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REVIEW OF LOW-SCORING edTPAs IN SPECIAL EDUCATION AND GUIDANCE FOR RE-TAKES

Audience:
edTPA Special Education candidates, faculty, program coordinators and clinical field supervisors/support providers

Purpose and Use:
This document has two purposes: 1) to guide faculty conversation and action to address low candidate performance and 2) to guide faculty/candidate conversations around re-take options. It presents common types of evidence that represent low-scoring portfolios, based on close examination of the rubrics, review of training benchmarks, and reports from trainers.

Faculty can use this document to collectively review and discuss low-scoring edTPAs to explore a pattern of low candidate performance on specific rubrics. After thinking about what is leading to low candidate scores, the collegial conversation can then turn to exploring solutions. These include discussions with other programs experiencing the same challenges, program modifications to strengthen their candidates’ teaching in those areas or identification of unclear directions or phrasing that can be reported to SCALE.

Faculty and/or edTPA candidates can also use this document to review an edTPA Special Education portfolio with scores at Levels 1 and/or 2 to help identify potential candidate misunderstandings and/or errors that led to a low score. Each rubric has a bulleted list of explanations of evidence that scores at levels 1 and 2. To begin, identify each low-scoring rubric that the candidate received. Next, review the corresponding rubric score explained below. Consider asking a question for each bullet point. For example, for rubric 1, did the candidate include lesson objectives and instruction or support for both learning targets?

NOTE: A separate “Review of Low-Scoring edTPAs and Guidance to Support Resubmissions” has been created for general education fields.

Condition Codes:
This document does not provide guidance for addressing condition codes. If a Condition Code replaces a score for any rubric, the candidate can contact Pearson Customer Support to learn the reason why the condition code was assigned.
Planning Rubrics - Rubric 1: Planning for Alignment and Development of Knowledge and Skills

| How do the candidate’s plans build knowledge and skills\(^1\) for both learning targets aligned to individualized education program/plan goals and benchmarks? |
|---|---|
| **Level 1 Rubric Language** | **Level 2 Rubric Language** |
| For both learning targets, identified individualized education program/plan goals and benchmarks, standards (if applicable), lesson objectives, and learning tasks and materials are **not aligned with each other**. | For at least one learning target, identified individualized education program/plan goals and benchmarks, standards (if applicable), lesson objectives, and learning tasks and materials are **loosely or inconsistently aligned with each other**. |

**Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score**

Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompts 1a-b, 2a-f, and the lesson plans and instructional materials submitted (with a focus on alignment for both learning targets).

Alignment of iep goals and benchmarks, standards (if applicable), lesson objectives, and learning tasks and materials:

- For both learning targets, there is little alignment between most individual education program/plan goals and/or benchmarks, standards (if applicable), learning targets, lesson objectives, learning tasks and materials.

**Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score**

Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompts 1a-b, 2a-f, and the lesson plans and instructional materials submitted (with a focus on the standards/objectives).

Alignment of iep goals and benchmarks, standards (if applicable), lesson objectives, and learning tasks and materials:

- There is alignment between **most** individualized education plan goals and/or benchmarks, standards (if applicable), learning targets, lesson objectives, learning tasks and materials, but not all.
- There is general, but not specific, alignment.
- There is alignment for only one learning target, e.g., lesson objectives are missing for one learning target.
- For at least one learning target, one or more lesson objectives do not include clearly defined measurable outcomes.

---

\(^1\) The desired learning outcomes for the learning segment. Knowledge and skills includes conceptual understanding and the knowledge of how and when to use knowledge, concepts, skills, and strategies to shape behavior and performance (not merely discrete knowledge and skills).
# Planning Rubrics - Rubric 2: Planning Challenge and Support for the Focus Learner

How does the candidate use knowledge of the focus learner to tailor strategies to provide and support access to challenging curriculum and instruction for both learning targets?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Rubric Language</th>
<th>Level 2 Rubric Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence of planned supports for either learning target. OR There is a severe mismatch between the focus learner’s chronological age or developmental level and the ways in which the candidate uses instructional strategies, supports, or materials for either learning target. OR Learning tasks and support strategies do NOT align to lesson objectives and/or do NOT reflect required modifications and accommodations from the iep for either learning target.</td>
<td>Planned supports are loosely aligned to lesson objectives for at least one of the learning targets of the learning segment. AND For at least one learning target, learning tasks and support strategies generally reflect the focus learner’s prior learning, experience, and needs or superficially address the learner’s strengths and social/emotional development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score

Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompts 3 a-d, 4a, c (primary source).

