



Understanding Rubric Level Progressions

**Middle Childhood Mathematics
Version 01**

Candidate Support Resource

SCALE

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, & Equity

URLP_MCM_v01

Copyright © 2018 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. This document was authored by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE) with design assistance from Evaluation Systems.

Overview

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

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

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

1. Elaborated explanations for rubric Guiding Questions
2. Definitions of key terms used in rubrics
3. Primary sources of evidence for each rubric
4. Rubric-specific scoring decision rules
5. Examples that distinguish between levels for each rubric: Level 3, below 3 (Levels 1 and 2), and above 3 (Levels 4 and 5).

Scoring Decision Rules

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

1. **Preponderance of Evidence:** When scoring each rubric, scorers must make score decisions based on the evidence provided by candidates and how it matches the rubric level criteria. A pattern of evidence supporting a particular score level has a heavier weight than isolated evidence in another score level.
2. **Multiple Criteria:** In cases where there are two criteria present across rubric levels, greater weight or consideration will be for the criterion named as "primary."
3. **Automatic 1:** Some rubrics have Automatic 1 criteria. These criteria outweigh all other criteria in the specific rubric, as they reflect essential practices related to particular guiding questions. NOTE: Not all criteria for Level 1 are Automatic 1s.

Drawing from the Association of Middle Level Education preparation standards¹, all subject-specific handbooks for middle childhood attend to the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to teach diverse young adolescents in grades four through nine. Because the secondary edTPA handbooks were developed for use in states with licenses spanning grades 7–12, there is significant overlap between the middle childhood and secondary handbooks, prompts, and rubrics that measure content specific pedagogical knowledge.

¹ AMLE Standards <http://www.amle.org/AboutAMLE/ProfessionalPreparation/AMLEStandards/tabid/263/Default.aspx>

Additionally, all handbooks include attention to developmentally appropriate pedagogical practices associated with powerful learning for young and older adolescents. In particular, middle childhood edTPA prompts and rubrics are designed to attend to AMLE Performance Standards² (Standard 1: Young Adolescent Development Elements a and b; Standard 2: Middle Level Curriculum Elements a, b, and c; and Standard 4: Middle Level Instruction and Assessment Elements a–d).

The Middle Childhood edTPA handbooks include prompts and modified rubric level descriptors to assess additional indicators core to middle level teaching and learning—these include the following specific outcomes:

Standard 1: Young Adolescent Development

- "Middle level teacher candidates understand the major concepts, principles, and theories of young adolescent development—intellectual, physical, social, emotional, and moral."
- "Middle level teacher candidates utilize their knowledge of young adolescent development when selecting instructional strategies and making curricular decisions."

Standard 2: Middle Level Curriculum

- "Middle level teacher candidates demonstrate a depth and breadth of subject matter content knowledge that reflects the subjects they teach, for example, mathematics, English/language arts, reading, science, social studies, speech and drama, health, physical education, and family and consumer science. They incorporate literacy skills and state-of-the-art technologies into teaching the content of the subjects they teach."
- "Middle level teacher candidates understand the interdisciplinary nature of knowledge and help young adolescents make connections among subject areas. They assist young adolescents in making connections with their own ideas, interests, and experiences."
- "Middle level teacher candidates understand that middle level curriculum should be relevant, challenging, integrative, and exploratory and provide learning opportunities that enhance critical thinking and problem solving in their specialty fields (e.g., mathematics, social studies, health)."
- "Middle level teacher candidates are knowledgeable about local, state, national and common core middle level curriculum standards and know how to teach and assess the content of those standards."

Standard 4: Middle Level Instruction and Assessment

- "Middle level teacher candidates are knowledgeable about teaching and assessment strategies that are especially effective in their content fields."
- "Middle level teacher candidates know a wide variety of teaching, learning, and assessment strategies, and apply them in ways that increase learning for all young adolescents. Middle level teacher candidates create learning experiences that encourage exploration, problem solving, creativity, and critical thinking so that young adolescents can be actively engaged in learning."

² Note that AMLE Standards 3 and 5 are not measured by edTPA. edTPA is intended to be used as one assessment in a program's multiple measures evaluation system. A candidate's performance related to these standards is best evaluated ongoing through coursework, systematic observation and clinical supervision.

- "Middle level teacher candidates develop and administer assessments and use them as formative and summative tools to create meaningful learning experiences by effectively judging prior learning, implementing effective lessons, reflecting on young adolescent learning, and adjusting instruction based on the knowledge gained."
- "Middle level teacher candidates understand how to motivate all young adolescents and facilitate their learning through a wide variety of developmentally responsive materials and resources."

The chart below reveals where the Middle Childhood indicators identified above are reflected in rubric criteria (by number) and where the secondary handbook rubric criteria already address AMLE Performance Standards and other subject-specific pedagogical standards.

Middle Childhood Indicators by Rubric	Unmodified Criteria/Score Level Descriptors Consistent with AMLE Performance Standards
<p>Task 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rubric 1 Planning for Mathematical Understandings (interdisciplinary connections) ■ Rubric 3 Justification for Plans (connections to development) 	<p>Task 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rubric 2 Planning for Varied Student Learning Needs ■ Rubric 4 Academic Language Support ■ Rubric 5 Monitoring Student Learning
<p>Task 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rubric 7 Engaging Students (connections to development) ■ Rubric 10 Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness (connections to development) 	<p>Task 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rubric 6 Learning Environment Rubric 8 Deepening Student Learning ■ Rubric 9 Subject-Specific Pedagogy: Using Representations
<p>Task 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rubric 15 Using Assessment to Inform Instruction (connections to development) 	<p>Task 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rubric 11 Analyzing Student Learning ■ Rubric 12 Providing Feedback to Guide Learning ■ Rubric 13 Student Understanding and Use of Feedback ■ Rubric 14 Analyzing Students' Language Use

MIDDLE CHILDHOOD MATHEMATICS LEARNING SEGMENT FOCUS:

Candidate's instruction should support young adolescents to develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem-solving skills.

Planning Rubric 1: Planning for Mathematical Understandings

MC MTH1: How do the candidate's plans build young adolescents' conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how a candidate's plans build a learning segment of three to five lessons around a central focus. Candidates will explain how they plan to organize tasks, activities, and/or materials to align with the central focus and the standards/objectives. The planned learning segment must develop young adolescents' conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem-solving skills. In addition, candidates will explain how they will help young adolescent learners make interdisciplinary and integrative connections between mathematics and other subject areas.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *Aligned*—Standards, objectives, instructional strategies and learning tasks are "aligned" when they consistently address the same/similar learning outcomes for young adolescents.
- *Significant content inaccuracies*—Content flaws in commentary explanations, lesson plans, or instructional materials that will lead to student misunderstandings and the need for reteaching.

