# PPAT® Assessment

## Task 4 Implementing and Analyzing Instruction to Promote Student Learning

### Rubric for Step 1: Planning (textboxes 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3)

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| A response at the 1 level provides *minimal* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify learning goal(s) and state and/or national standards for the lesson and to explain their appropriateness for the lesson and student learning needs; to identify whole-class data to use as a baseline for measuring student growth; to use students' prior knowledge and background information to influence the planning process; to plan to use academic content language to advance the understanding of the concept being taught in the lesson; to plan to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning; to plan to use questioning skills to | A response at the 2 level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify learning goal(s) and state and/or national standards for the lesson and to explain their appropriateness for the lesson and student learning needs; to identify whole-class data to use as a baseline for measuring student growth; to use students' prior knowledge and background information to influence the planning process; to plan to use academic content language to advance the understanding of the concept being taught in the lesson; to plan to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning; to plan to use questioning skills to | A response at the 3 level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify learning goal(s) and state and/or national standards for the lesson and to explain their appropriateness for the lesson and student learning needs; to identify whole-class data to use as a baseline for measuring student growth; to use students' prior knowledge and background information to influence the planning process; to plan to use academic content language to advance the understanding of the concept being taught in the lesson; to plan to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning; to plan to use questioning skills to | A response at the 4 level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify learning goal(s) and state and/or national standards for the lesson and to explain their appropriateness for the lesson and student learning needs; to identify whole-class data to use as a baseline for measuring student growth; to use students' prior knowledge and background information to influence the planning process; to plan to use academic content language to advance the understanding of the concept being taught in the lesson; to plan to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning; to plan to use questioning skills to |

## Rubric for Step 1 (continued)

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| promote student learning; to plan the integration of literacy into the content being taught to promote student learning; to design a learning activity or activities that is (are) the main focus of the lesson and explain how the activity or activities will anticipate <u>and</u> address student learning needs; to plan for the monitoring of student learning while teaching the lesson; and to plan for student work samples, integrated into the lesson, to assess student learning resulting from the lesson.<br><br>The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal* and/or *ineffective* throughout the response for Step 1. Evidence may also be missing. | promote student learning; to plan the integration of literacy into the content being taught to promote student learning; to design a learning activity or activities that is (are) the main focus of the lesson and explain how the activity or activities will anticipate <u>and</u> address student learning needs; to plan for the monitoring of student learning while teaching the lesson; and to plan for student work samples, integrated into the lesson, to assess student learning resulting from the lesson.<br><br>The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 1. | promote student learning; to plan the integration of literacy into the content being taught to promote student learning; to design a learning activity or activities that is (are) the main focus of the lesson and explain how the activity or activities will anticipate <u>and</u> address student learning needs; to plan for the monitoring of student learning while teaching the lesson; and to plan for student work samples, integrated into the lesson, to assess student learning resulting from the lesson.<br><br>The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 1. | promote student learning; to plan the integration of literacy into the content being taught to promote student learning; to design a learning activity or activities that is (are) the main focus of the lesson and explain how the activity or activities will anticipate <u>and</u> address student learning needs; to plan for the monitoring of student learning while teaching the lesson; and to plan for student work samples, integrated into the lesson, to assess student learning resulting from the lesson.<br><br>The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 1. |

## Response for Textbox 4.1.1

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• identification of *irrelevant* learning goal(s) and state and/or national standards, with *minimal* explanation of their appropriateness for the lesson and student learning needs<br><br>• an *ineffective* use of whole-class data to establish a baseline to measure student growth<br><br>• an *inappropriate* use of students' prior knowledge **and** background information to influence the planning process | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• identification of *loosely connected* learning goal(s) and state and/or national standards, with a *partial* explanation of their appropriateness for the lesson and student learning needs<br><br>• an *incomplete* use of whole-class data to establish a baseline to measure student growth<br><br>• a *limited* use of students' prior knowledge **and** background information to influence the planning process | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• identification of *appropriate* learning goal(s) and state and/or national standards, with an *informed* explanation of their appropriateness for the lesson and student learning needs<br><br>• an *effective* use of whole-class data to establish a baseline to measure student growth<br><br>• an *appropriate* use of students' prior knowledge **and** background information to influence the planning process | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• identification of *substantive* learning goal(s) and state and/or national standards, with a *thorough* explanation of their appropriateness for the lesson and student learning needs<br><br>• an *extensive* use of whole-class data to establish a baseline to measure student growth<br><br>• an *in-depth* use of students' prior knowledge **and** background information to influence the planning process |