**Automatic 1 (no relationship between learning tasks and support strategies AND either the learning targets and lesson objectives or the modifications and accommodations required in the iep)**

- There is little relationship between the learning tasks and support strategies and the lesson objectives and/or learning targets for the focus learner.
- Learning tasks and supports do not reflect specified modifications and accommodations specified in the individualized education program/plan for the focus learner.

**Planned Supports:**

- There is little or no evidence of planned support for meeting either learning targets.
- For at least one learning target, the instructional strategies, supports, or materials are very inappropriate for the focus learner’s age or needs.

### Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score

Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompts 3 a-d, 4a, c (primary source).

**Planned Supports:**

- Support is planned for only one learning target.
- For at least one learning target, planned supports are loosely aligned to lesson objectives. “Loosely aligned” means that the planned supports would work for any lesson objective, e.g., close monitoring without specifying what to monitor, work in group.
- For at least one learning target, the learning tasks and level of planned support is only loosely associated with the baseline data and description of the focus learner’s prior learning, experience, and needs.
- For at least one learning target, the learning tasks and planned support does little to draw upon the focus learner’s strengths or to support further social/emotional development. Strengths and social/emotional development are derived from the description of the focus learner’s prior learning, lived experiences, language and communication development, or family/cultural assets.

---

2 Learning environment, tasks, materials, accommodations, modifications, assistive technology, and/or scaffolding

3 Learning needs include individualized education program/plan goals, benchmarks, accommodations, modifications, assistive technology, and/or scaffolding as well as other needs identified and justified by the candidate in order to achieve the lesson objectives.

4 Strengths relative to the learning target may come from prior learning, lived experiences, language and communication development, or family/cultural assets.
### Planning Rubrics - Rubric 3: Justification of Instruction and Support

**How does the candidate use knowledge of the focus learner, research, and/or theory to justify decisions for both learning targets?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Rubric Language</th>
<th>Level 2 Rubric Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s justification of instruction or support strategies is either missing for both learning targets OR represents a deficit view of the focus learner for at least one learning target.</td>
<td>For at least one learning target, candidate’s justification of instruction and support strategies makes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• general connections to the needs of the focus learner OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• vague or unclear connections to research and/or theory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score**

Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompt 4b.

**Automatic 1 (deficit view of focus learner and his/her backgrounds):**
- There is a consistent focus in the justification of learning tasks and support on what the focus learner cannot do. This could result from a focus on challenges from the focus learner’s cultural or linguistic background, disability, or a lack of family support.
- For at least one learning target, the candidate demonstrates a pattern of low expectations relative to the learner’s potential, not taking responsibility for providing appropriate instruction or support, or not acknowledging any learner strengths and need for challenge.

**Justification of learning tasks and support is missing:**
- There is no justification of the learning tasks and support for either learning target.

**Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score**

Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompt 4b.

**Justification of learning tasks through focus learner needs:**
- For at least one learning target, the candidate justifies the learning tasks and support strategies by referring to focus learner needs, but specific details are lacking.

**Justification of learning tasks through research/theory:**
- For at least one learning target, there is mention of research and/or theory, but there is little connection to the planned learning tasks or support strategies.
### Planning Rubrics - Rubric 4: Supporting the Focus Learner’s Use of Expressive and/or Receptive Communication

**How does the candidate identify and support communication demands for participation in learning tasks and/or demonstrating learning for the primary learning target?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Rubric Language</th>
<th>Level 2 Rubric Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate identifies an expressive and/or receptive communication skill (function) that is not <strong>aligned with the primary learning target.</strong></td>
<td>Instructional strategies supporting communication <strong>primarily address vocabulary demands</strong> (words, symbols, signs, and/or behavior), but do not relate them to the purpose of the expressive and/or receptive communication related to the primary learning target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional strategies supporting communication are missing or are not aligned with the expressive and/or receptive communication demand(s) for the primary learning target.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score</th>
<th>Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompt 5 a-e (primary source), Lesson Plans, and Instructional Materials.</td>
<td>Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompt 5 a-e (primary source), Lesson Plans, and Instructional Materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communication skill (function) identified:**
- The communication skill (function) identified in Prompt 5a has little relationship to the primary learning target. See specific language functions as suggested in the glossary. Some examples are asking, responding, signaling, selecting, initiating, expressing, comparing, sequencing, analyzing, and interpreting.

**Communication Supports:**
- The supports identified for communication in Prompt 5e do not align to the communication skill (function) identified for the primary learning target.

**Communication Supports:**
- The communication supports are limited to vocabulary demands. They address words, symbols, signs, and/or behavior. However, the supports are not used to understand how to engage in the learning task or how to demonstrate learning. The decontextualized communication may or may not lead the learner to understand why s/he is expected to use the communication or what s/he can do with it.

- Attention to other communication demands is superficial, at best.
### Planning Rubrics - Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Learning

#### How are the assessments and daily assessment records selected or designed to provide evidence of the focus learner’s progress toward both learning targets?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Level 1 Rubric Language</strong></th>
<th><strong>Level 2 Rubric Language</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The set of planned assessments and daily assessment records are <strong>not aligned to the lesson objectives</strong> and will <strong>provide no evidence</strong> of the focus learner’s progress toward at least one learning target.</td>
<td>Planned assessments and the daily assessment records are <strong>loosely aligned</strong> to the lesson objectives, and <strong>provide limited evidence to monitor the focus learner’s progress during the learning segment</strong> for at least one learning target. <strong>OR</strong> Some lesson objectives are not assessed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score

- Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompt 1b (required supports, modifications, or accommodations for assessments), Planning Commentary Prompt 6 (primary), Lesson Plans (assessments), and Assessment Materials.

#### Lack of alignment:
- The planned assessments and daily assessment records are not aligned to the lesson objectives.

#### Evidence of focus learner progress:
- The planned assessments and daily assessment records will not provide evidence of learner progress toward at least one learning target.
- There are no lesson objectives or assessments (including daily assessment records) for one learning target.

#### Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score

- Review responses to Planning Commentary Prompt 1b (required supports, modifications, or accommodations for assessments), Planning Commentary Prompt 6 (primary), Lesson Plans (assessments), and Assessment Materials

#### Alignment to learning targets:
- For at least one learning target, some assessments (including the daily assessment records) are not aligned to the learning target.
- For at least one learning target, the assessments (including the daily assessment records) measure the same general knowledge or skill, but not the specific knowledge or skill identified in the lesson objectives.
- Some lesson objectives are not assessed.
### Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 6: Learning Environment

**How does the candidate demonstrate a respectful learning environment that supports the focus learner’s engagement in learning for the primary learning target?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Level 1 Rubric Language</strong></th>
<th><strong>Level 2 Rubric Language</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The candidate demonstrates disrespectful behavior toward any learner OR allows disruptive/disrespectful behavior to interfere with learning. OR Candidate does not respond in a timely manner to safety issues.</td>
<td>The candidate demonstrates respect for ALL learners. AND Candidate provides a learning environment that serves primarily to control the focus learner’s behavior, and minimally supports the learning associated with the primary learning target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score

Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source) and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 3a-b.

**Automatic 1 (no timely attention to emotional or physical safety issues):**
- While there are threats to emotional or physical safety seen on the video (with respect to either the focus learner or to other learners in a group), the candidate makes no attempt to address them.

**Disrespectful interactions between candidate and learner(s) or between learners:**
- Video shows evidence of severe candidate disrespect for any learner seen in the video. This includes candidate actions such as ignoring learner attempts to communicate related to the lesson objectives, communicating that one or more learners are not ever likely to be successful at the learning task, etc.

**Disruptive behavior that interferes with student learning**
- The behavior of the focus learner or other learners in the group consistently disrupts or disturbs the lesson so that student learning is impacted negatively.
- The candidate is not able to manage learner behavior (individually, in a group, or in a classroom) and learning throughout the video clip(s) is severely impacted.
- The focus learner consistently does not have an opportunity to learn because of distractions of other learners as seen in the video clip(s).

#### Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score

Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source) and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 3a-b.

**Respect for students:**
- Respect for the focus learner and other learners is seen (e.g., addressing a learner by name, eliciting learner responses), but the majority of the lesson focuses on managing behavior in ways that restrict learning opportunities related to the lesson objectives for the primary learning target.

**Controlling learning environment that minimally supports learning goals**
- Candidate focuses much of the lesson on managing behavior or interactions in ways that leave little time directed specifically to the lesson objective for the primary learning target. NOTE: If a focus learner has a behavior management plan and/or a social/emotional learning target, then candidates will be managing learner behavior.
- At this level, the learning environment controls the focus learner’s behavior so much that the learner is unable to participate in instruction in a meaningful way and/or to demonstrate learning for the primary learning target.
### Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 7: Engaging the Focus Learner

How does the candidate actively engage the focus learner in developing knowledge and skills to reach the lesson objectives for the primary learning target?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Rubric Language</th>
<th>Level 2 Rubric Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The focus learner is predominantly passive, inattentive, or out of control while candidate provides instruction or intervention for the primary learning target.</strong></td>
<td>Candidate uses strategies to encourage the focus learner’s participation in the learning task for the primary learning target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td>Candidate makes vague or superficial links between prior academic learning and new learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is little or no evidence that the candidate links the focus learner’s prior learning with new learning for the primary learning target.</strong></td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate uses strategies to encourage the focus learner’s participation in the learning task for the primary learning target.</strong></td>
<td>Candidate makes vague or superficial links between the focus learner’s prior learning and new learning for the primary learning target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score

**Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source), primary learning target and lesson objective for each lesson seen, and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 4a-c**

**Focus learner is not engaged in learning related to the primary learning target:**

- The learning task(s) seen in the video clip(s) are not related to the primary learning target.
- Video clip(s) show evidence of that the focus learner is passive, inattentive, or out of control. The candidate does not explain any sensory or behavioral issues that make the focus learner appear to be disengaged when s/he is engaged.
- The learning task design requires minimal engagement of the focus learner, e.g., it consists of lengthy explanations or modeling with no interaction with the focus learner.

**No links between new learning and the focus learner’s prior learning and new learning**

- During the video clip(s) the candidate does not make links between the new learning for the primary learning target and the focus learner’s prior learning.
- Candidate makes links to prior learning that are not related to the primary learning target.

### Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score

**Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source), lesson objective for the primary learning target for each lesson seen, and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 4a-c.**

**Participation without engagement in understanding concepts:**

- Video clip(s) show formulaic participation by the focus learner in the learner task(s) related to the primary learning target. The learning tasks lack strategies for engagement or motivation to prompt the focus learner to work to develop the targeted knowledge and skills.

**Vague links between prior learning and new learning:**

- Any links between the focus learner’s prior learning (as described in the baseline data, Planning commentary, or Instruction commentary prompt 4) and new learning are indirect or unclear. It is not clear that they were understood by the focus learner.
### Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 8: Deepening Learning

How does the candidate support the focus learner in developing deep understanding of the knowledge and/or skills related to the primary learning target?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Rubric Language</th>
<th>Level 2 Rubric Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate provides the focus learner with few opportunities related to the primary learning target to respond.</strong></td>
<td>Candidate primarily uses superficial prompts to elicit focus learner responses related to the primary learning target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Candidate evaluates focus learner responses only as correct or incorrect for the primary learning target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials or candidate responses include <strong>significant inaccuracies that are not corrected</strong> and that will lead to focus learner misunderstandings or misdirected performance for the primary learning target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score

Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source) and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 5a.-c.

**Automatic 1 (significant content inaccuracies):**
- The candidate makes frequent significant statements or models actions that include inaccuracies related to the primary learning target and lesson objective(s) for the lesson(s) seen. These statements will limit opportunities for learner success. These are not minor misstatements or errors that are subsequently corrected, but major errors, like an incorrect formula for calculating density in science or demonstrating an action that is likely to eventually cause harm or an injury.
- The inaccuracies seen in the video clip(s) would require the lesson to be retaught to clarify any misunderstandings.

**Candidate does most of the talking/performing:**
- In the video clip(s), the candidate does most of the talking or performing actions and there are very limited opportunities for the focus learner to respond to questions the candidate poses. Note that in group instruction, it is not expected that the focus learner will be the only learner providing responses, but there should be some responses (oral, written, demonstrated) from the focus learner that will allow the candidate to monitor the individual learning.
- The candidate does not require responses from the focus learner OR the candidate poses questions but does not allow time to students to respond.

### Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score

Review the Video Clip(s) (primary source) and responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 5a-c.

**Nature of learner responses**
- The candidate provides few opportunities for the focus learner (and, in a group setting, other learners) to apply the targeted knowledge and skills during the video clip(s).
- In the video clip(s), a majority of responses reflect superficial application of the targeted knowledge and skills.
- In the video clip(s), candidate is not guiding or building the focus learner’s application of the targeted knowledge or skills.
- In group instruction, if learners take turns responding to questions or demonstrating applications, the focus learner should be seen taking some turns. It is assumed that the focus learner will learn from listening to or watching other learners unless the candidate description of the focus learner suggests otherwise.