Mathematic Terms Central to the edTPA:

- *Conceptual understanding*—Young adolescents demonstrate "*conceptual understanding*" in mathematics when they recognize, label, and generate examples of concepts; use and interrelate models, diagrams, manipulatives, and varied representations of concepts; identify and apply principles; know and apply facts and definitions; compare, contrast, and integrate related concepts and principles; recognize, interpret, and apply the signs, symbols, and terms used to represent concepts (NAEP, 2003; *What Does the NAEP Mathematics Assessment Measure?*).
- *Mathematical reasoning*—"...the capacity to think logically about the relationships among concepts and situations. Such reasoning is correct and valid, stems from careful consideration of alternatives, and includes knowledge of how to justify the conclusions...One uses it to navigate through the many facts, procedures, concepts, and solution methods and to see that they all fit together in some way, that they make sense." (National Research Council, (2001). *Adding it Up: Helping Children Learn Mathematics*, p. 151, "adaptive reasoning").
- *Problem-solving skills*—skills to engage in a task for which the solution method is not known in advance (adapted from *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics*, p. 52).

- Procedural Fluency**—Procedural fluency is a critical component of mathematical proficiency. Procedural fluency is the ability to apply procedures accurately, efficiently, and flexibly; to transfer procedures to different problems and contexts; to build or modify procedures from other procedures; and to recognize when one strategy or procedure is more appropriate to apply than another. To develop procedural fluency, students need experience in integrating concepts and procedures and building on familiar procedures as they create their own informal strategies and procedures. Students need opportunities to justify both informal strategies and commonly used procedures mathematically, to support and justify their choices of appropriate procedures, and to strengthen their understanding and skill through distributed practice.³

Young Adolescent Learning Terms Central to the edTPA:

- Integrative**—The Association for Middle Level Education (AMLE) encourages middle grades teachers to design curriculum and select materials that are integrative, challenging, and grounded in the ideas, interests, and experiences of all young adolescents. In an integrative curriculum, a problem or issue, often initiated by the learners, is the driving force for organizing the curriculum.
- Interdisciplinary**—An interdisciplinary curriculum makes connections across several disciplines through a theme that crosses curricular lines. The learning experiences require that knowledge from several disciplines be utilized to explore the concepts and skills of the curriculum.

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Context for Learning Information

Planning Commentary **Prompt 1**

Strategic review of Lesson Plans & Instructional Materials

Scoring Decision Rules

<p>► Multiple Criteria</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A for this rubric
<p>► AUTOMATIC 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pattern of significant content inaccuracies that are core to the central focus or a key learning objective for the learning segment A pattern of misalignment is demonstrated in relation to standards/objectives, learning tasks and materials across two or more lessons

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at **Level 3**:

- Plans for instruction are **logically sequenced** to facilitate young adolescents' learning.
- 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 mathematical problem is posed and young adolescents develop an understanding of concepts and procedures by reasoning from what they already know to explore the problem.

³ From "Procedural Fluency in Mathematics". Downloaded from www.nctm.org on February 9, 2016.

- In addition, the sequencing of the plans supports young adolescents' learning by connecting facts and procedures to concepts **AND** reasoning or problem solving during the learning segment. **These connections are explicitly written in the plans or commentary**, and how the connections are made is not left to the determination of the scorer.
- Be sure to pay attention to each component of the subject-specific emphasis (facts, concepts, procedures, mathematical reasoning/problem solving).

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- Plans for instruction support young adolescent learning of facts and/or computations/procedures but **with little or no** planned instruction to guide understanding of the underlying concepts of facts and procedures or why the procedures work.

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

- The candidate is paying some attention to helping young adolescents understand what they are doing with facts or procedures, but the **connections** to concepts or reasoning **are fleeting or vague**, so that young adolescents are largely left to make sense of these on their own.

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

- The candidate is **focused on teaching memorization or step-by-step procedures** where there is little or no attention to assisting young adolescents in understanding the concepts or problem solving connections.

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

- There is a pattern of **significant content inaccuracies** that will lead to young adolescent misunderstandings. Content flaws in the plans or instructional materials are significant and systematic, and interfere with young adolescent learning
- **Standards, objectives, learning tasks, and materials are not aligned** with each other. There is a pattern of misalignment across two or more lessons. If one standard or objective does not align within the learning segment, this level of misalignment is not significant enough for a Level 1.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above Level 3:

- Learning tasks are designed to support young adolescents to make clear, **consistent** connections between procedures, concepts AND reasoning or problem-solving skills.
- Consistent connections require young adolescents to routinely apply understandings of concepts and explain their reasoning or problem-solving strategies as they use facts or procedures throughout the learning segment.
- Plans support learning mathematics AND interdisciplinary connections.

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

- In the commentary, the candidate addresses connections between and among concepts, procedures, and reasoning or problem solving **in every lesson**. Be sure to pay attention to each component of the subject-specific emphasis (facts, concepts, procedures, mathematical reasoning or problem solving).

- The candidate uses these connections **to deepen young adolescent understanding of the central focus.**
- The candidate may state general interdisciplinary connections in the commentary, but these are not clearly represented in the lesson plans.

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

- **Plans include activities and questions that will clearly support young adolescents in making mathematics connections themselves.**
- This would include **plans that pose strategic problems and/or questions that lead young adolescents to make the connections** and/or plans where **young adolescents develop the habit** of looking for connections between concepts and procedures through reasoning and problem-solving strategies, justifying the steps in a solution, and/or identifying and correcting errors in their solution strategy.
- Interdisciplinary or real-life connections are clearly stated as objectives in the lesson plans and connections originate from an integrative theme (e.g., Transportation), not solely from subject matter outcomes.

Planning Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs

MC MTH2: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for young adolescents to develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate plans to support young adolescents in relationship to young adolescents' characteristics. This includes using the candidate's understanding of young adolescents 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 young adolescents learning of the central focus.

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Context for Learning Information (required supports, modifications, or accommodations)

Planning Commentary **Prompts 2 and 3**

Strategic review of lesson plans and instructional materials to clarify planned supports.

Scoring Decision Rules

▶ Multiple Criteria	▪ N/A for this rubric
▶ AUTOMATIC 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Planned support according to requirements in IEP or 504 plans is completely missing. The automatic 1 is only related to the support for IEP or 504 plans, not for students with other learning needs.▪ If there are no young adolescents with IEPs or 504 plans, then this criterion is not applicable.

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

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

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3: Candidate plans insufficient supports to develop young adolescents' learning relative to the learning objectives or the central focus. Evidenced by ONE or more of the following:

- Candidate does not plan supports for young adolescents.
- Planned supports are not closely tied to learning objectives or the central focus.
- Evidence does not reflect ANY instructional requirements in IEP or 504 plans.

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

- Plans address at least one of the instructional requirements set forth in IEPs and 504 plans. However, it is not clear that other planned supports will be helpful in supporting young adolescents to meet the learning objectives.
- The supports would work for almost any learning objective. Therefore, supports are not closely connected to the learning objectives or central focus (e.g., pair high and low young adolescents during partner work without a specific description of how that supports young adolescents with a specific need, check on young adolescents who are usually having trouble, without any specific indication of what the candidate might be checking for, such as setting up an equation correctly from a word problem).
- Supports are tied to learning objectives within each lesson, but there is no central focus.

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

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

Automatic Score of 1:

- 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 young adolescent in the lesson plans or commentary, then the score is determined by the Planned Support criterion. **(If there are no young adolescents with IEPs or 504 plans, then this criterion is not applicable.)**

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:

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

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

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

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

- ALSO identifies possible preconceptions, errors, or misconceptions associated with the central focus or learning objectives, and describes specific strategies to identify and respond to them.
- If the plans and commentary attend to misconceptions or common 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

MC MTH3: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate justifies the ways in which learning tasks and materials make content meaningful to young adolescents, 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 young adolescents' 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 young adolescent's strengths, this is a deficit view.

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

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

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Planning Commentary **Prompts 2 and 3**

Scoring Decision Rules

▶ Multiple Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Criterion 1 (primary): Justification of plans using knowledge of young adolescents'—i.e., prior academic learning AND/OR assets (personal, cultural, community, developmental)▪ Criterion 2: Research and theory connections▪ Place greater weight or consideration on criterion 1 (justification of plans using knowledge of students including development).
▶ AUTOMATIC 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Deficit view of students and their backgrounds

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

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

- *Secondary Criterion:* The candidate refers to research or theory in relation to the plans to support young adolescent learning. The connections between the research/theory and the tasks are superficial/not clearly made. They are not well connected to a particular element of the instructional design.
- If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 3, the rubric is scored at Level 3 **regardless of the evidence for the secondary criterion.**
- If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 4, and candidate has NO connection to research/theory, the rubric is scored at Level 3.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance 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 young adolescents 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 young adolescents' prior academic learning OR assets (personal, cultural, community, developmental). These connections are not strong, but are instead vague or unelaborated, or involve a listing of what candidates know about their young adolescents in terms of prior knowledge or background without making a direct connection to how that is related to planning.

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

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

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

- Candidate's justification of learning tasks includes a pattern representing a deficit view of young adolescents and their backgrounds. (See the explanation of deficit thinking listed above under Key Concepts of Rubric.)

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:

- The candidate's justification not only uses knowledge of young adolescents—as both academic learners AND as individuals who bring in personal, cultural, community, and developmental assets—but also uses research or theory to inform planning.

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

- The evidence includes specific examples from young adolescents' prior academic learning **AND** knowledge of young adolescents' assets (personal, cultural, community, developmental), 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 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.

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

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

- Explains how principles of research or theory support or **set a foundation for** their planning decisions.
- The justifications are explicit, well-articulated, and demonstrate a thorough understanding of the research/theory and developmental principles that are clearly reflected in the plans.

Planning Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands

MC MTH4: How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key mathematics learning task?

The Guiding Question

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

Key Concepts of Rubric:

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

- **language demands**—Specific ways that academic language (vocabulary and/or symbols, functions mathematical precision, syntax, discourse) is used by young adolescents to participate in learning tasks through reading, writing, listening, and/or speaking to demonstrate their disciplinary understanding.
- **language functions**—**Purpose for which language is used.** The content and language focus of the learning task represented by the active verbs within the learning outcomes. Common language functions in mathematics include **describing** mathematical phenomena; **predicting** from models and data; **comparing/contrasting** based on common attributes; **summarizing** mathematical information; **justifying** conclusions; **evaluating** data, models, and mathematical representations; **classifying** based on attributes; and **explaining** phenomena and processes.
- **vocabulary**—Words and phrases that are used within disciplines including: (1) words and phrases with subject-specific meanings that differ from meanings used in everyday life (e.g., table); (2) general academic vocabulary used across disciplines (e.g., compare, analyze, evaluate); and (3) subject-specific words defined for use in the discipline. This includes symbols that are used to communicate mathematical language (e.g., =, +, ÷, ×).
- **discourse**—How members of the discipline talk, write, and participate in knowledge construction, using the structures of written and oral language. Discipline-specific discourse has distinctive features or ways of structuring oral or written language (text structures) or representing knowledge visually that provide useful ways for the content to be communicated. In mathematics, language structures include symbolic representations such as two-column proofs (which can be translated into words), graphic representations, such as tables and graphs (which are shorthand language for summarizing complex sets of data), and narratives (e.g., explanations of problem solutions, descriptions). If the language function is to prove, then appropriate language structures include formal two-column proofs as well as explanations that begin with a statement of the problem and known information, followed by a series of statements such as "And then, I know _____ because _____," ending with what is to be proved.
- **syntax**—The rules for organizing words or symbols together into phrases, clauses, sentences or visual representations. One of the main functions of syntax is to organize language in order to convey meaning.

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

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Planning Commentary **Prompt 4a–d**

Strategic review of Lesson Plans

Scoring Decision Rules

▶ Multiple Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ N/A
▶ AUTOMATIC 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- General supports are planned and described, though not in specific detail, for young adolescents' students' application of any two or more of the language demands (function, vocabulary and/or symbols, mathematical precision, syntax, discourse).
 - Language supports must go beyond opportunities for students to practice using the language demands either individually or with other students within the learning segment. Examples of general language supports include describing and defining the function, modeling vocabulary, mathematical precision, syntax or discourse, providing an example with little explanation, questions and answers about a language demand, whole group discussion of a language demand, providing pictures to illustrate vocabulary.
- The candidate may inaccurately categorize a language demand (e.g., identifies syntax as discourse), but does describe general supports for two of the language demands required of students within the learning task. For example:
 - "For discourse, I will model how to identify and substitute terms into the formula for finding the area of a triangle. To support vocabulary, we will review the terms (side, hypotenuse) and solve several sample problems as a class." This example would be scored at a level 3 because there are supports for two language demands, vocabulary and syntax, even though the candidate categorizes using formulas (a form of syntax) as discourse.
- If the candidate chooses a mathematical function that is NOT a language function, supports for that function cannot be used to justify a score. The rubric can be scored at Level 3 if the supports are for two other demands (e.g.; vocabulary and discourse), but cannot be scored above a 3.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

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

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

- The primary focus of support is on only one of the language demands (function, vocabulary and/or symbols, function, mathematical precision, syntax, or discourse) with little to no attention to any of the other language demands.
- Support may be general, (e.g., discussing, defining or describing a language demand), or it may be targeted, (e.g., modeling a language demand while using an example with labels). Regardless, the support provided is limited to one language demand.
- One of the two demands for which supports are described is a language function, but this function does not qualify as a language function (solving a problem, simplifying an expression, modeling how to solve the problem)

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

- There is a pattern of misalignment between the language demand(s) and the language supports identified. For example, the language function is listed as compare/contrast, but the language task is that the students will be adding two three-digit numbers and explain what strategy they used. The syntax is supported by sentence frames that say, First I ..., Next I ...

OR

- Language supports are completely missing.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:

- An accurate language function is correctly identified. The supports specifically address the language function, vocabulary and/or symbols, and at least one other language demand (mathematical precision, syntax and/or discourse) in relation to the use of the language function in the context of the chosen task.

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

- The candidate identifies specific planned language supports and describes how supports address each of the following: vocabulary and/or/symbols, the language function, and at least one other language demand (mathematical precision, syntax and/or discourse).
- Supports are focused (e.g., provide structures or scaffolding) to address specific language demands, such as sentence starters (syntax or function); modeling how to construct an argument, explanation, or paragraph using a think aloud (function, discourse); graphic organizers tailored to organizing text (discourse or function); identifying critical elements of a language function using an example; more in-depth exploration of vocabulary development (vocabulary mapping that includes antonym, synonym, student definition and illustration).

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

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

Planning Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning

MC MTH5: How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to monitor young adolescents' conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills?

The Guiding Question

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 young adolescents' progress throughout the learning segment. It also addresses required adaptations from IEPs or 504 plans. The array of assessments should provide evidence of young adolescents' conceptual understanding, computational/procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem-solving skills.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *assessment (formal and informal)*—"[R]efer[s] to all those activities undertaken by teachers and by their students . . . that provide information to be used as feedback to modify teaching and learning activities."⁴ Assessments provide evidence of students' prior knowledge, thinking, or learning in order to evaluate what students understand and how they are thinking. Informal assessments may include such things as student questions and responses during instruction and teacher observations of students as they work or perform. Formal assessments may include such things as quizzes, homework assignments, journals, projects, and performance tasks.

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Context for Learning Information (required supports, modifications, or accommodations for assessments)

Planning Commentary **Prompt 5**

Assessment Materials

Strategic review of Lesson Plans

Scoring Decision Rules

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

⁴ Black, P., & William, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 139–148.

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- The planned assessments provide evidence of young adolescents' conceptual understanding, facts and/or computational/procedural fluency AND mathematical reasoning/problem-solving skills at various points within the learning segment. The assessments must provide evidence of all three (conceptual understanding, facts and/or computational/procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem-solving skills).
- Requirements from the IEP or 504 plan must be explicitly addressed in the commentary and/or the Planning Task 1 artifacts. List of assessment requirements and/or accommodations in the Context for Learning Information document is not sufficient by itself.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- The planned assessments will yield insufficient evidence to monitor students' conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, or mathematical reasoning/problem-solving skills within the learning segment.

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

- Assessments will produce evidence of young adolescents' learning, but evidence is limited. Examples of limited assessments include a single assessment or assessments for only procedures or conceptual understanding and not the other areas.
- Although assessments may provide some evidence of young adolescents' 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 facts or following procedures without providing evidence of conceptual understanding or reasoning/problem-solving skills.

Automatic Score of 1:

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

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:

- The array of assessments provides consistent evidence of conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning or problem-solving skills.
- Assessment evidence will allow the candidate to determine young adolescents' progress toward developing conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills.

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

- There are multiple forms of evidence, not just the same kind of evidence collected at different points in time or in different settings, to monitor development of conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning/problem-solving skills for the central focus. "Multiple forms of evidence" means that different types of evidence are used—e.g., explanations of thinking, drawings, explaining reasoning for problem solutions, application to word problems—and not that there is only one type of evidence on homework, exit slips, and the final test.
- The array of assessments provides evidence to track young adolescents' progress toward developing the conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem-solving skills defined by the standards and learning objectives.
- This evidence is collected for all three areas in every lesson OR the assessments correspond to a plan for the learning segment that builds understandings in one or more areas and uses that understanding to address other areas.

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

- Describes how assessments are targeted and explicit in design to allow individuals or groups with specific needs to demonstrate their learning without oversimplifying the content.
- Strategic design of assessments goes beyond, for example, allowing extra time to complete an assignment or adding a challenge question.

Instruction Rubric 6: Learning Environment

MC MTH6: How does the candidate demonstrate a respectful learning environment that supports young adolescents' engagement in learning?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses the type of learning environment that the candidate establishes and the degree to which it fosters respectful interactions between the candidate and young adolescent learners, 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.**

Scoring Decision Rules

► **Multiple Criteria**

- N/A

► **AUTOMATIC 1**

- None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at **Level 3**: In the clip(s),

- The candidate's interactions with young adolescent learners are respectful, demonstrate rapport (evidence of relationship between candidate and young adolescents and/or ease of interaction that goes back and forth based on relevance or engaged conversation), and young adolescents communicate easily with the candidate.
- There is evidence that the candidate facilitates a positive learning environment wherein students are willing to answer questions and work together without the candidate or other students criticizing their responses.
- There is evidence of mutual respect among young adolescents. Examples include attentive listening while other young adolescents speak, respectful attention to another young adolescent's idea (even if disagreeing), working together with a partner or group to accomplish tasks.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance **below 3**: The clip(s):

- Do not exhibit evidence of positive relationships and interactions between the candidate and young adolescent learners.
- Reveal a focus on classroom management and maintaining young adolescent behavior and routines rather than engaging young adolescents in learning.

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

- Although clip(s) reveal the candidate's respectful interactions with young adolescents, there is an emphasis on candidate's rigid control of young adolescent behaviors, discussions, and other activities in ways that limit and do not support learning.

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

1. The clip(s) reveal evidence of candidate-young adolescent or young adolescent-young adolescent interactions that discourage young adolescent contributions, disparage the young adolescent(s), or take away from learning.
2. The classroom management is so weak that the candidate is not able to, or does not successfully, redirect young adolescents, or the young adolescents themselves find it difficult to engage in learning tasks because of disruptive behavior.

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

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

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3: The clip(s):

- Reveal a positive learning environment that includes tasks/discussions that challenge young adolescent learner thinking and encourage respectful young adolescent-young adolescent interaction.

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

- The learning environment supports learning tasks that appropriately challenge young adolescent learners by promoting higher-order thinking or application to develop new learning. There must be evidence that the environment is challenging for young adolescents. Examples include: young adolescents cannot answer immediately, but need to think to respond; the candidate asks higher-order thinking questions; young adolescents are trying to apply their initial learning to another context.
- The learning environment encourages and supports mutual respect among young adolescents, e.g., candidate reminds students to discuss ideas respectfully with each other.

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

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

Instruction Rubric 7: Engaging Students in Learning

MC MTH7: How does the candidate actively engage young adolescents in developing conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND/OR mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate provides video evidence of engaging young adolescents in meaningful tasks and discussions to develop their understanding of mathematical concepts, procedures, and reasoning/problem-solving skills.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

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

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

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.**

Scoring Decision Rules

▶ Multiple Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Criterion 1 (primary): Engagement in learning tasks▪ Criterion 2: Connections between students' academic learning AND/OR assets (personal, cultural, community, developmental) and new learning▪ Place greater weight or consideration on the criterion 1 (engagement in learning tasks).
▶ AUTOMATIC 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at **Level 3**:

- *Primary criterion:* The clip(s) show that the young adolescents are engaged in learning tasks that provide opportunities for young adolescents to focus on conceptual understanding, procedural understandings, and reasoning and/or problem solving. Although these content understandings are evident in conversations, they are addressed at a cursory level. For example, the candidate has a student summarize how he found the value of an angle formed by two parallel lines cut by a transversal, using the concept of supplementary angles and the procedure (angle relationships) used. The candidate relates this to the congruent supplement theorem, but moves on immediately, leaving the instruction at a cursory level
- *Secondary criterion:* The clip(s) show the candidate **making connections** to young adolescents' prior academic learning to help them develop the new content or skills.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance **below 3**:

- Young adolescents are participating in tasks that provide little opportunity to develop conceptual understanding or mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills.

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

- Young adolescents are participating in rote tasks that primarily focus on following step-by-step procedures and provide little opportunity to develop conceptual understanding or mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills.
- The structure of the learning task or the way in which it is implemented constrains young adolescent development of content and skills.
- In addition, the candidate may refer to young adolescents' learning from prior units, but the references are indirect or unclear and do not facilitate new learning.

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

- The learning tasks seen in the video clip(s) have little relation to the central focus identified.
- In addition, the candidate is not using either young adolescents' prior academic learning or assets (personal, cultural, community) or developmental assets to build new learning.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance **above 3**:

- The learning tasks as seen in the clip(s) are structured to engage young adolescents to develop understandings of concepts and procedures through mathematical reasoning and problem-solving skills.
- Connections between young adolescents' prior academic learning and assets (personal, cultural, or community)—OR connections between young adolescents' prior academic learning and developmental assets. Either connection must support the new learning.

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

- The learning tasks in the clip(s) include structures or scaffolding that promote the learning of concepts, procedures AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills. Young adolescents 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 young adolescents' knowledge and assets from outside school **AND** knowledge of their developmental levels to support new learning.

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

- The learning tasks as seen in the clip(s) are structured or scaffolded so that young adolescents will develop and use concepts, procedures, AND reasoning and/or problem-solving skills in ways that are appropriately challenging and directly related to new learning.
- In addition, the candidate encourages young adolescents to connect and use their prior knowledge and assets (academic **AND** personal, cultural, or community) or developmental assets to support new learning.

Instruction Rubric 8: Deepening Student Learning

MC MTH8: How does the candidate elicit responses to promote thinking and to develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how, in the video clip(s), the candidate brings forth and builds on young adolescents' responses to guide learning; this can occur during whole class discussions, small group discussions, or consultations with individual young adolescents.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

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

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Video 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.**

Scoring Decision Rules

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

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- The candidate prompts young adolescents to offer responses that require thinking related to either concepts, procedures, OR to mathematical reasoning and problem solving, e.g., by using "how" and "why" questions. 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 interactions provide young adolescents with limited or no opportunities to think and learn.

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

- The candidate asks questions that elicit right/wrong or yes/no answers and do little to encourage young adolescents 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 young adolescents were able to express ideas.

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

- There is a pattern of **significant content inaccuracies** that will lead to young adolescent misunderstandings.
- The candidate makes a significant error in content (e.g., introducing an inaccurate definition of a central concept before young adolescents work independently) that is core to the central focus or a key standard for the learning segment.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:

- In the clip(s), the candidate uses young adolescent ideas and thinking to develop young adolescents' mathematical learning or their abilities to evaluate their own learning.

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

- The candidate follows up on young adolescent responses to encourage the young adolescent or his/her peers to explore or build on the ideas expressed.
- The candidate uses this strategy to develop young adolescents' understanding of mathematics concepts, procedures, AND reasoning and/or problem-solving skills.
- Examples of "building on young adolescent responses" includes referring to a previous young adolescent response in developing a point or an argument; calling on the young adolescent to elaborate on what s/he said; posing questions to guide a young adolescent discussion; soliciting young adolescent examples and asking another young adolescent to identify what they have in common; asking a young adolescent to summarize a lengthy discussion or rambling explanation; and asking another young adolescent to respond to a young adolescent comment or answer a question posed by a young adolescent to move instruction forward.

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

- There is evidence in the clip(s) that the candidate structures and supports young adolescent-young adolescent conversations and interactions that facilitate young adolescents' ability to evaluate and self-monitor their learning.

Instruction Rubric 9: Subject-Specific Pedagogy: Using Representations

MC MTH9: How does the candidate use representations to develop young adolescents' understanding of mathematical concepts and procedures?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate uses representations (e.g., charts, graphs, metaphors, equations) in the clip(s) to build young adolescents' understanding of mathematical content.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- *Representation*—The term representation refers both to process and to product—in other words, to the act of capturing a mathematical concept or relationship in some form and to the form itself. . . . Moreover, the term applies to processes and products that are observable externally as well as to those that occur "internally," in the minds of people doing mathematics. All these meanings of representation are important to consider in school mathematics.⁵

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.**

Scoring Decision Rules

▶ Multiple Criteria	▪ N/A for this rubric
▶ AUTOMATIC 1	▪ Representations that are not appropriate or used inappropriately for the content being taught

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- In the clip(s), the candidate guides conversation and/or structures explorations using representations that facilitate young adolescents' understanding of mathematical concepts and procedures.

⁵ National Council of Teachers of Mathematics [2000]. *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics*, p. 67

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- In the clip(s), the candidate is not using representations effectively to guide young adolescent learning.

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

- The candidate attempts to use representations to facilitate understanding of mathematical concepts and procedures, but the connections between them are not strong enough or clear enough to be effective.

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

- The candidate stays focused on facts or procedures and fails to make connections to concepts.

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

- The representations are significantly inappropriate for the intended learning.
- The use of the representations will lead to significant young adolescent misunderstandings.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:

- In the clip(s), the candidate is making strategic choice or use of representations to develop young adolescents' mathematical learning.

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

- In the clip(s), the candidate provides opportunities for young adolescents to use representations to develop mathematical learning. The students are using representations in specific ways that relate to the mathematical concepts and procedures being developed.

What distinguishes a Level 5 from a Level 4: At Level 5, in the clip(s), the candidate meets Level 4 **AND**

- Structures and supports young adolescent-young adolescent conversations to help them evaluate their own use of representations to represent and understand concepts and conjectures and to solve problems.

Instruction Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness

MC MTH10: How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet young adolescents' varied learning needs?

The Guiding Question

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 young adolescents. The candidate justifies the changes based on young adolescents' needs and references to research and/or theory including young adolescent development.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- N/A

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Instruction Commentary **Prompt 5**

Video Clip(s) (for evidence of student young adolescent learning)

Scoring Decision Rules

▶ Multiple Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Criterion 1 (primary): Proposed changes▪ Criterion 2: Connections to research/theory, including young adolescent development▪ Place greater weight or consideration on criterion 1 (proposed changes).
▶ AUTOMATIC 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- **Primary Criterion:** The proposed changes address the central focus and the candidate explicitly connects those changes to the learning needs of the class as a whole.
 - Proposed changes noted by the candidate should be related to the lessons that are seen or referenced in the 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 will be captured by the clip(s), candidates can suggest changes to any part of the same lesson(s) referenced in the clip(s), even if those portions of the lesson(s) are not depicted in the clip(s).
- **Secondary criterion:** The candidate refers to research or theory in relation to the plans to support student learning. The connections between the research/theory and the tasks are vague/not clearly made.
- If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 3, the rubric is scored at Level 3 **regardless of the evidence for the secondary criterion.**

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

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- The changes proposed by the candidate are not directly related to young adolescent 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 young adolescent 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, repeating instruction without making significant changes based on the evidence of student learning from the video clips, or including more group work without indicating how the group work will address specific learning needs.
- If a candidate's proposed changes have nothing to do with the central focus, this rubric cannot be scored beyond a Level 2.

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

- The changes are not supported by evidence of young adolescent learning from lessons seen or referenced in the clip(s).

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:

- The proposed changes relate to the central focus and explicitly address individual and collective needs that were within the lessons seen in the video clip(s).
- The changes in teaching practice are supported by research and/or theory, including understandings of young adolescent development.

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

- The changes clearly address the learning needs of individuals in addition to the learning needs of the whole class in the video clip(s) by providing additional support and/or further challenge in relation to the central focus. Candidate should explain how proposed changes relate to each individual's needs.
- The candidate explains how research 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.
- Scoring decision rules: To score at Level 4, the candidate must meet the primary criterion at Level 4 and make at least a fleeting, relevant reference to research or theory (meet the secondary criterion at least at Level 3).

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

- Explains how principles of research or theory, including developmental 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 11: Analysis of Student Learning

MC MTH11: How does the candidate analyze evidence of young adolescent learning of conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills?

The Guiding Question

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

Key Concepts of Rubric:

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

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

- *Patterns of learning*

Primary Sources of Evidence

Assessment Commentary **Prompt 1**

Student work samples

Evaluation criteria

Scoring Decision Rules

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

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- The analysis is an accurate listing of what young adolescents did correctly and incorrectly.
- The analysis is aligned with the evaluation criteria and/or assessed learning objectives.
- Some general differences in learning across the class are identified.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance 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 different ways** that evidence is scored at Level 2:

1. The analysis presents an incomplete picture of young adolescent learning by only addressing either successes or errors.
2. The analysis does not address conceptual understanding, reasoning, or problem solving but focuses solely on procedures or facts.

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

1. The analysis is superficial because it ignores important evidence from the work samples, focusing on trivial aspects.
2. The conclusions in the analysis are not supported by the work samples or the summary of learning.

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

- There is a significant lack of alignment between evaluation criteria, learning objectives, and/or analysis.
- A lack of alignment can be caused by a lack of relevant evaluation criteria to assess young adolescent performance on the learning objectives.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3: The analysis:

- Identifies patterns of learning (quantitative and qualitative) that summarize what young adolescents know, are able to do, and still need to learn.
- Describes patterns for the whole class, groups, or individuals.
- Is supported with evidence from the work samples and is consistent with the summary.

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

- The analysis describes consistencies in performance (patterns) across the class in terms of what young adolescents know and are able to do and where they need to improve.
- Specific examples from work samples are used to illustrate whole class patterns. An example is "Most students were successful on the two-step equations (Problems 1–10) but far fewer were successful with the word problems (problems 11–13). Student A was able to solve the problems (1–10), although making an arithmetic error on Problem 8 with otherwise correct procedures. However, most students were like Student B, who could solve the problems when the equations were given, but could not set up the equation correctly from the word problems (11–13)."