## Response for Textbox 4.1.2

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Response provides evidence that includes the following: | Response provides evidence that includes the following: | Response provides evidence that includes the following: | Response provides evidence that includes the following: |
| • an *ineffective* plan to use appropriate academic content language to promote student learning, with a *minimal* rationale<br><br>• an *inappropriate* plan to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with a *minimal* rationale<br><br>• an *ineffective* plan to use questioning skills to promote student learning, with a *minimal* rationale<br><br>• an *ineffective* plan to integrate literacy into the content to be taught, with a *minimal* rationale | • an *inconsistent* plan to use appropriate academic content language to promote student learning, with a *partial* rationale<br><br>• an *inconsistent* plan to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with a *partial* rationale<br><br>• an *inconsistent* plan to use questioning skills to promote student learning, with a *partial* rationale<br><br>• an *inconsistent* plan to integrate literacy into the content to be taught, with a *partial* rationale | • a *complete* plan to use appropriate academic content language to advance the understanding of the concept being taught, with a *connected* rationale<br><br>• an *informed* plan to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with a *connected* rationale<br><br>• a *logical* plan to use questioning skills to promote student learning, with a *connected* rationale<br><br>• an *effective* plan to integrate literacy into the content to be taught to promote student learning, with a *connected* rationale | • a *substantive* plan to use appropriate academic content language to promote student learning, with a *thorough* rationale<br><br>• a *substantive* plan to engage students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with a *thorough* rationale<br><br>• a *substantive* plan to use questioning skills to promote student learning, with a *thorough* rationale<br><br>• a *substantive* plan to integrate literacy into the content to be taught, with a *thorough* rationale |

## Response for Textbox 4.1.3

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Response provides evidence that includes the following: | Response provides evidence that includes the following: | Response provides evidence that includes the following: | Response provides evidence that includes the following: |
| • an *ineffective* learning activity or activities that is (are) the main focus of the lesson plan, with an *inappropriate* explanation of how the design of the activity or activities anticipates and addresses student learning needs | • an *incomplete* learning activity or activities that is (are) the main focus of the lesson plan, with a *partial* explanation of how the design of the activity or activities anticipates and addresses student learning needs | • an *aligned* learning activity or activities that is (are) the main focus of the lesson plan, with a *relevant* explanation of how the design of the activity or activities anticipates and addresses student learning needs | • a *significant* learning activity or activities that is (are) the main focus of the lesson plan, with a *thorough* explanation of how the design of the activity or activities anticipates and addresses student learning needs |
| • an *inappropriate* plan for monitoring student learning while teaching the lesson | • a *confusing* plan for monitoring student learning while teaching the lesson | • an *effective* plan for monitoring student learning while teaching the lesson | • an *in-depth* plan for monitoring student learning while teaching the lesson |
| • an *ineffective* plan for the submission of student work samples that are integrated into and/or resulting from the lesson, with a *minimal* rationale for the choice of work | • a *limited* plan for the submission of student work samples that are integrated into and/or resulting from the lesson, with a *partial* rationale for the choice of work | • an *appropriate* plan for the submission of student work samples that are integrated into and/or resulting from the lesson, with an *effective* rationale for the choice of work | • an *insightful* plan for the submission of student work samples that are integrated into and/or resulting from the lesson, with a *thorough* rationale for the choice of work |