**Feedback for focus learner:**
- In the video clip(s), the candidate responds to the focus learner (and other learners) only by acknowledging responses by globally acknowledging success or errors without sufficient detail for the focus learner to understand the nature of the success or need for correction.
### Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 9: Subject-Specific Pedagogy: Supporting Teaching and Learning

#### How does the candidate support learning for the primary learning target?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Level 1 Rubric Language</strong></th>
<th><strong>Level 2 Rubric Language</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate uses instructional strategies, supports, or materials that are <strong>not appropriate</strong> to the focus learner's needs in relation to the lesson objectives for the primary learning target.</td>
<td>Candidate uses <strong>instructional strategies, supports, and materials</strong> in ways that <strong>superficially match</strong> the focus learner's needs in relation to lesson objectives for the primary learning target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a <strong>severe mismatch</strong> between the focus learner's chronological age and the ways in which the candidate uses instructional strategies, supports, or materials for the primary learning target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score

- **Learning tasks focus on inappropriate content or pedagogy.**
  - Instructional and support strategies seen in the clip(s) are vague, inaccurate, or inappropriate for the lesson objective(s) for the primary learning target.
  - Instructional and support strategies are developmentally inappropriate, given the description of the focus learner needs described in the Planning commentary or response to the Instructional commentary prompt.
  - Instructional and support strategies, including materials, are grossly mismatched to the learner's chronological age. If the candidate is required to use the mismatched curriculum and materials, there is no effort to reduce the mismatch.

#### Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score

- **Superficial use of subject-specific pedagogy in clips to help the focus learner develop the targeted knowledge and skills.**
  - Instructional and support strategies and materials match the primary learning target in generic ways, but the generic nature limits the focus learner's development of the targeted knowledge and skills.
  - Instructional and support strategies and materials are developmentally appropriate for the focus learner, but do not match the focus learner's specific needs related to the primary learning target.
  - The candidate is so focused on implementing a curriculum or managing a group/class that s/he loses sight of relevant focus learner's needs (that s/he identified) that are not met by the curriculum or learning tasks as implemented.
## Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness

How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet the focus learner’s learning needs related to the primary learning target?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Rubric Language</th>
<th>Level 2 Rubric Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate <strong>proposes changes unrelated to the learning needs of the focus learner related to the primary learning target.</strong></td>
<td>Candidate proposes changes that are <strong>superficially related to learning needs related to the primary learning target</strong> (e.g., improving directions for learning tasks, candidate’s task/behavior management).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score

- Review responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 7a-b (primary source) and Video Clip(s).

### Proposed changes and relationship to lesson(s) seen in video:

- The proposed changes discussed in the commentary are not related to the focus learner’s needs (relative to the primary learning target) as seen in the video clip(s) or described in the commentary.

### Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score

- Review responses to the Instruction Commentary Prompt 7a-b (primary source) and Video Clip(s).

### Superficial connections between changes to candidate practice and focus learner needs:

- The proposed changes discussed in the commentary are related to the lesson(s) seen in the video clip(s).
- The proposed changes focus on teaching practice that will probably improve learning in general, but are vague with respect to the specific learning seen in the video clip(s); changes are more about improving general teacher practice than about meeting specific learning needs of the focus learner. The changes might be such things as increasing challenge by asking additional higher-order questions (without providing examples to illustrate what questions might be asked), improving directions, increasing or decreasing pacing with no details, or including more group work without indicating how the group work will address specific focus learner needs.
### Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 11: Analyzing the Focus Learner’s Performance

**How does the candidate demonstrate an understanding of the focus learner’s performance with respect to both learning targets as reflected in the lesson objectives?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Rubric Language</th>
<th>Level 2 Rubric Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The <strong>analysis is superficial or inadequately supported</strong> by either the work sample or</td>
<td>The analysis focuses only on whether or not the focus learner did or did not achieve...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the daily assessment record <strong>for at least one learning target</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning targets, lesson objectives, daily assessment record(s), and/or the work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sample are <strong>insufficiently aligned with each other for at least one learning target</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more lesson objectives <strong>did not contain</strong> explicit, operationally defined criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for meeting the objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score**

- Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 1 a-f (primary source), Completed Final Assessments (both learning targets), Daily Assessment Records.

