learning, with examples that provide *ineffective* support	• *cursory* steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions to impact student engagement and learning • *partial* feedback provided during the lesson to facilitate student learning, with supporting examples that are *loosely connected*	• *logical* steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions to impact student engagement and learning • *appropriate* feedback provided during the lesson to facilitate student learning, with supporting examples that are *connected*	• *extensive* steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions to impact student engagement and learning • *significant* feedback provided during the lesson to facilitate student learning, with supporting examples that are *tightly connected*

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Response for Textbox 3.3.2

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *minimal* analysis of the extent to which each of the two Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s), with *inappropriate* examples for support • a *minimal* analysis of the impact of the differentiation of the lesson on both Focus Students in helping them meet the learning goal(s), with supporting examples that are *ineffective*	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *uneven* analysis of the extent to which each of the two Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s), with *partial* examples for support • a *limited* analysis of the impact of the differentiation of the lesson on both Focus Students in helping them meet the learning goal(s), with supporting examples that are *loosely connected*	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *informed* analysis of the extent to which each of the two Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s), with *appropriate* examples for support • an *informed* analysis of the impact of the differentiation of the lesson on both Focus Students in helping them meet the learning goal(s), with supporting examples that are *connected*	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *consistent* analysis of the extent to which each of the two Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s), with *extensive* examples for support • an *in-depth* analysis of the impact of the differentiation of the lesson on both Focus Students in helping them meet the learning goal(s), with supporting examples that are *tightly connected*

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Missouri Educator
Gateway Assessments

Rubric for Step 4: Reflecting (textboxes 3.4.1 and 3.4.2)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
A response at the 1 level provides *minimal* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s); to use the analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class; and to use analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons, including specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, for each of the two Focus Students.	A response at the 2 level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s); to use the analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class; and to use analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons, including specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, for each of the two Focus Students.	A response at the 3 level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s); to use the analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class; and to use analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons, including specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, for each of the two Focus Students.	A response at the 4 level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s); to use the analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class; and to use analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons, including specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, for each of the two Focus Students.
The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal* and/or *ineffective* throughout the response for Step 4. Evidence may also be missing.	The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 4.	The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 4.	The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 4.

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Response for Textbox 3.4.1

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *ineffective* use of instructional activities, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s), with examples that provide *little or no* support • an *inappropriate* use of the analysis of the lesson and student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *partial* use of instructional activities, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s), with examples that provide *limited* support • a *limited* use of the analysis of the lesson and student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *appropriate* use of specific instructional activities, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s), with examples that provide *effective* support • an *informed* use of the analysis of the lesson and student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *extensive* use of specific instructional activities, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s), with examples that provide *thorough* support • an *in-depth* use of the analysis of the lesson and student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class

Response for Textbox 3.4.2

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • *little or no* use of the analysis of the lesson and evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students, with *minimal* examples of specific learning	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • an *ineffective* use of the analysis of the lesson and evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students, with examples of specific learning strategies,	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • a *logical* use of the analysis of the lesson and evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students, with *targeted* examples of specific learning	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • an *insightful* use of the analysis of the lesson and evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students, with *extensive* examples of specific learning

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Missouri Educator Gateway Assessments

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to support the reflection	learning activities, materials, resources, and technology that *inconsistently* support the reflection	strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology that support the reflection	strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology that support the reflection

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning