

Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment (MoPTA)

Task 4 NV: Planning, Implementing, Analyzing and Adjusting Instructions to Promote Student Learning

Rubric for Step 1: Planning the Sequence of Lessons Within the Unit (textboxes 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, and 4.1.4)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
A response at the 1 level provides minimal evidence that	A response at the 2 level provides	A response at the 3 level provides	A response at the 4 level provides consistent evidence that
demonstrates the teacher	<i>partial</i> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to	<i>effective</i> evidence that demonstrates the teacher	demonstrates the teacher
candidate's ability to identify the	identify the content focus of the	candidate's ability to identify the	candidate's ability to identify the
content focus of the unit and the	unit and the Missouri or national	content focus of the unit and the	content focus of the unit and the
Missouri or national standards for	standards for the sequence of	Missouri or national standards for	Missouri or national standards for
the sequence of lessons; to	lessons; to identify the learning	the sequence of lessons; to	the sequence of lessons; to
identify the learning goal(s) of the	goal(s) of the sequence of lessons	identify the learning goal(s) of the	identify the learning goal(s) of the
sequence of lessons that are	that are appropriate for the	sequence of lessons that are	sequence of lessons that are
appropriate for the students; to	students; to use students' prior	appropriate for the students; to	appropriate for the students; to
use students' prior knowledge and	knowledge and background	use students' prior knowledge and	use students' prior knowledge and
background information to	information to influence the	background information to	background information to
influence the planning process; to	planning process; to establish a	influence the planning process; to	influence the planning process; to
establish a baseline to measure student growth using whole-class	baseline to measure student growth using whole-class data; to	establish a baseline to measure student growth using whole-class	establish a baseline to measure student growth using whole-class
data; to plan to use academic	plan to use academic content	data; to plan to use academic	data; to plan to use academic
content language, to engage	language, to engage students in	content language, to engage	content language, to engage
students in critical thinking, and	critical thinking, and to use	students in critical thinking, and	students in critical thinking, and
to use questioning skills to	questioning skills to promote	to use questioning skills to	to use questioning skills to
promote student learning; to plan	student learning; to plan to	promote student learning; to plan	promote student learning; to plan
to integrate literacy into the	integrate literacy into the content	to integrate literacy into the	to integrate literacy into the



Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
content being taught; to design learning activities that are the main focus of the sequence of lessons; to explain how the sequence of lessons will anticipate and address student learning needs; to plan to monitor student learning; to use data collected from assessments or assignments for formative purposes; to use rubrics/scoring guides with students to promote self-regulated learning; to use baseline data to identify the learning needs of each Focus Student; to explain what areas of growth are targeted for each Focus Student for the sequence of lessons; and to explain how the student work samples from each Focus Student will demonstrate learning progress.	being taught; to design learning activities that are the main focus of the sequence of lessons; to explain how the sequence of lessons will anticipate and address student learning needs; to plan to monitor student learning; to use data collected from assessments or assignments for formative purposes; to use rubrics/scoring guides with students to promote self-regulated learning; to use baseline data to identify the learning needs of each Focus Student; to explain what areas of growth are targeted for each Focus Student for the sequence of lessons; and to explain how the student work samples from each Focus Student will demonstrate learning progress.	content being taught; to design learning activities that are the main focus of the sequence of lessons; to explain how the sequence of lessons will anticipate and address student learning needs; to plan to monitor student learning; to use data collected from assessments or assignments for formative purposes; to use rubrics/scoring guides with students to promote self-regulated learning; to use baseline data to identify the learning needs of each Focus Student; to explain what areas of growth are targeted for each Focus Student for the sequence of lessons; and to explain how the student work samples from each Focus Student will demonstrate learning progress.	content being taught; to design learning activities that are the main focus of the sequence of lessons; to explain how the sequence of lessons will anticipate and address student learning needs; to plan to monitor student learning; to use data collected from assessments or assignments for formative purposes; to use rubrics/scoring guides with students to promote self-regulated learning; to use baseline data to identify the learning needs of each Focus Student; to explain what areas of growth are targeted for each Focus Student for the sequence of lessons; and to explain how the student work samples from each Focus Student will demonstrate learning progress.
The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is <i>minimal</i> and/or <i>ineffective</i> throughout the response for Step 1. Evidence may also be missing.	The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is <i>limited</i> and/or <i>vague</i> throughout the response for Step 1.	The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is <i>appropriate</i> and <i>connected</i> throughout the response for Step 1.	The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is <i>insightful</i> and <i>thoroughly connected</i> throughout the response for Step 1.