**Automatic 1 (significant misalignment between final assessments, daily assessment record(s), lesson objectives, and/or analyses, including lack of evaluation criteria)**

- One or more of the lesson objectives is not defined in terms of explicit, operationally defined criteria.
- For at least one learning target, there is a lack of alignment between the final assessments, the daily assessment record, and the lesson objective(s).
- For at least one learning target, the daily assessment records do not contain data related to the lesson objectives.
- For at least one learning target, the final assessment is unrelated to at least one lesson objective and daily assessment record.
- There are no assessments and/or lesson objectives for one learning target.

**Analysis is superficial or incorrect**

- The analysis focuses on an assessment that is not included in the portfolio.
- The analysis is superficial, focusing on trivial rather than important information

**Support for analysis from completed final assessments and daily assessment records**

- The analysis is consistent with the completed final assessments and the daily assessment records.

**Focus of analysis**

- The analysis focuses only on whether or not the focus learner achieved all of the lesson objectives (for both learning targets).
- The analysis does not explore how or why the focus learner did or did not meet the lesson objectives.
| from the final assessment or ignores one or more lesson objectives (for either learning target). |
| The conclusions in the analysis are not supported by the final assessment or the daily assessment record. |
### Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Further Learning

**What type of feedback does the candidate provide to the focus learner for the primary learning target?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Rubric Language</th>
<th>Level 2 Rubric Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is <strong>unrelated to the primary learning target</strong> OR is severely mismatched to the focus learner’s chronological age or developmental level.</td>
<td>Feedback related to the primary learning target is general with respect to error prevention or error correction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>AND/OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback contains significant inaccuracies.</td>
<td>Feedback consists of nonspecific praise related to the primary learning target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score**

- **Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompts 1a and 2 a, b, d (primary source), Completed Final Assessment (Work Sample) for primary learning target, and Evidence of Feedback (oral, written, demonstrated).**

**Automatic 1 - significant content inaccuracies:**
- The feedback for the work sample for the primary leaning target contains significant inaccuracies that would misdirect the focus learner.

**Automatic 1 – Developmentally inappropriate:**
- Feedback is severely inappropriate for the focus learner’s chronological age and/or level of development.

**Relationship of feedback to lesson objectives:**
- Feedback is not provided for the primary learning target.
- Feedback is not related to the lesson objectives for the primary learning target.

**Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score**

- **Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompts 1a and 2 a, b, d (primary source), Completed Final Assessment (Work Sample) for primary learning target, and Evidence of Feedback (oral, written, demonstrated).**

**Feedback is general:**
- Feedback on errors through either error prevention (when the candidate intervenes to prevent errors that are about to occur) or error correction strategies is generally related to the lesson objectives, but without enough detail to guide the focus learner.
- Feedback on successes is limited to nonspecific praise.

**Feedback is given on errors AND/OR strengths:**
- The feedback on the student work is general for errors, strengths, or both.
### Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 13: Learner Use of Feedback

How does the candidate provide opportunities for the focus learner to use the feedback for the primary learning target to guide their further learning or performance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Rubric Language</th>
<th>Level 2 Rubric Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for applying feedback related to the primary learning target are not described.</td>
<td>Candidate provides vague explanation for how the focus learner has used or will use feedback related to the primary learning target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate provides limited or no feedback related to the primary learning target to inform the focus learner’s performance/responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score

Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 2 c-d (primary source) and Evidence of oral or written feedback.

**Opportunities to apply feedback:**
- Opportunities for the focus learner to apply the feedback related to the primary learning target are not described.
- The opportunities described in the commentary are not related to the work sample for the primary learning target on which the focus learner received feedback.

**Limited or no feedback to inform student learning:**
- Severely limited or no feedback is provided for the work sample for the primary learning target. Any opportunities described cannot be connected back to any evidence of feedback.

#### Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score

Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 2 c-d (primary source) and Evidence of oral or written feedback.

