edTPA®

Understanding Rubric Level Progressions

Additional Washington Rubrics
Version 01.2

Candidate Support Resource

Overview

The state of Washington has three rubrics based on additional prompts embedded within the national tasks. The Washington edTPAs are scored with the national rubrics (rubrics 1–15 for most fields; rubrics 1–13 for Classical languages and World Language) plus the three Washington-specific rubrics, which are identical across credential fields. **To understand rubrics 1–15, review the *Understanding Rubric Level Progressions* document for your field.** This document explains the Student Voice rubrics (rubrics 16–18 most fields; rubrics 14–16 for Classical languages and World Language).

Student Voice

The additional Washington prompts and rubrics are focused on a concept named "Student Voice." Student Voice is ongoing reflective self-assessment communicated by the learner for the purpose of improving teaching and learning. Student voice is important evidence, in addition to student work, of student understanding of his/her own learning process and progress toward the learning target(s). Washington TPAs use the term "learning targets" for "learning objectives." Examples of Student Voice evidence might include the following:

- Evidence that students know the learning targets and what is required to meet them.
  - Students explain the learning target(s) in their own words, written or oral, rather than as worded by the teacher.
  - Students express why the learning target(s) are important.
  - Students describe how they will demonstrate that they have reached the targets.
- Evidence that students know how to monitor their progress toward the learning target(s) using tools (checklists, rubrics, etc.) and strategies (questions, procedures for evaluating work).
  - Students know and discuss the progression of learning that guides their progress.
  - Students compare their work with a tool that clarifies the progression of learning.
  - Students explain what they are doing well, and what they need to improve, and what they need to do to make the identified improvements.
- Evidence that students know how to access resources and additional support when needed.
  - Students articulate the range of resources available to them to help them reach the learning target(s).
  - Students explain how and why particular resources will help them reach the learning target.

Preponderance of Evidence and Automatic 1s

For the Washington Student Voice rubrics, the preponderance of evidence rule does not apply. **The evidence must meet all requirements of the rubric level at which it is scored.**

There are no Automatic 1s for the Student Voice rubrics.

Student Voice Rubric 16[1]: Eliciting Student Understanding of Learning Targets

GQ16: How does the candidate focus student attention on the learning targets?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question addresses how a candidate's plans support student understanding of the learning targets and provides opportunities to express that understanding.

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Planning Commentary Prompts 1d, 2a, and 5c (For Early Childhood, it is Prompts 1e, 2a, and 5d. For Library Specialist, Physical Education, and Secondary English-Language Arts, it is Prompts 1e, 2a, and 5d. For Classical Languages and World Language, it is Prompts 1d, 2a, and 4c. For Special Education, it is Prompts 3d and 5b.)

Lesson Plans, Instructional Materials, and Assessments (if needed to clarify learning targets and planned tools and strategies related to Student Voice)

Key Concepts in Rubric

- *learning targets*: "[D]efines academic success, what we want students to know and be able to do."[2] Generally written in student-friendly language so the learner can articulate and demonstrate learning.

- *tools and strategies for student voice evidence*: Tools and strategies for prompting children to communicate their understanding of either the learning targets or their own learning progress. Tools are artifacts (e.g., graphic organizers, rubrics, checklists). Strategies are plans or methods (e.g., routines for unpacking learning objectives or self-monitoring of learning progress, peer review opportunities, teacher or peer feedback, letter to a friend in another school explaining the learning target) for eliciting student-voice evidence.

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at <u>Level 3</u>:

- **Criterion 1 (same as Criterion 1 for Level 2):** Candidate creates learning targets that students are likely to understand and fit the students described in terms of development, prior learning, and academic language[3].

- **Criterion 2:** The plans must include tools/strategies for students to express their own understandings of the learning targets, in verbal or nonverbal ways as appropriate to their cognitive or communication skills.

---

[1] For World Language and Classical Language, which have 13 rubrics, these rubrics are 14, 15, and 16 instead of 16, 17, and 18.

[2] Stiggins, R. J. (2001). Student-involved classroom assessment (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merill Prentice Hall.