	Score of 1		Score of 2		Score of 3		Score of 4
	esponse provides evidence that cludes the following:		esponse provides evidence that cludes the following:		sponse provides evidence that cludes the following:		sponse provides evidence that cludes the following:
•	an <i>inappropriate</i> identification of the content focus of the unit and the Missouri or national standards for the sequence of lessons	•	a <i>cursory</i> identification of the content focus of the unit and the Missouri or national standards for the sequence of lessons	•	a <i>clear</i> identification of the content focus of the unit and the Missouri or national standards for the sequence of lessons	•	a <i>significant</i> identification of the content focus of the unit and the Missouri or national standards for the sequence of lessons
•	a <i>trivial</i> rationale for the selection of the learning goal(s), appropriate to the students, for the sequence of lessons	•	an <i>incomplete</i> rationale for the selection of the learning goal(s), appropriate to the students, for the sequence of lessons	•	a <i>logical</i> rationale for the selection of the learning goal(s), appropriate to the students, for the sequence of lessons	•	a <i>thorough</i> rationale for the selection of the learning goal(s), appropriate to the students, for the sequence of lessons
•	<i>little or no</i> explanation of how students' prior knowledge and background information influenced the planning process	•	a <i>partial</i> explanation of how students' prior knowledge and background information influenced the planning process	•	an <i>informed</i> explanation of how students' prior knowledge and background information influenced the planning process	•	an <i>insightful</i> explanation of how students' prior knowledge and background information influenced the planning process
•	<i>irrelevant</i> whole-class data used to establish a baseline to measure student growth	•	<i>limited</i> whole-class data used to establish a baseline to measure student growth	•	<i>relevant</i> whole-class data used to establish a baseline to measure student growth	•	<i>significant</i> whole-class data used to establish a baseline to measure student growth



	Score of 1	Score of 2		Score of 3		Score of 4
	esponse provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:		Response provides evidence that includes the following:		esponse provides evidence that cludes the following:
•	an <i>ineffective</i> plan to use academic content language to promote student learning, with a <i>disconnected</i> rationale	• an <i>inconsistent</i> plan to use academic content language to promote student learning, with a <i>partially connected</i> rationale	i	an <i>informed</i> plan to use academic content language to promote student learning, with a <i>connected</i> rationale	•	a <i>substantive</i> plan to use academic content language to promote student learning, with a <i>tightly connected</i> rationale
•	a <i>trivial</i> plan to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with a <i>disconnected</i> rationale	• an <i>inconsistent</i> plan to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with a <i>partially connected</i> rationale		an <i>effective</i> plan to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with a <i>connected</i> rationale	•	a <i>substantive</i> plan to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with a <i>tightly connected</i> rationale
•	an <i>ineffective</i> plan to use questioning skills to promote student learning, with a <i>disconnected</i> rationale	• an <i>inconsistent</i> plan to use questioning skills to promote student learning, with a <i>partially connected</i> rationale		an <i>appropriate</i> plan to use questioning skills to promote student learning, with a <i>connected</i> rationale	•	a <i>substantive</i> plan to use questioning skills to promote student learning, with a <i>tightly</i> <i>connected</i> rationale
•	an <i>inappropriate</i> plan to integrate literacy into the content to be taught, with a <i>disconnected</i> rationale	 an <i>inconsistent</i> plan to integrate literacy into the content to be taught, with a <i>partially connected</i> rationale 		a <i>logical</i> plan to integrate literacy into the content to be taught, with a <i>connected</i> rationale	•	a <i>substantive</i> plan to integrate literacy into the content to be taught, with a <i>tightly</i> <i>connected</i> rationale



