## Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment (MoPTA)

### Task 3: Designing Instruction for Student Learning

#### Rubric

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A response at the 1 level provides <em>minimal</em> evidence that effectively demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to identify a learning theory/method, learning goal(s), and standards to guide planning; to select a content focus and identify related content that students have previously encountered as well as identify difficulties students may encounter; to select different instructional strategies connected to the learning goal(s) and to use individual, small-group, and/or whole-group instruction; to design learning activities that address</td>
<td>A response at the 2 level provides <em>partial</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to identify a learning theory/method, learning goal(s), and standards to guide planning; to select a content focus and identify related content that students have previously encountered as well as identify difficulties students may encounter; to select different instructional strategies connected to the learning goal(s) and to use individual, small-group, and/or whole-group instruction; to design learning activities that address</td>
<td>A response at the 3 level provides <em>effective</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to identify a learning theory/method, learning goal(s), and standards to guide planning; to select a content focus and identify related content that students have previously encountered as well as identify difficulties students may encounter; to select different instructional strategies connected to the learning goal(s) and to use individual, small-group, and/or whole-group instruction; to design learning activities that address</td>
<td>A response at the 4 level provides <em>consistent</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to identify a learning theory/method, learning goal(s), and standards to guide planning; to select a content focus and identify related content that students have previously encountered as well as identify difficulties students may encounter; to select different instructional strategies connected to the learning goal(s) and to use individual, small-group, and/or whole-group instruction; to design learning activities that address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step 1: Planning the Lesson (textboxes 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>address student strengths and needs and are influenced by classroom demographics; and to identify materials, resources, and technology to enhance instruction and student learning.</td>
<td>student strengths and needs and are influenced by classroom demographics; and to identify materials, resources, and technology to enhance instruction and student learning.</td>
<td>student strengths and needs and are influenced by classroom demographics; and to identify materials, resources, and technology to enhance instruction and student learning.</td>
<td>student strengths and needs and are influenced by classroom demographics; and to identify materials, resources, and technology to enhance instruction and student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is <strong>minimal</strong> and/or <strong>ineffective</strong> throughout the response for Step 1. Evidence may also be missing.</td>
<td>The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is <strong>limited</strong> and/or <strong>vague</strong> throughout the response for Step 1.</td>
<td>The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is <strong>appropriate</strong> and <strong>connected</strong> throughout the response for Step 1.</td>
<td>The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is <strong>insightful</strong> and <strong>thoroughly connected</strong> throughout the response for Step 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For **textbox 3.1.1**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:
- a *misinformed* learning theory that guides the planning process
- *minimal* inclusion of both Missouri and national standards to guide the planned learning activities
- *minimal* connections of content to the students’ prior knowledge

For **textbox 3.1.1**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:
- a *cursory* learning theory that guides the planning process
- *partial* inclusion of both Missouri and national standards to guide the planned learning activities
- *weak* connections of content to the students’ prior knowledge
- *limited* identification of

For **textbox 3.1.1**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:
- an *appropriate* learning theory that guides the planning process
- *effective* inclusion of both Missouri and national standards to guide the planned learning activities
- *informed* connections of content to the students’ prior knowledge
- *limited* identification of

For **textbox 3.1.1**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:
- a *significant* learning theory that guides the planning process
- *well-defined* inclusion of both Missouri and national standards to guide the planned learning activities
- *thorough* connections of content to the students’ prior knowledge

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning
### Step 1: Planning the Lesson (textboxes 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• minimal identification of difficulties students may have, with an inappropriate plan to address those difficulties</td>
<td>difficulties students may have, with a partial plan to address those difficulties</td>
<td>• a knowledgeable identification of difficulties students may have, with a relevant plan to address those difficulties</td>
<td>• in-depth identification of difficulties students may have, with a thorough plan to address those difficulties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For textbox 3.1.2**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:

- little or no instructional strategies to promote student engagement and enhance learning, with disconnected rationales for the choice of each strategy
- little or no connection of the instructional strategies to the learning goal(s) to facilitate student learning
- minimal reasons for the choice of groupings (individual, small group, and/or whole group) to facilitate student learning

**For textbox 3.1.2**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:

- partial instructional strategies to promote student engagement and enhance learning, with loosely connected rationales for the choice of each strategy
- a vague connection of the instructional strategies to the learning goal(s) to facilitate student learning
- weak reasons for the choice of groupings (individual, small group, and/or whole group) to facilitate student learning

**For textbox 3.1.2**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:

- targeted instructional strategies to promote student engagement and enhance learning, with appropriate rationales for the choice of each strategy
- an effective connection of the instructional strategies to the learning goal(s) to facilitate student learning
- logical reasons for the choice of groupings (individual, small group, and/or whole group) to facilitate student learning

**For textbox 3.1.2**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:

- significant instructional strategies to promote student engagement and enhance learning, with well-defined rationales for the choice of each strategy
- a consistent connection of the instructional strategies to the learning goal(s) to facilitate student learning
- insightful reasons for the choice of groupings (individual, small group, and/or whole group) to facilitate student learning
### Step 1: Planning the Lesson (textboxes 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **For textbox 3.1.3**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:  
  - *little or no* identification and discussion of appropriate learning activities planned for the lesson  
  - a *minimal* connection between the learning activities and how they address student strengths and needs  
  - an *ineffective* connection between the classroom demographics and the design of the learning activities | **For textbox 3.1.3**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:  
  - *limited* identification and discussion of appropriate learning activities planned for the lesson  
  - a *limited* connection between the learning activities and how they address student strengths and needs  
  - a *partial* connection between the classroom demographics and the design of the learning activities | **For textbox 3.1.3**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:  
  - *effective* identification and discussion of appropriate learning activities planned for the lesson  
  - an *appropriate* connection between the learning activities and how they address student strengths and needs  
  - an *appropriate* connection between the classroom demographics and the design of the learning activities | **For textbox 3.1.3**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:  
  - an *extensive* identification and discussion of appropriate learning activities planned for the lesson  
  - a *thorough* connection between the learning activities and how they address student strengths and needs  
  - an *insightful* connection between the classroom demographics and the design of the learning activities |
| **For textbox 3.1.4**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:  
  - an *illogical* choice of materials and resources to support instruction, with an *ineffective* rationale for each choice  
  - an *ineffective* choice of technology planned for use in | **For textbox 3.1.4**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:  
  - a *limited* choice of materials and resources to support instruction, with a *vague* rationale for each choice  
  - a *cursory* choice of technology planned for use in the lesson, | **For textbox 3.1.4**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:  
  - a *logical* choice of materials and resources to support instruction, with an *appropriate* rationale for each choice  
  - an *effective* choice of technology planned for use in | **For textbox 3.1.4**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:  
  - a *significant* choice of materials and resources to support instruction, with a *well-defined* rationale for each choice  
  - a *significant* choice of technology planned for use in |
### Step 1: Planning the Lesson (textboxes 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the lesson with <em>little or no</em> connection to the enhancement of instruction or student learning</td>
<td>with a <em>limited</em> connection to the enhancement of instruction and student learning</td>
<td>the lesson, with a <em>logical</em> connection to the enhancement of instruction and student learning</td>
<td>the lesson, with a <em>thorough</em> connection to the enhancement of instruction and student learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step 2: The Focus Students (textboxes 3.2.1 and 3.2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A response at the 1 level provides <em>minimal</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to identify two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs; to identify the learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson for each Focus Student; to plan to collect evidence that will show each Focus Student’s progress toward the learning goal(s); to differentiate instructional strategies and learning activities, adapt learning goal(s), add or adapt materials, resources, and technology to engage each of the Focus Students and facilitate their learning; and to determine how the teacher candidate and each Focus Student will know if he or she achieved the learning goal(s)</td>
<td>A response at the 2 level provides <em>partial</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to identify two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs; to identify the learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson for each Focus Student; to plan to collect evidence that will show each Focus Student’s progress toward the learning goal(s); to differentiate instructional strategies and learning activities, adapt learning goal(s), add or adapt materials, resources, and technology to engage each of the Focus Students and facilitate their learning; and to determine how the teacher candidate and each Focus Student will know if he or she achieved the learning goal(s)</td>
<td>A response at the 3 level provides <em>effective</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to identify two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs; to identify the learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson for each Focus Student; to plan to collect evidence that will show each Focus Student’s progress toward the learning goal(s); to differentiate instructional strategies and learning activities, adapt learning goal(s), add or adapt materials, resources, and technology to engage each of the Focus Students and facilitate their learning; and to determine how the teacher candidate and each Focus Student will know if he or she achieved the learning goal(s)</td>
<td>A response at the 4 level provides <em>consistent</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to identify two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs; to identify the learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson for each Focus Student; to plan to collect evidence that will show each Focus Student’s progress toward the learning goal(s); to differentiate instructional strategies and learning activities, adapt learning goal(s), add or adapt materials, resources, and technology to engage each of the Focus Students and facilitate their learning; and to determine how the teacher candidate and each Focus Student will know if he or she achieved the learning goal(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning
Step 2: The Focus Students (textboxes 3.2.1 and 3.2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of the lesson.</td>
<td>of the lesson.</td>
<td>of the lesson.</td>
<td>of the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is limited and/or vague throughout the response for Step 2.</td>
<td>The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is appropriate and connected throughout the response for Step 2.</td>
<td>The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is insightful and thoroughly connected throughout the response for Step 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For **textbox 3.2.1**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:
- *little or no* identification of each Focus Student’s learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson, with *ineffective* rationales
- an *incomplete* plan to collect evidence to show the progress of each Focus Student toward the learning goal(s)

For **textbox 3.2.1**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:
- *cursory* identification of each Focus Student’s learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson, with a rationale that *lacks detail*
- a *limited* plan to collect evidence to show the progress of each Focus Student toward the learning goal(s)

For **textbox 3.2.1**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:
- *specific* identification of each Focus Student’s learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson, with an *appropriate* rationale
- a *detailed* plan to collect evidence to show the progress of each Focus Student toward the learning goal(s)

For **textbox 3.2.1**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:
- *well-defined* identification of each Focus Student’s learning strengths and challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson, with an *insightful* rationale
- a *significant* plan to collect evidence to show the progress of each Focus Student toward the learning goal(s)
### Step 2: The Focus Students (textboxes 3.2.1 and 3.2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| For **textbox 3.2.2**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:  
  - ineffective adaptation of the learning goals to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning  
  - minimal differentiation of instructional strategies and learning activities to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning, with an ineffective rationale for the differentiation  
  - irrelevant identification of materials, resources, and technology to add or adapt to engage both Focus Students and to facilitate their learning, with little or no rationale for the choices  
  - a misinformed plan to determine how the teacher candidate and both Focus Students will know if the learning goal(s) are reached | For **textbox 3.2.2**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:  
  - cursory adaptation of the learning goals to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning  
  - vague differentiation of instructional strategies and learning activities to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning, with a rationale for the differentiation that lacks detail  
  - partial identification of materials, resources, and technology to add or adapt to engage both Focus Students and to facilitate their learning, with a limited rationale for the choices  
  - a weak plan to determine how the teacher candidate and both Focus Students will know if the learning goal(s) are reached | For **textbox 3.2.2**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:  
  - targeted adaptation of the learning goals to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning  
  - appropriate differentiation of instructional strategies and learning activities to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning, with an appropriate rationale for the differentiation  
  - knowledgeable identification of materials, resources, and technology to add or adapt to engage both Focus Students and to facilitate their learning, with an appropriate rationale for the choices  
  - an informed plan to determine how the teacher candidate and both Focus Students will know if the learning goal(s) are reached | For **textbox 3.2.2**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:  
  - insightful adaptation of the learning goals to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning  
  - significant differentiation of instructional strategies and learning activities to engage both Focus Students and facilitate their learning, with a well-defined rationale for the differentiation  
  - well-defined identification of materials, resources, and technology to add or adapt to engage both Focus Students and to facilitate their learning, with an in-depth rationale for the choices  
  - an insightful plan to determine how the teacher candidate and both Focus Students will know if the learning goal(s) are reached |

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning
### Step 3: Analyzing the Lesson (textboxes 3.3.1 and 3.3.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A response at the 1 level provides <em>minimal</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to analyze how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning; to analyze how students demonstrated their understanding of the content presented; to analyze adjustments implemented during the lesson to support student engagement and learning; to analyze steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions; to analyze the impact that feedback provided while teaching had on student learning; to analyze the extent to which each of the Focus Students achieved the learning</td>
<td>A response at the 2 level provides <em>partial</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to analyze how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning; to analyze how students demonstrated their understanding of the content presented; to analyze adjustments implemented during the lesson to support student engagement and learning; to analyze steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions; to analyze the impact that feedback provided while teaching had on student learning; to analyze the extent to which each of the Focus Students achieved the learning</td>
<td>A response at the 3 level provides <em>effective</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to analyze how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning; to analyze how students demonstrated their understanding of the content presented; to analyze adjustments implemented during the lesson to support student engagement and learning; to analyze steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions; to analyze the impact that feedback provided while teaching had on student learning; to analyze the extent to which each of the Focus Students achieved the learning</td>
<td>A response at the 4 level provides <em>consistent</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to analyze how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning; to analyze how students demonstrated their understanding of the content presented; to analyze adjustments implemented during the lesson to support student engagement and learning; to analyze steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions; to analyze the impact that feedback provided while teaching had on student learning; to analyze the extent to which each of the Focus Students achieved the learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step 3: Analyzing the Lesson (textboxes 3.3.1 and 3.3.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>goal(s) of the lesson; and to analyze how the differentiation of the lesson helped each Focus Student meet the learning goal(s).</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is <strong>minimal and/or ineffective</strong> throughout the response for Step 3. Evidence may also be missing.</td>
<td><strong>goal(s) of the lesson; and to analyze how the differentiation of the lesson helped each Focus Student meet the learning goal(s).</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is <strong>limited and/or vague</strong> throughout the response for Step 3.</td>
<td><strong>goal(s) of the lesson; and to analyze how the differentiation of the lesson helped each Focus Student meet the learning goal(s).</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is <strong>appropriate and connected</strong> throughout the response for Step 3.</td>
<td><strong>goal(s) of the lesson; and to analyze how the differentiation of the lesson helped each Focus Student meet the learning goal(s).</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is <strong>insightful and thoroughly connected</strong> throughout the response for Step 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For **Textbox 3.3.1**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:
- *little or no* analysis of how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning, with *ineffective* evidence supporting the analysis
- A *misinformed* analysis of how the students demonstrated their understanding of the presented

For **Textbox 3.3.1**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:
- A *partial* analysis of how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning, with evidence that *lacks detail* supporting the analysis
- An *inconsistent* analysis of how the students demonstrated their understanding of the presented

For **Textbox 3.3.1**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:
- A *knowledgeable* analysis of how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning, with *relevant* evidence supporting the analysis
- A *specific* analysis of how the students demonstrated their understanding of the presented

For **Textbox 3.3.1**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:
- A *significant* analysis of how the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, facilitated student learning, with *thorough* evidence supporting the analysis
- An *in-depth* analysis of how the students demonstrated their understanding of the presented
## Step 3: Analyzing the Lesson (textboxes 3.3.1 and 3.3.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>content, with examples from the lesson and from student work providing <strong>ineffective</strong> support to the analysis</td>
<td>content, with examples from the lesson and from student work that are <strong>loosely connected</strong> to the analysis</td>
<td>content with <strong>appropriate</strong> examples from the lesson and from student work supporting the analysis</td>
<td>content, with <strong>insightful</strong> examples from the lesson and from student work supporting the analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>illogical</strong> adjustments implemented while teaching to support student engagement and learning, with examples that <strong>ineffectively</strong> support the choices</td>
<td>• <strong>uneven</strong> adjustments implemented while teaching to support student engagement and learning, with supporting examples that <strong>lack detail</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>targeted</strong> adjustments implemented while teaching to support student engagement and learning, with examples that <strong>appropriately</strong> support the choices</td>
<td>• <strong>well-defined</strong> adjustments implemented while teaching to support student engagement and learning, with examples that <strong>thoroughly</strong> support the choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>irrelevant</strong> steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions to impact student engagement and learning</td>
<td>• <strong>cursory</strong> steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions to impact student engagement and learning</td>
<td>• <strong>coherent</strong> steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions to impact student engagement and learning</td>
<td>• <strong>extensive</strong> steps taken to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions to impact student engagement and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>incomplete</strong> feedback provided during the lesson to facilitate student learning, with examples that provide <strong>ineffective</strong> support</td>
<td>• <strong>partial</strong> feedback provided during the lesson to facilitate student learning, with supporting examples that are <strong>loosely connected</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>appropriate</strong> feedback provided during the lesson to facilitate student learning, with supporting examples that are <strong>connected</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>significant</strong> feedback provided during the lesson to facilitate student learning, with supporting examples that are <strong>thoroughly connected</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For **Textbox 3.3.2**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:

- **minimal** analysis of the extent to which each of the two Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s), with **inappropriate**

For **Textbox 3.3.2**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:

- **uneven** analysis of the extent to which each of the two Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s), with **partial** examples

For **Textbox 3.3.2**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:

- **informed** analysis of the extent to which each of the two Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s), with **appropriate**

For **Textbox 3.3.2**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:

- **consistent** analysis of the extent to which each of the two Focus Students achieved the learning goal(s), with **numerous**

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning
### Step 3: Analyzing the Lesson (textboxes 3.3.1 and 3.3.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>examples for support</td>
<td>for support</td>
<td>examples for support</td>
<td>examples for support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- an <em>ineffective</em> analysis of the impact of the differentiation of the lesson on both Focus Students in helping them meet the learning goal(s), with supporting examples that are <em>ineffective</em></td>
<td>- a <em>limited</em> analysis of the impact of the differentiation of the lesson on both Focus Students in helping them meet the learning goal(s), with supporting examples that are <em>loosely connected</em></td>
<td>- an <em>informed</em> analysis of the impact of the differentiation of the lesson on both Focus Students in helping them meet the learning goal(s), with supporting examples that are <em>connected</em></td>
<td>- an <em>informed</em> analysis of the impact of the differentiation of the lesson on both Focus Students in helping them meet the learning goal(s), with supporting examples that are <em>insightfully connected</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step 4: Reflecting (textboxes 3.4.1 and 3.4.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A response at the 1 level provides <em>minimal</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to identify specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s); to use the analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class; and to use analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons, including specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, for each of the two Focus Students.</td>
<td>A response at the 2 level provides <em>partial</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to identify specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s); to use the analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class; and to use analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons, including specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, for each of the two Focus Students.</td>
<td>A response at the 3 level provides <em>effective</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to identify specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s); to use the analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class; and to use analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons, including specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, for each of the two Focus Students.</td>
<td>A response at the 4 level provides <em>consistent</em> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate’s ability to identify specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s); to use the analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class; and to use analysis of the lesson and the evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons, including specific instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, for each of the two Focus Students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning
### Step 4: Reflecting (textboxes 3.4.1 and 3.4.2)

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

For **textbox 3.4.1**, a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:
- *ineffective* use of instructional activities, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s), with examples that provide little or no support
- an *inappropriate* use of the analysis of the lesson and student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class

For **textbox 3.4.1**, a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:
- *partial* use of instructional activities, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s), with examples that provide *limited* support
- a *limited* use of the analysis of the lesson and student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class

For **textbox 3.4.1**, a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:
- *appropriate* use of specific instructional activities, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s), with examples that provide *effective* support
- an *informed* use of the analysis of the lesson and student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class

For **textbox 3.4.1**, a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:
- *extensive* use of specific instructional activities, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s), with examples that provide *thorough* support
- an *in-depth* use of the analysis of the lesson and student learning to guide planning for future lessons for the whole class

Rubric — Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning
### Step 4: Reflecting (textboxes 3.4.1 and 3.4.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For textbox 3.4.2,</strong> a response with a score of 1 provides evidence that includes the following:</td>
<td><strong>For textbox 3.4.2,</strong> a response with a score of 2 provides evidence that includes the following:</td>
<td><strong>For textbox 3.4.2,</strong> a response with a score of 3 provides evidence that includes the following:</td>
<td><strong>For textbox 3.4.2,</strong> a response with a score of 4 provides evidence that includes the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• little or no use of the analysis of the lesson and evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students, with minimal examples of specific learning strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to support the reflection</td>
<td>• an ineffective use of the analysis of the lesson and evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students, with examples of specific learning strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology that inconsistently support the reflection</td>
<td>• a logical use of the analysis of the lesson and evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students, with targeted examples of specific learning strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology that support the reflection</td>
<td>• an insightful use of the analysis of the lesson and evidence of student learning to guide planning for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students, with extensive examples of specific learning strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology that support the reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>