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

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

- The candidate uses specific evidence from work samples to demonstrate qualitative patterns of understanding. The analysis uses these qualitative patterns to interpret the range of similar correct or incorrect responses from individuals or groups (e.g., individuals or groups), and to determine elements of what young adolescents learned and what would be most productive to work on. The qualitative patterns may include struggles, partial understandings, and/or attempts at solutions. An example would be "Most students could use correct procedures to solve two-step equations—(See problems 1–10) or from word problems (See problems 11–13), as illustrated by Students A. But most students were like Student B, who could not set up the equation on any of the word problems, while Student A's work sample represented the few students who could. Even though Student A made an arithmetic error on Problem 8, the procedure was correct. While Student B found the correct solution to problems 1–10, he was unable to construct the correct equation for any of the word problems. This suggests that most of my students understood the procedures and how to use them, but most had difficulty with conceptual understanding sufficient to solve two-step equations when they appeared in a real-world context/word problem. They appeared to be really confused, because like Student B, there was no consistent error across the word problems. In Problem 11, the unknown (which should be x) is not identified. In Problem 12, the answer is calculated incorrectly, and in Problem 13, irrelevant information from the word problem is put in the equation set-up."

Assessment Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Learning

MC MTH12: What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?

The Guiding Question

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*—Content flaws in the feedback are significant and systematic, and interfere with learning
- *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 English learners, feedback that requires abstract or conceptual thinking beyond the developmental level of the student, or feedback to a student with an explanation that references a concept later in the curriculum).

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Assessment Commentary **Prompt 2a–b**

Evidence of feedback (written, audio/video)

Scoring Decision Rules

▶ Multiple Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ N/A
▶ AUTOMATIC 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One or more content errors in the feedback that will mislead student(s) in significant ways ▪ No evidence of feedback for one or more focus students

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- The feedback identifies specific strengths OR needs for improvement. At Level 3, the candidate **MUST** provide the focus students with qualitative feedback about their performance that is aligned with the learning objectives. Specific feedback includes such things as pointing to successful use of a strategy, naming a type of problem successfully solved, pointing to and naming errors, suggesting information that would help solve the problem successfully. Checkmarks, points deducted, grades, or scores do not meet Level 3, even when they distinguish errors from correct responses.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

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

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

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

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

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

Automatic Score of 1 is given when:

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

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:

- Feedback is specific, related to assessed learning objectives, and addresses young adolescents' strengths AND needs.

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

- Specific feedback addresses both strengths and needs. For example, "You did a great job setting up the equation correctly. Make sure to check your answer by evaluating the equation on each side to make sure each side balances to the other."

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

- The feedback for at least one focus student includes:
 - A strategy to address a specific learning need, including the need for a greater challenge. For example, "You got the right answer. Make sure you slow down and show all of your work."

OR

- A meaningful connection to experience or prior learning. For example, the candidate refers back to a prior math lesson: "I want you to compare how to solve two-step equations like we did one step equations. Then Set up the two-step equations and 'talk out loud or a partner' as you work through the steps like we did when learned to solve one-step equations by solving them out loud—step-by-step with our elbow partners."

Assessment Rubric 13: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback

MC MTH13: How does the candidate support focus students to understand and use the feedback to guide their further learning?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate explains how they will help focus students understand and use the feedback provided in order to improve their learning.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- N/A

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Assessment Commentary **Prompt 2c**

Evidence of Written or Oral Feedback

Scoring Decision Rules

▶ Multiple Criteria	▪ N/A for this rubric
▶ AUTOMATIC 1	▪ None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- Candidate describes how the focus students will understand **OR** use feedback related to the learning objectives. This description needs to relate to the feedback given to one or more of the focus students.
- The description should be specific enough that you understand what the candidate and/or students are going to do. Otherwise, it is vague and the evidence should be scored at Level 2.
 - Example for **understanding** feedback: Candidate reviews work with whole class focusing on common mistakes that explicitly includes content that one or more focus students were given feedback on.
 - Example for **using** feedback: Candidate asks focus students to revise work using feedback given and resubmit revised work.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

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

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

- The description of how the focus young adolescents will understand or use feedback is very general or superficial. Details about how the students will understand or use the feedback are missing, e.g., "The students will use the feedback on their next assignment."
- The use of feedback is not clearly related to the assessed learning objectives.

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

- Opportunities for understanding or using feedback are not described **OR**
- There is NO evidence of feedback for two or more focus students.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:

- Support for young adolescents to understand **AND** use feedback is described in enough detail to understand how young adolescents will develop in areas identified for growth and/or continue to deepen areas of strength.

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

- The candidate describes planned or implemented support for young adolescents to understand and use feedback on their strengths OR weaknesses to further develop their learning in relation to the learning objectives. This can be corrections of misunderstandings or partial understandings or extensions of learning related to the learning objectives. For example, a candidate may work with focus students in a small group and reteach the difference between a part and a whole, which these students struggled with on their assessment (as noted by feedback given), using a T-chart for recording both differences and highlighting the part vs. whole in several word problems. Next, students would be given an opportunity to revise their responses involving those concepts, using the T-chart to support their revisions. This example shows how a candidate can help focus students understand their feedback in relation to misunderstandings and support them in using that feedback to enhance learning in relation to objectives assessed. This type of planned support could take place with the whole class as long as explicit attention to one or more of the focus student's strengths or weaknesses is addressed in relation to the feedback given.

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

- Describes planned or implemented support for young adolescents to understand and use feedback on their strengths AND weaknesses related to the learning objectives.

Assessment Rubric 14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Mathematics Learning

MC MTH14: How does the candidate analyze young adolescents' use of language to develop content understanding?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate explains students' use of the identified language demands and how that use demonstrates and develops mathematical understanding.