	Score of 1		Score of 2		Score of 3		Score of 4
	esponse provides evidence that cludes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:			Response provides evidence that includes the following:		sponse provides evidence that cludes the following:
•	<i>minimal</i> learning activities that are the main focus of the sequence of lessons, with a <i>disconnecte</i> d rationale	•	<i>inconsistent</i> learning activities that are the main focus of the sequence of lessons, with a <i>loosely connecte</i> d rationale	•	<i>targeted</i> learning activities that are the main focus of the sequence of lessons, with a <i>connected</i> rationale	•	<i>significant</i> learning activities that are the main focus of the sequence of lessons, with a <i>tightly connecte</i> d rationale
•	an <i>irrelevant</i> explanation of how the design of the activities anticipates and addresses student learning needs	•	a <i>partial</i> explanation of how the design of the activities anticipates and addresses student learning needs	•	a <i>relevant</i> explanation of how the design of the activities anticipates and addresses student learning needs	•	an <i>insightful</i> explanation of how the design of the activities anticipates and addresses student learning needs
•	an <i>ineffective</i> plan to monitor student learning	•	an <i>incomplete</i> plan to monitor student learning	•	an <i>effective</i> plan to monitor student learning	•	a <i>detailed</i> plan to monitor student learning
•	an <i>inappropriate</i> plan to use data to be collected from assessments or assignments for formative purposes	•	a <i>limited</i> plan to use data to be collected from assessments or assignments for formative purposes	•	an <i>appropriate</i> plan to use data to be collected from assessments or assignments for formative purposes	•	an <i>in-depth</i> plan to use data to be collected from assessments or assignments for formative purposes
•	a <i>trivial</i> plan to use rubrics/scoring guides to promote self-regulated learning with students	•	an <i>uneven</i> plan to use rubrics/scoring guides to promote self-regulated learning with students	•	an <i>informed</i> plan to use rubrics/scoring guides to promote self-regulated learning with students	•	a <i>thorough</i> plan to use rubrics/scoring guides to promote self-regulated learning with students



Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
• <i>ineffective</i> use of baseline data to identify the learning needs of each Focus Student	 partial use of baseline data to identify the learning needs of each Focus Student 	 <i>logical</i> use of baseline data to identify the learning needs of each Focus Student 	 extensive use of baseline data to identify the learning needs of each Focus Student
 <i>inappropriate</i> areas of growth targeted for each Focus Student during the sequence of lessons, with a <i>disconnected</i> reason for the choice <i>misinformed</i> explanation of 	 cursory areas of growth targeted for each Focus Student during the sequence of lessons, with a <i>loosely</i> connected reason for the choice 	 appropriate areas of growth targeted for each Focus Student during the sequence of lessons, with a <i>connected</i> reason for the choice <i>informed</i> explanation of how 	• <i>significant</i> areas of growth targeted for each Focus Student during the sequence of lessons, with a <i>tightly</i> <i>connected</i> reason for the choice
how the three student work samples from each Focus Student will demonstrate learning progress	• <i>confusing</i> explanation of how the three student work samples from each Focus Student will demonstrate learning progress	the three student work samples from each Focus Student will demonstrate learning progress	• <i>in-depth</i> explanation of how the three student work samples from each Focus Student will demonstrate learning progress