**Opportunities to use feedback:**
- The candidate provides only a general comment about the focus learner about applying the feedback related to the primary learning target, e.g., apply to the next assignment or the next trial. Specific details about how the focus learner did or will apply the feedback are not described.
**Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 14: Explaining the Focus Learner’s Use of Communication**

How does the candidate explain the focus learner’s use of the targeted expressive and/or receptive communication skill (function) and other communication demands for the primary learning target to access the learning task and/or demonstrate learning for the primary learning target?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Rubric Language</th>
<th>Level 2 Rubric Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate describes the focus learner’s <strong>use of the expressive and/or receptive</strong></td>
<td>Candidate’s description focuses on <strong>vocabulary demands (words, symbols, signs, and/or behaviors)</strong> that are decontextualized from the purpose associated with the primary learning target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>communication skill (function)</strong> that is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• not aligned with the primary learning target <strong>OR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• not consistent with the evidence submitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score**

Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 3 (primary source) and Work Sample for primary learning target and/or Video evidence.

**Evidence of language use identified by candidate:**

- The candidate identifies the focus learner’s use of expressive and/or receptive communication that is either unrelated or vaguely related to accessing instruction or demonstrating learning for the primary learning target.
- The candidate’s description of the focus learner’s use of expressive and/or receptive communication is not consistent with the evidence provided.

**Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score**

Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 3 (primary source) and Work Sample for primary learning target and/or Video evidence.

**Evidence of expressive/receptive communication use identified by candidate:**

- The candidate’s description of students’ communication use is limited to vocabulary demands that are associated with the primary learning target. This can be failure of use, attempts at use, or actual use. Vocabulary demands include words, symbols, signs, and/or behaviors.
- The evidence of use of vocabulary demands is decontextualized, and does not provide evidence that the focus learner can use the vocabulary (including symbols, signs, behaviors) to communicate meaningfully.
- The candidate does not explain how the focus learner uses the vocabulary demands to access instruction or demonstrate learning.

---

5 The selected communication skill (function) identified in Planning Commentary Prompt 5a (e.g., retelling a story, following directions, starting or stopping communication, indicating preference with an eye gaze)
### Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

**How does the candidate use conclusions about what the focus learner knows and is able to do related to both learning targets to plan next steps in instruction?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Rubric Language</th>
<th>Level 2 Rubric Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For at least one learning target,</strong> next steps are not achievable or do not follow from the analysis.</td>
<td><strong>For at least one learning target,</strong> next steps focus on changes to teaching practice that are superficially related to learning (e.g., reteaching, more practice, and/or pacing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OR</strong></td>
<td>Next steps are described in sufficient detail to understand them but not to provide the logical connection to current instruction for at least one learning target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next steps are not relevant to the lesson objectives assessed for at least one learning target.</td>
<td>For both learning targets, candidate makes no connections to research and/or theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next steps are not described in sufficient detail to understand them for at least one learning target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For both learning targets, candidate makes no connections to research and/or theory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence that Results in a Level 1 Score**

- Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 1a, d-f, 4 (primary source), Learner Work Samples, Baseline Data, and Daily Assessment Records.

**Next steps related to analysis:**
- For one or both learning targets, the candidate describes next steps that are not related to learning needs identified in the analysis (Assessment Commentary Prompt 1d-f).

**Relationship of next steps to lesson objectives:**
- For one or both learning targets, the candidate describes next steps that are not related to the lesson objectives. (Assessment Commentary Prompt 1a)

**Description of next steps:**
- For one or both learning targets, the candidate does not provide enough detail when describing next steps. There should be a clear enough description of the instructional steps that the scorer would understand what will happen. The next steps may be very general, such as move to next chapter, continue to support the focus learner.

**Evidence that Results in a Level 2 Score**

- Review responses to the Assessment Commentary Prompt 1a, d-f and 4 (primary source), Learner Work Samples, Baseline Data, and Daily Assessment Records.

**Description of next steps:**
- For at least one learning target, next steps have a superficial relationship to learning, e.g., solely focus on repeating instruction, providing additional practice with little or no further instruction or change in support, or improving conditions for learning such as pacing or clarity of instructions. The focus is more on improving candidate practice than on improving learning.
- Next steps are described for only one learning target.

**Connection to current instruction**
- For at least one learning target, the next steps are clearly described, but the explanation for how they are related to the instruction in the learning segment for the focus learner is vague or missing.

**Connection to research and/or theory**
- For both learning targets, either research/theory is not mentioned or the connection to the next steps is extremely vague, e.g., providing a research citation only or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Connection to research and/or theory</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• For <strong>both learning targets</strong>, either research/theory is not mentioned OR the connection to the next steps is extremely vague, e.g., providing a research citation only or mentioning the name of a theory or researcher without relating the theory or research findings to the next steps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mentioning the name of a theory or researcher without relating the theory or research findings to the next steps.