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- **language demands**—Specific ways that academic language (vocabulary and/or symbols, functions, mathematical precision, discourse, syntax) is used by students to participate in learning tasks through reading, writing, listening, and/or speaking to demonstrate their disciplinary understanding.
- **language functions**—**Purpose for which language is used.** The content and language focus of the learning task represented by the active verbs within the learning outcomes. Common language functions in mathematics include **describing** mathematical phenomena; **predicting** from models and data; **comparing/contrasting** based on common attributes; **summarizing** mathematical information; **justifying** conclusions; **evaluating** data, models, and mathematical representations; **classifying** based on attributes; and **explaining** phenomena and processes.
- **vocabulary**—Words and phrases that are used within disciplines including: (1) words and phrases with subject-specific meanings that differ from meanings used in everyday life (e.g., table); (2) general academic vocabulary used across disciplines (e.g., compare, analyze, evaluate); and (3) subject-specific words defined for use in the discipline. This includes symbols that are used to communicate mathematical language (e.g., =, +, ÷, ×).
- **discourse**—How members of the discipline talk, write, and participate in knowledge construction, using the structures of written and oral language. Discipline-specific discourse has distinctive features or ways of structuring oral or written language (text structures) or representing knowledge visually that provide useful ways for the content to be communicated. In mathematics, language structures include symbolic representations such as two-column proofs (which can be translated into words), graphic representations, such as tables and graphs (which are shorthand language for summarizing complex sets of data), and narratives (e.g., explanations of problem solutions, descriptions). If the language function is to prove, then appropriate language structures include formal two-column proofs as well as explanations that begin with a statement of the problem and known information, followed by a series of statements such as "And then, I know _____ because _____," ending with what is to be proved.
- **syntax**—The rules for organizing words or symbols together into phrases, clauses, sentences or visual representations. One of the main functions of syntax is to organize language in order to convey meaning.

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

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Assessment Commentary **Prompt 3**

Evidence of language use (student work samples and/or video evidence)

Scoring Decision Rules

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

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- The candidate explains and identifies evidence that the young adolescents used or attempted to use the language function AND one additional language demand (vocabulary and/or symbols, mathematical precision, syntax or discourse. Note: The language demands discussed in the Assessment Commentary do not have to be the same as those discussed in Task 1.
- The evidence addresses young adolescents' use of the language function AND one additional language demand (vocabulary and/or symbols, mathematical precision, syntax, or discourse) associated with the language function.
- It is not sufficient for the candidate to reference an artifact and make a general statement, for example, "As seen in the work samples, the student used the vocabulary in their work." The candidate must explain how the students used the identified language and reference or identify an example of that use from the artifact, e.g., "Students 1 and 2 used the vocabulary and also identified what they did mathematically to go from one step to the next (the component of explanations identified) in their explanations. Student 3 used a mixture of vocabulary and everyday language in the explanation (e.g., this thing here, when referring to the exponent), but included both components of explanation."

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

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

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

- The candidate's description and/or evidence of young adolescents' language use is limited to only one language demand (vocabulary and/or symbols, function, mathematical precision, syntax, or discourse).

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

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

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:

- Candidate identifies specific evidence of young adolescent use of the language function and vocabulary and/or symbols along with at least one other language demand (mathematical precision, syntax or discourse).
- Candidate explains how evidence of student language represents their development of content understandings, which may include growth and/or struggles with both understanding and expressing content understandings.
- Candidate explains and provides evidence of language use and content learning for young adolescents with distinct language needs.

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

- The candidate identifies and explains evidence that young adolescents are able to use the language function, vocabulary and/or symbols, AND associated language demands (mathematical precision, syntax and/or discourse). The explanation uses specific evidence from the video and/ or work samples. The discussion of young adolescent language use demonstrates how this use develops content understandings.
- The candidate's analysis includes evidence of how young adolescent language use demonstrates growth and/or struggles in developing content understandings. For example, the candidate notes that, "All students could give a complete explanation using some commonly used vocabulary words, like equation, and solution (4:35, 5:07). Using the work samples, it is evident that most of the students could produce written detailed explanations (the language function) in terms of general concepts and procedures for solving two-step equations (e.g., Students 1 and 2, problem 1). However, other students' explanations were incomplete (e.g., Student 3 problem 7), not explaining in writing how to solve the equation in standard form), suggesting that some students still need support to develop in the area of written discourse."

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

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

Assessment Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

MC MTH15: How does the candidate use the analysis of what young adolescents know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?

The Guiding Question

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

Key Concepts of Rubric:

- N/A

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Assessment Commentary **Prompt 4**

Scoring Decision Rules

<p>► Multiple Criteria</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Criterion 1 (primary): Next steps for instruction ■ Criterion 2: Connections to research/theory (including young adolescent development) ■ Place greater weight or consideration on criterion 1 (next steps for instruction).
<p>► AUTOMATIC 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- *Primary Criterion*: The next steps focus on support for young adolescent learning that is general for the whole class, not specifically targeted for individual young adolescents. The support addresses learning related to the learning objectives that were assessed.
- *Secondary Criterion*: The candidate refers to research or theory when describing the next steps. The connections between the research/theory and the next steps are vague/not clearly made.
- If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 3, the rubric is scored at Level 3 **regardless of the evidence for the secondary criterion**.
- If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 4, and candidate has NO connection to research/theory, the rubric is scored at Level 3.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:

- The next steps are not directly focused on young adolescent learning needs that were identified in the analysis of the assessment.
- Candidate does not explain how next steps are related to young adolescent learning.

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

- The next steps are related to the analysis of young adolescent 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 young adolescent learning. There is little detail on the changes in relation to the assessed young adolescent learning. Examples include repeating instruction or focusing on improving conditions for learning such as pacing or classroom management, with no clear connections to how changes address the young adolescent learning needs identified.

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

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

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:

- Next steps are based on the assessment results and provide scaffolded or structured support that is directly focused on specific young adolescent learning needs related to conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills.
- Next steps are supported by research and/or theory, including young adolescent development.

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

- The next steps are clearly aimed at supporting specific young adolescent needs for either individuals (2 or more young adolescents) or groups with similar needs related to one or more of the three areas of mathematical learning (conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills). Candidate should be explicit about how next steps will strategically support individuals or groups and explain how that support will address each individual or group's needs in relation to the area of mathematical learning.
- The candidate discusses how the research or theory is related to the next steps in ways that make some level of sense given their young adolescents and central focus. They may cite the research or theory in their discussion, or they may refer to the ideas from the research. Either is acceptable, as long as they clearly connect the research/theory to their next steps.

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

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

- The next steps are clearly aimed at supporting specific young adolescent needs for both individuals and groups with similar needs related to one or more of the three areas of mathematical learning (conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, **AND/OR** mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills). Candidate should be explicit about how next steps will strategically support individuals and groups and explain how that support will address each individual's and group's needs in relation to the identified area(s) of mathematical learning.
- The candidate explains how principles of research or theory, including developmental 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.