Rubric for Step 2: Implementing the Sequence of Lessons Within the Unit (textboxes 4.2.1, 4.2.2, and 4.2.3)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
A response at the 1 level provides	A response at the 2 level provides	A response at the 3 level provides	A response at the 4 level provides
minimal evidence that	partial evidence that demonstrates	effective evidence that	consistent evidence that
demonstrates the teacher	the teacher candidate's ability to	demonstrates the teacher	demonstrates the teacher
candidate's ability to determine	determine areas of strength and	candidate's ability to determine	candidate's ability to determine
areas of strength and areas in	areas in need of improvement in	areas of strength and areas in	areas of strength and areas in
need of improvement in each	each Focus Student's learning	need of improvement in each	need of improvement in each
Focus Student's learning based on	based on the results of each	Focus Student's learning based on	Focus Student's learning based on
the results of each assessment or	assessment or assignment; to	the results of each assessment or	the results of each assessment or
assignment; to provide feedback	provide feedback that reflects	assignment; to provide feedback	assignment; to provide feedback
that reflects areas of strength and	areas of strength and areas in	that reflects areas of strength and	that reflects areas of strength and
areas in need of improvement for	need of improvement for each	areas in need of improvement for	areas in need of improvement for
each Focus Student; to determine	Focus Student; to determine steps	each Focus Student; to determine	each Focus Student; to determine
steps to take to help each Focus	to take to help each Focus Student	steps to take to help each Focus	steps to take to help each Focus
Student understand progress	understand progress toward the	Student understand progress	Student understand progress
toward the learning goal(s) based	learning goal(s) based on the	toward the learning goal(s) based	toward the learning goal(s) based
on the results of the assessment	results of the assessment or	on the results of the assessment	on the results of the assessment
or assignment and feedback; to	assignment and feedback; to use	or assignment and feedback; to	or assignment and feedback; to
use the rubric/scoring guide and	the rubric/scoring guide and	use the rubric/scoring guide and	use the rubric/scoring guide and
student work to promote that	student work to promote that	student work to promote that	student work to promote that
understanding; to analyze how the	understanding; to analyze how the	understanding; to analyze how the	understanding; to analyze how the
results of the assessment or	results of the assessment or	results of the assessment or	results of the assessment or
assignment will inform instruction	assignment will inform instruction	assignment will inform instruction	assignment will inform instruction
for each Focus Student; and to	for each Focus Student; and to	for each Focus Student; and to	for each Focus Student; and to
determine how the adjustments	determine how the adjustments	determine how the adjustments	determine how the adjustments
made to instruction following each	made to instruction following each	made to instruction following each	made to instruction following each
assessment or assignment	assessment or assignment	assessment or assignment	assessment or assignment
impacted the results of the next	impacted the results of the next	impacted the results of the next	impacted the results of the next
assessment or assignment.	assessment or assignment.	assessment or assignment.	assessment or assignment.



Rubric for Step 2 (continued)

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

Response for Textbox 4.2.1

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
• <i>minimal</i> evidence of the identification of areas of strength and areas in need of improvement in each Focus Student's learning based on the results of the first assessment or assignment, with <i>disconnected</i> examples from the student work to support the analysis	 partial evidence of the	 informed evidence of the	 thorough evidence of the
	identification of areas of	identification of areas of	identification of areas of
	strength and areas in need of	strength and areas in need of	strength and areas in need of
	improvement in each Focus	improvement in each Focus	improvement in each Focus
	Student's learning based on	Student's learning based on	Student's learning based on
	the results of the first	the results of the first	the results of the first
	assessment or assignment,	assessment or assignment,	assessment or assignment,
	with loosely connected	with connected examples from	with tightly connected
	examples from the student	the student work to support	examples from the student
	work to support the analysis	the analysis	work to support the analysis
• <i>ineffective</i> feedback provided	• <i>incomplete</i> feedback provided	• <i>effective</i> feedback provided to	• <i>insightful</i> feedback provided to
to each Focus Student with an	to each Focus Student with an	each Focus Student with an	each Focus Student with an
explanation of how that	explanation of how that	explanation of how that	explanation of how that
feedback addressed areas of	feedback addressed areas of	feedback addressed areas of	feedback addressed areas of
strength and areas in need of	strength and areas in need of	strength and areas in need of	strength and areas in need of
improvement, with <i>ineffective</i>	improvement, with <i>vague</i>	improvement, with <i>appropriate</i>	improvement, with <i>detailed</i>