## Rubric for Step 2: Implementing the Plan (textboxes 4.2.1, 4.2.2, and 4.2.3)

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| A response at the 1 level provides *minimal* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze and cite examples of the use of academic content language to advance the understanding of the concept being taught, the engagement of students in critical thinking to promote learning, and the use of questioning skills to promote student learning; to analyze and cite examples of the integration of literacy into the content taught to promote student learning; to analyze and cite examples of the monitoring of student learning that guided instructional decision making while teaching the lesson; to analyze and cite examples of the use of individual <u>and</u> whole-class feedback while teaching the lesson to advance student learning; to analyze and cite examples of the use of verbal and nonverbal communication techniques to foster student learning; and to analyze and cite examples of the impact of classroom management | A response at the 2 level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze and cite examples of the use of academic content language to advance the understanding of the concept being taught, the engagement of students in critical thinking to promote learning, and the use of questioning skills to promote student learning; to analyze and cite examples of the integration of literacy into the content taught to promote student learning; to analyze and cite examples of the monitoring of student learning that guided instructional decision making while teaching the lesson; to analyze and cite examples of the use of individual <u>and</u> whole-class feedback while teaching the lesson to advance student learning; to analyze and cite examples of the use of verbal and nonverbal communication techniques to foster student learning; and to analyze and cite examples of the impact of classroom management | A response at the 3 level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze and cite examples of the use of academic content language to advance the understanding of the concept being taught, the engagement of students in critical thinking to promote learning, and the use of questioning skills to promote student learning; to analyze and cite examples of the integration of literacy into the content taught to promote student learning; to analyze and cite examples of the monitoring of student learning that guided instructional decision making while teaching the lesson; to analyze and cite examples of the use of individual <u>and</u> whole-class feedback while teaching the lesson to advance student learning; to analyze and cite examples of the use of verbal and nonverbal communication techniques to foster student learning; and to analyze and cite examples of the impact of classroom management | A response at the 4 level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze and cite examples of the use of academic content language to advance the understanding of the concept being taught, the engagement of students in critical thinking to promote learning, and the use of questioning skills to promote student learning; to analyze and cite examples of the integration of literacy into the content taught to promote student learning; to analyze and cite examples of the monitoring of student learning that guided instructional decision making while teaching the lesson; to analyze and cite examples of the use of individual <u>and</u> whole-class feedback while teaching the lesson to advance student learning; to analyze and cite examples of the use of verbal and nonverbal communication techniques to foster student learning; and to analyze and cite examples of the impact of classroom management |

Rubric – Implementing and Analyzing Instruction to Promote Student Learning – Task 4

## Rubric for Step 2 (continued)

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **strategies used to engage students and promote a positive learning environment.**<br><br>**The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal* and/or *ineffective* throughout the response for Step 2. Evidence may also be missing.** | **strategies used to engage students and promote a positive learning environment.**<br><br>**The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 2.** | **strategies used to engage students and promote a positive learning environment.**<br><br>**The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 2.** | **strategies used to engage students and promote a positive learning environment.**<br><br>**The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 2.** |

## Response for Textbox 4.2.1

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Response provides evidence that includes the following: | Response provides evidence that includes the following: | Response provides evidence that includes the following: | Response provides evidence that includes the following: |
| • an *inaccurate* use of academic content language to advance the understanding of the concept being taught, with *inappropriate* **examples** from the video for support | • a *limited* use of academic content to advance the understanding of the concept being taught, with *incomplete* **examples** from the video for support | • an *accurate* use of academic content language to advance the understanding of the concept being taught, with *appropriate* **examples** from the video for support | • an *extensive* use of academic content language to advance the understanding of the concept being taught, with *in-depth* **examples** from the video for support |
| • an *ineffective* engagement of students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with *little or no* **examples** from the video for support | • a *limited* engagement of students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with *partial* **examples** from the video for support | • an *effective* engagement of students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with *appropriate* **examples** from the video for support | • a *significant* engagement of students in critical thinking to promote student learning, with *thorough* **examples** from the video for support |
| • an *inappropriate* use of questioning skills to promote student learning, with *little or no* | • a *limited* use of questioning skills to promote student learning, | • an *appropriate* use of questioning skills to promote student learning, with | • an *insightful* use of questioning skills to promote student learning, with *extensive* |

Rubric – Implementing and Analyzing Instruction to Promote Student Learning – Task 4

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **examples** from the video for support | with *partial* **examples** from the video for support | *appropriate* **examples** from the video for support | **examples** from the video for support |
| • an *ineffective* integration of literacy into the content being taught to promote student learning, with *little or no* **examples** from any part of the lesson for support | • a *cursory* integration of literacy into the content being taught to promote student learning, with *partial* **examples** from any part of the lesson for support | • an *informed* integration of literacy into the content being taught to promote student learning, with *appropriate* **examples** from any part of the lesson for support | • a *significant* integration of literacy into the content being taught to promote student learning, with *thorough* **examples** from any part of the lesson for support |

## Response for Textbox 4.2.2

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Response provides evidence that includes the following: | Response provides evidence that includes the following: | Response provides evidence that includes the following: | Response provides evidence that includes the following: |
| • an *inappropriate* monitoring of student learning to guide instructional decision making while teaching the lesson, with *little or no* **examples** from the video for support | • an *incomplete* monitoring of student learning to guide instructional decision making while teaching the lesson, with *limited* **examples** from the video for support | • an *effective* monitoring of student learning to guide instructional decision making while teaching the lesson, with *appropriate* **examples** from the video for support | • a *consistent* monitoring of student learning to guide instructional decision making while teaching the lesson, with *extensive* **examples** from the video for support |
| • an *ineffective* use of individual **and** whole-class feedback provided while teaching the lesson to advance student learning, with *little or no* **examples** from the video for support | • a *limited* use of individual **and** whole-class feedback provided while teaching the lesson to advance student learning, with *inconsistent* **examples** from the video for support | • an *effective* use of individual **and** whole-class feedback provided while teaching the lesson to advance student learning, with *connected* **examples** from the video for support | • an *insightful* use of individual **and** whole-class feedback provided during the lesson to advance student learning, with *thorough* **examples** from the video for support |
| • *ineffective* verbal and nonverbal communication techniques used during the lesson to foster | • *partial* verbal and nonverbal communication techniques used during the lesson to foster student learning, with *cursory* | • *logical* verbal and nonverbal communication techniques used while teaching the lesson to | • *significant* verbal and nonverbal communication techniques used while teaching the lesson to foster student learning, with |

Rubric – Implementing and Analyzing Instruction to Promote Student Learning – Task 4

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| student learning, with *little or no* **examples** from the lesson for support | **examples** from the lesson for support | foster student learning, with *appropriate* **examples** from the lesson for support | *thorough* **examples** from the lesson for support |

## Response for Textbox 4.2.3

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• an *inaccurate* identification of classroom management strategies used while teaching the lesson, with *little or no* **examples** from the video for support<br><br>• an *ineffective* use of classroom management strategies to engage students and promote a positive learning environment, with *minimal* **examples** from the video for support | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• a *limited* identification of classroom management strategies used while teaching the lesson, with *partial* **examples** from the video for support<br><br>• a *limited* use of classroom management strategies to engage students and promote a positive learning environment, with *partial* **examples** from the video for support | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• a *complete* identification of classroom management strategies used while teaching the lesson, with *appropriate* **examples** from the video for support<br><br>• an *effective* use of classroom management strategies to engage students and promote a positive learning environment, with *relevant* **examples** from the video for support | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• an *in-depth* identification of classroom management strategies used while teaching the lesson, with *significant* **examples** from the video for support<br><br>• an *insightful* use of classroom management strategies to engage students and promote a positive learning environment, with *thorough* **examples** from the video for support |

## Rubric for Step 3: Understanding the Two Focus Students (textbox 4.3.1)

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| A response at the 1 level provides *minimal* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to choose Focus Students who reflect different learning strengths and challenges; to identify data to use as a baseline to measure the learning growth of each Focus Student; and to identify evidence to be collected to show the progress of each Focus Student toward the learning goal(s).<br><br>The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal* and/or *ineffective* throughout the response for Step 3. Evidence may also be missing. | A response at the 2 level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to choose Focus Students who reflect different learning strengths and challenges; to identify data to use as a baseline to measure the learning growth of each Focus Student; and to identify evidence to be collected to show the progress of each Focus Student toward the learning goal(s).<br><br>The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 3. | A response at the 3 level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to choose Focus Students who reflect different learning strengths and challenges; to identify data to use as a baseline to measure the learning growth of each Focus Student; and to identify evidence to be collected to show the progress of each Focus Student toward the learning goal(s).<br><br>The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 3. | A response at the 4 level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to choose Focus Students who reflect different learning strengths and challenges; to identify data to use as a baseline to measure the learning growth of each Focus Student; and to identify evidence to be collected to show the progress of each Focus Student toward the learning goal(s).<br><br>The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 3. |

Rubric – Implementing and Analyzing Instruction to Promote Student Learning – Task 4

## Response for Textbox 4.3.1

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• an *ineffective* explanation of how each Focus Student reflects different strengths and challenges<br><br>• a *misinformed* use of data to establish a baseline to measure the learning growth of each Focus Student<br><br>• a *minimal* explanation of collected evidence that shows the learning progress of each Focus Student | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• a *confusing* explanation of how each Focus Student reflects different learning strengths and challenges<br><br>• a *cursory* use of data to establish a baseline to measure the learning growth of each Focus Student<br><br>• a *partial* explanation of collected evidence that shows the learning progress of each Focus Student | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• an *effective* explanation of how each Focus Student reflects different learning strengths and challenges<br><br>• an *informed* use of data to establish a baseline to measure the learning growth of each Focus Student<br><br>• an *informed* explanation of collected evidence that shows the learning progress of each Focus Student | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• an *extensive* explanation of how each Focus Student reflects different learning strengths and challenges<br><br>• a *significant* use of data to establish a baseline to measure the learning growth of each Focus Student<br><br>• an *in-depth* explanation of collected evidence that shows the learning progress of each Focus Student |

## Rubric for Step 4: Reflecting (textboxes 4.4.1 and 4.4.2)

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| A response at the 1 level provides *minimal* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to determine and cite examples of the extent to which students reached the learning goal(s); to reflect on and cite examples of instructional strategies, | A response at the 2 level provides *partial* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to determine and cite examples of the extent to which students reached the learning goal(s); to reflect on and cite examples of instructional strategies, | A response at the 3 level provides *effective* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to determine and cite examples of the extent to which students reached the learning goal(s); to reflect on and cite examples of instructional strategies, | A response at the 4 level provides *consistent* evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to determine and cite examples of the extent to which students reached the learning goal(s); to reflect on and cite examples of instructional strategies, |

Rubric – Implementing and Analyzing Instruction to Promote Student Learning – Task 4