	Score of 1		Score of 2		Score of 3		Score of 4
	examples from student work to support the analysis		examples from student work to support the analysis		examples from student work to support the analysis		examples from student work to support the analysis
•	misinformed evidence of steps taken to help each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goal(s) based on the results of the assessment or assignment and feedback	•	<i>limited</i> evidence of steps taken to help each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goal(s) based on the results of the assessment or assignment and feedback	•	<i>informed</i> evidence of steps taken to help each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goal(s) based on the results of the assessment or assignment and feedback	•	thorough evidence of steps taken to help each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goal(s) based on the results of the assessment or assignment and feedback
•	<i>inappropriate</i> evidence of the use of the rubric/scoring guide and student work to promote understanding of progress toward the learning goal(s)	•	<i>incomplete</i> evidence of the use of the rubric/scoring guide and student work to promote understanding of progress toward the learning goal(s) <i>uneven</i> identification of how	•	appropriate evidence of the use of the rubric/scoring guide and student work to promote understanding of progress toward the learning goal(s)	•	<i>extensive</i> evidence of the use of the rubric/scoring guide and student work to promote understanding of progress toward the learning goal(s)
•	<i>unclear</i> identification of how the results of the first assessment or assignment will inform instruction for each Focus Student, with <i>minimal</i> examples of adjustments made to the instruction		the results of the first assessment or assignment will inform instruction for each Focus Student, with <i>limited</i> examples of adjustments made to the instruction	•	<i>clear</i> identification of how the results of the first assessment or assignment will inform instruction for each Focus Student, with <i>relevant</i> examples of the adjustments made to the instruction	•	<i>in-depth</i> identification of how the results of the first assessment or assignment will inform instruction for each Focus Student, with <i>thorough</i> examples of adjustments made to the instruction



Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
• <i>minimal</i> evidence of how adjustments made to instruction following the first assessment or assignment impact the results of the second assessment or assignment, with <i>ineffective</i> examples to support the analysis	• <i>cursory</i> evidence of how adjustments made to instruction following the first assessment or assignment impact the results of the second assessment or assignment, with <i>tangential</i> examples to support the analysis	 informed evidence of how adjustments made to instruction following the first assessment or assignment impact the results of the second assessment or assignment, with <i>clear</i> examples to support the analysis 	 detailed evidence of how adjustments made to instruction following the first assessment or assignment impact the results of the second assessment or assignment, with significant examples to support the analysis
• <i>inaccurate</i> evidence of the identification of areas of strength and areas in need of improvement in each Focus Student's learning based on the results of the second assessment or assignment, with <i>disconnected</i> examples from the student work supporting the analysis	 <i>limited</i> evidence of the identification of areas of strength and areas in need of improvement in each Focus Student's learning based on the results of the second assessment or assignment, with <i>loosely connected</i> examples from the student work supporting the analysis 	• <i>informed</i> evidence of the identification of areas of strength and areas in need of improvement in each Focus Student's learning based on the results of the second assessment or assignment, with <i>connected</i> examples from the student work supporting the analysis	• <i>in-depth</i> evidence of the identification of areas of strength and areas in need of improvement in each Focus Student's learning based on the results of the second assessment or assignment, with <i>tightly connected</i> examples from the student work supporting the analysis
• <i>ineffective</i> feedback provided to each Focus Student with an explanation of how that feedback reflected areas of strength and areas in need of improvement, with <i>unclear</i> examples from student work to support the analysis	• <i>confusing</i> feedback provided to each Focus Student with an explanation of how that feedback reflected areas of strength and areas in need of improvement, with <i>tangential</i> examples from student work to support the analysis	• <i>effective</i> feedback provided to each Focus Student with an explanation of how that feedback reflected areas of strength and areas in need of improvement, with <i>logical</i> examples from student work to support the analysis	• substantive feedback provided to each Focus Student with an explanation of how that feedback reflected areas of strength and areas in need of improvement, with extensive examples from student work to support the analysis



Response for Textbox 4.2.2 (continued)

	Score of 1		Score of 2		Score of 3		Score of 4
•	misinformed evidence of steps taken to help each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goal(s) based on the results of the assessment or assignment and feedback	•	<i>uneven</i> evidence of steps taken to help each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goal(s) based on the results of the assessment or assignment and feedback	•	<i>informed</i> evidence of steps taken to help each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goal(s) based on the results of the assessment or assignment and feedback	•	significant evidence of steps taken to help each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goal(s) based on the results of the assessment or assignment and feedback
•	<i>inappropriate</i> evidence of the use of the rubric/scoring guide and student work to promote understanding of progress toward the learning goal(s)	•	<i>inconsistent</i> evidence of the use of the rubric/scoring guide and student work to promote understanding of progress toward the learning goal(s)	•	<i>appropriate</i> evidence of the use of the rubric/scoring guide and student work to promote understanding of progress toward the learning goal(s)	•	thorough evidence of the use of the rubric/scoring guide and student work to promote understanding of progress toward the learning goal(s) insightful identification of how
•	<i>little or no</i> identification of how the results of the second assessment or assignment will inform instruction for each Focus Student, with <i>unclear</i> examples of the adjustments made to the instruction	•	<i>incomplete</i> identification of how the results of the second assessment or assignment will inform instruction for each Focus Student, with <i>partial</i> examples of the adjustments made to the instruction	•	<i>clear</i> identification of how the results of the second assessment or assignment will inform instruction for each Focus Student, with <i>clear</i> examples of the adjustments made to the instruction		<i>insightful</i> identification of how the results of the second assessment or assignment will inform instruction for each Focus Student, with <i>significant</i> examples of the adjustments made to the instruction



Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
• <i>ineffective</i> evidence of how adjustments made to instruction following the second assessment or assignment impact the results of the third assessment or assignment, with unclear examples to support the analysis	 <i>limited</i> evidence of how adjustments made to instruction following the second assessment or assignment impact the results of the third assessment or assignment, with incomplete examples to support the analysis 	 informed evidence of how adjustments made to instruction following the second assessment or assignment impact the results of the third assessment or assignment, with clear examples to support the analysis 	• <i>in-depth</i> evidence of how adjustments made to instruction following the second assessment or assignment impact the results of the third assessment or assignment, with detailed examples to support the analysis
• <i>inaccurate</i> evidence of the identification of areas of strength and areas in need of improvement in each Focus Student's learning based on the results of the third assessment or assignment, with disconnected examples from the student work to support the analysis	 incomplete evidence of the identification of areas of strength and areas in need of improvement in each Focus Student's learning based on the results of the third assessment or assignment, with partial examples from the student work to support the analysis 	 informed evidence of the identification of areas of strength and areas in need of improvement in each Focus Student's learning based on the results of the third assessment or assignment, with connected examples from the student work to support the analysis 	• <i>significant</i> evidence of the identification of areas of strength and areas in need of improvement in each Focus Student's learning based on the results of the third assessment or assignment, with tightly connected examples from the student work to support the analysis
• <i>ineffective</i> feedback provided to each Focus Student with an explanation of how that feedback reflected areas of strength and areas in need of improvement, with irrelevant examples from student work to support the analysis	 inconsistent feedback provided to each Focus Student with an explanation of how that feedback reflected areas of strength and areas in need of improvement, with incomplete examples from student work to support the analysis 	• <i>effective</i> feedback provided to each Focus Student with an explanation of how that feedback reflected areas of strength and areas in need of improvement, with relevant examples from student work to support the analysis	• substantive feedback provided to each Focus Student with an explanation of how that feedback reflected areas of strength and areas in need of improvement, with extensive examples from student work to support the analysis



Response for Textbox 4.2.3 (continued)