## Rubric for Step 4 (continued)

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| interactions with students, and classroom-management strategies and determine what went well during the lesson and what areas are in need of revision; to make revisions to the lesson for future use and to cite examples to support the revisions; to reflect on the progress of each of the two Focus Students toward the learning goal(s) using the baseline data and student work samples; and to determine plans for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students using the baseline data and student work samples.<br><br>The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is *minimal* and/or *ineffective* throughout the response for Step 4. Evidence may also be missing. | interactions with students, and classroom-management strategies and determine what went well during the lesson and what areas are in need of revision; to make revisions to the lesson for future use and to cite examples to support the revisions; to reflect on the progress of each of the two Focus Students toward the learning goal(s) using the baseline data and student work samples; and to determine plans for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students using the baseline data and student work samples.<br><br>The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is *limited* and/or *vague* throughout the response for Step 4. | interactions with students, and classroom-management strategies and determine what went well during the lesson and what areas are in need of revision; to make revisions to the lesson for future use and to cite examples to support the revisions; to reflect on the progress of each of the two Focus Students toward the learning goal(s) using the baseline data and student work samples; and to determine plans for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students using the baseline data and student work samples.<br><br>The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is *appropriate* and *connected* throughout the response for Step 4. | interactions with students, and classroom-management strategies and determine what went well during the lesson and what areas are in need of revision; to make revisions to the lesson for future use and to cite examples to support the revisions; to reflect on the progress of each of the two Focus Students toward the learning goal(s) using the baseline data and student work samples; and to determine plans for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students using the baseline data and student work samples.<br><br>The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is *insightful* and *tightly connected* throughout the response for Step 4. |

Rubric – Implementing and Analyzing Instruction to Promote Student Learning – Task 4

## Response for Textbox 4.4.1

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• a *minimal* analysis of the extent to which the students reached the learning goal(s), with *ineffective* **examples** from the lesson plan and/or video for support<br><br>• *little or no* reflection on instructional strategies, interactions with students, and classroom-management strategies to determine what went well and what areas are in need of revision, with *minimal* **examples** from the video for support<br><br>• *illogical* choices of revisions to make in the lesson plan for future use and *inappropriate* reasons for making the revisions, with *minimal* **examples** from the lesson plan, student work, and/or the video to support the choices | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• a *cursory* analysis of the extent to which the students reached the learning goal(s), with *limited* **examples** from the lesson plan and/or video for support<br><br>• a *partial* reflection on instructional strategies, interactions with students, and classroom-management strategies to determine what went well and what areas are in need of revision, with *limited* **examples** from the video for support<br><br>• *inconsistent* choices of revisions to make in the lesson plan for future use and *inappropriate* reasons for making the revisions, with *partial* **examples** from the lesson plan, student work, and/or the video to support the choices | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• an *informed* analysis of the extent to which the students reached the learning goal(s), with *appropriate* **examples** from the lesson plan and/or video for support<br><br>• an *effective* reflection on instructional strategies, interactions with students, and classroom-management strategies to determine what went well and what areas are in need of revision, with *relevant* **examples** from the video for support<br><br>• *effective* choices of revisions to make in the lesson plan for future use and *appropriate* reasons for making the revisions, with r*elevant* **examples** from the lesson plan, student work, and/or the video to support the choices | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• an *in-depth* analysis of the extent to which the students reached the learning goal(s), with *extensive* **examples** from the lesson plan and/or video for support<br><br>• a *significant* reflection on instructional strategies, interactions with students, and classroom-management strategies to determine what went well and what areas are in need of revision, with *thorough* **examples** from the video for support<br><br>• *insightful* choices of revisions to make in the lesson plan for future use and *appropriate* reasons for making the revisions, with *extensive* **examples** from the lesson plan, student work, and/or the video to support the choices |

## Response for Textbox 4.4.2

| Score of 1 | Score of 2 | Score of 3 | Score of 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• an *ineffective* use of the baseline data and student work samples to reflect on the extent to which each of the two Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson<br><br>• an *ineffective* analysis of the baseline data and student work samples to guide planning of future lessons for each of the two Focus Students | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• a *partial* use of the baseline data and student work samples to reflect on the extent to which each of the two Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson<br><br>• a *partial* analysis of the baseline data and student work samples to guide planning of future lessons for each of the two Focus Students | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• an *effective* use of the baseline data and student work samples to reflect on the extent to which each of the two Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson<br><br>• an *effective* analysis of the baseline data and student work samples to guide planning of future lessons for each of the two Focus Students | Response provides evidence that includes the following:<br><br>• a *thorough* use of the baseline data and student work samples to reflect on the extent to which each of the two Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson<br><br>• a *significant* analysis of the baseline data and student work samples to guide planning of future lessons for each of the two Focus Students |