	Score of 1		Score of 2		Score of 3		Score of 4
•	minimal evidence of steps taken to help each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goals based on the results of the assessment or assignment and feedback	•	partial evidence of steps taken to help each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goals based on the results of the assessment or assignment and feedback uneven evidence of the use of	•	<i>informed</i> evidence of steps taken to help each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goals based on the results of the assessment or assignment and feedback	•	thorough evidence of steps taken to help each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goals based on the results of the assessment or assignment and feedback
•	<i>inappropriate</i> evidence of the use of the rubric/scoring guide and student work to promote understanding of the progress toward the learning goal(s)		the rubric/scoring guide and student work to promote understanding of the progress toward the learning goal(s) <i>limited</i> identification of how the	•	<i>appropriate</i> evidence of the use of the rubric/scoring guide and student work to promote understanding of the progress toward the learning goal(s)	•	significant evidence of the use of the rubric/scoring guide and student work to promote understanding of the progress toward the learning goal(s)
•	unclear identification of how the results of the third assessment or assignment will inform instruction for each Focus Student, with trivial examples of the adjustments made to the instruction		results of the third assessment or assignment will inform instruction for each Focus Student, with cursory examples of the adjustments made to the instruction	•	<i>clear</i> identification of how the results of the third assessment or assignment will inform instruction for each Focus Student, with informed examples of the adjustments made to the instruction	•	<i>insightful</i> identification of how the results of the third assessment or assignment will inform instruction for each Focus Student, with thorough examples of the adjustments made to the instruction



Rubric for Step 3: Analyzing the Sequence of Lessons Within the Unit (textbox 4.3.1)

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 the use of academic content language, strategies used to engage students in critical thinking, and the use of questioning skills to promote student learning; and to analyze the integration of literacy into the content taught to promote student learning.	A response at the 2 level provides partial evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze the use of academic content language, strategies used to engage students in critical thinking, and the use of questioning skills to promote student learning; and to analyze the integration of literacy into the content taught to promote student learning.	A response at the 3 level provides <i>effective</i> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze the use of academic content language, strategies used to engage students in critical thinking, and the use of questioning skills to promote student learning; and to analyze the integration of literacy into the content taught to promote student learning.	A response at the 4 level provides consistent evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze the use of academic content language, strategies used to engage students in critical thinking, and the use of questioning skills to promote student learning; and to analyze the integration of literacy into the content taught to promote student learning.
The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is <i>minimal</i> and/or <i>ineffective</i> throughout the response for Step 3. Evidence may also be missing.	The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is <i>limited</i> and/or <i>vague</i> throughout the response for Step 3.	The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is <i>appropriate</i> and <i>connected</i> throughout the response for Step 3.	The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is <i>insightful</i> and <i>thoroughly connected</i> throughout the response for Step 3.



Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
• the <i>inaccurate</i> use of academic content language to promote student learning, with <i>little or no</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis	• the <i>limited</i> use of academic content language to promote student learning, with <i>partial</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis	• the <i>accurate</i> use of academic content language to promote student learning, with <i>appropriate</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis	• the <i>extensive</i> use of academic content language to promote student learning, with <i>thorough</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis
• the <i>ineffective</i> use of strategies to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with <i>little or no</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis	 the <i>limited</i> use of strategies to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with <i>partial</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis the <i>limited</i> use of questioning 	• the <i>effective</i> use of strategies to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with <i>appropriate</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis	• the <i>significant</i> use of strategies to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with <i>thorough</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis
• the <i>inappropriate</i> use of questioning skills to promote student learning, with <i>little or</i> <i>no</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis	 skills to promote student learning, with <i>partial</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis the <i>cursory</i> use of literacy integrated into the content 	• the <i>targeted</i> use of questioning skills to promote student learning, with <i>appropriate</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis	• the <i>insightful</i> use of questioning skills to promote student learning, with <i>extensive</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis
• the <i>ineffective</i> use of literacy integrated into the content being taught to promote student learning, with <i>little or</i> <i>no</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis	being taught to promote student learning, with <i>partial</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis	• the <i>informed</i> use of literacy integrated into the content being taught to promote student learning, with <i>appropriate</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis	• the <i>significant</i> use of literacy integrated into the content being taught to promote student learning, with <i>thorough</i> evidence from instruction and/or student work to support the analysis



Rubric for Step 4: Reflecting on the Sequence of Lessons Within the Unit (textboxes 4.4.1 and 4.4.2)

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 determine the extent to which students reached the learning goals for the sequence of lessons; to reflect on the sequence of lessons and determine what revisions would be made for future use and tell why they would be made; and to reflect on the steps taken to have each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goal(s) and tell how those steps could be revised to help students better understand that progress.	A response at the 2 level provides partial evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to determine the extent to which students reached the learning goals for the sequence of lessons; to reflect on the sequence of lessons and determine what revisions would be made for future use and tell why they would be made; and to reflect on the steps taken to have each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goal(s) and tell how those steps could be revised to help students better understand that progress.	A response at the 3 level provides effective evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to determine the extent to which students reached the learning goals for the sequence of lessons; to reflect on the sequence of lessons and determine what revisions would be made for future use and tell why they would be made; and to reflect on the steps taken to have each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goal(s) and tell how those steps could be revised to help students better understand that progress.	A response at the 4 level provides consistent evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to determine the extent to which students reached the learning goals for the sequence of lessons; to reflect on the sequence of lessons and determine what revisions would be made for future use and tell why they would be made; and to reflect on the steps taken to have each Focus Student understand progress toward the learning goal(s) and tell how those steps could be revised to help students better understand that progress.
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 thoroughly connected throughout the response for Step 4.



Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
 minimal analysis of the extent to which the students reached the learning goal(s), with incomplete evidence from the baseline data, instruction, and/or student work to support the reflection 	• a <i>cursory</i> analysis of the extent to which the students reached the learning goal(s), with <i>limited</i> evidence from the baseline data, instruction, and/or student work to support the reflection	• a <i>detailed</i> analysis of the extent to which the students reached the learning goal(s), with <i>informed</i> evidence from the baseline data, instruction, and/or student work to support the reflection	 an <i>in-depth</i> analysis of the extent to which the students reached the learning goal(s), with <i>extensive</i> evidence from the baseline data, instruction, and/or student work to support the reflection
 <i>little or no</i> reflection on the sequence of lessons to determine what revisions would be made and why they would be made, with <i>trivial</i> evidence from the baseline data, instruction, and student work to support the reflection 	• a <i>partial</i> reflection on the sequence of lessons to determine what revisions would be made and why they would be made, with <i>limited</i> evidence from the baseline data, instruction, and student work to support the reflection	• an <i>effective</i> reflection on the sequence of lessons to determine what revisions would be made and why they would be made, with <i>clear</i> evidence from the baseline data, instruction, and student work to support the reflection	• a <i>significant</i> reflection on the sequence of lessons to determine what revisions would be made and why they would be made, with <i>thorough</i> evidence from the baseline data, instruction, and student work to support the reflection



Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
 Response provides evidence that includes the following: <i>minimal</i> choices of revisions to make on the steps to be taken to help each Focus Student better understand progress toward the learning goal(s) 	 Response provides evidence that includes the following: <i>partial</i> choices of revisions to make on the steps to be taken to help each Focus Student better understand progress toward the learning goal(s) 	 Response provides evidence that includes the following: <i>relevant</i> choices of revisions to make on the steps to be taken to help each Focus Student better understand progress toward the learning goal(s) 	 Response provides evidence that includes the following: significant choices of revisions to make on the steps to be taken to help each Focus Student better understand progress toward the learning goal(s)

© 2015 MoDESE. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, gender, national origin, age, or disability in its programs and activities. Inquiries related to Department programs and to the location of services, activities, and facilities that are accessible by persons with disabilities may be directed to the Jefferson State Office Building, Office of the General Counsel, Coordinator – Civil Rights Compliance (Title VI/Title IX/504/ADA/Age Act), 6th Floor, 205 Jefferson Street, P.O. Box 480, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480; telephone number 573-526-4757 or TTY 800-735-2966; email civilrights@dese.mo.gov