[3] For Classical Languages and World Language, student understanding is based on their development and prior learning only. For English as an Additional Language, student understanding is based on their development, prior learning, and English language development.

■ For example, the candidate may ask the students to restate the learning target in their own words. The candidate may also use more indirect tools/strategies, e.g., eliciting or providing examples of key concepts in the rubric followed by students expressing the learning target in terms of those examples, eliciting examples of how the students can apply the learning target in the school or community.

■ **Examples of tools** for eliciting student understanding of the learning target include completing sentence starters, e.g., "I am learning to…", "I can…", or using a prompt for students to explain the learning target in their own words either orally or in writing. Some students may use assistive technology, e.g., a communication device or a picture board.

■ **Examples of strategies** to elicit student understanding of the learning target include introducing new terms followed by the students' stating the learning target in their own words, having students explain how what they are doing as they work represents the learning target, restating the learning target in their own words, turning to a partner and taking turns explaining how they would know that they had achieved the learning target, asking students what they are going to be learning, asking students to compare this learning target to an earlier learning target and identify how it is an extension of or different from the previous target, or asking strategic questions related specifically to the learning target as a whole. Questions solely related to concepts in the learning target or content are part of instruction and formative assessment, but there must be at least one question that elicits understanding of the learning target itself.

■ Tools or strategies identified ask students to communicate a specific understanding of the learning target. If the candidate asks students for a thumbs up–thumbs down or to hold up 1–5 fingers or to circle smilie/neutral/frownie faces to indicate their understanding of a learning target, there are follow-up questions planned to allow students to identify or explain specific areas of mis/understanding.

■ **For students with emergent cognitive and communication skills who communicate nonverbally or with a single word or phrase**, the planned expression of understanding may be through learner responses indicating general understanding of the learning target, such as one- or two-word responses, or selection among pictorial illustrations.

■ **For students with developing cognitive or communication skills who can communicate and think concretely who are at most beginning to develop abstract thinking skills,** the candidate may plan to gather learner responses that are highly scaffolded, e.g., eliciting responses to a series of questions and then asking students to describe the learning target or eliciting in some detail how and where the student might use the learning target.

■ **Non-examples of tools and strategies** include *inferences* about what students understand from observing them work (this is formative assessment, not evidence of student voice), candidate or students reading the learning targets aloud with no further discussion, posted learning targets, or students copying the learning targets word for word.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:

- The candidate develops learning targets for students, but there are **no tools or strategies planned** to support students to communicate an understanding of them at an appropriate developmental level. The planned tools/strategies may provide an opportunity for students to express separate understanding of key concepts in the learning target aloud, but they do not express understanding of the learning target itself.

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

- **Criterion 1:** The candidate creates learning targets that students are likely to understand and fit the students described in terms of development, prior learning, and academic language[4]. There are explicit plans to help students understand any new concepts. However, no tools or strategies are described for students to communicate **their own understandings** of the learning target in developmentally appropriate ways.

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

- The candidate provides learning targets for each lesson orally or in writing, or, for very young students or students with emergent communication skills, by demonstrating a learning target while explaining it. However, the learning targets are not appropriate for students' prior knowledge or academic language development.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:

- **Criterion 1:** The learning targets are appropriate for the lesson context and may be scaffolded across the learning segment.

- **Criterion 1:** The learning targets are communicated to the students in ways that are appropriate for the students' prior knowledge, development, and academic language[5] as described by the candidate.

- **Criterion 2:** For tools or strategies with which the students are not familiar, there is explicit instruction in use of the tools or strategies for expressing understanding of the learning targets and why they are important to learn.

- **Criterion 2:** There may be a plan to guide students in creating tools and strategies together for reflection on their progress, revision of learning targets, and new goal setting.

---

[4] For Classical Languages and World Language, student understanding is based on their development and prior learning only. For English as an Additional Language, student understanding is based on their development, prior learning, and English language development.

[5] Classical Languages and World Language do not include academic language as a criterion, and English as an Additional Language considers English language development instead of academic language.

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

- **Criterion 1:** Learning targets are not overly generalized but are linked to the particular lesson context and are appropriate for the students' prior knowledge, development, and academic language (or for very young students, communication development) as described by the candidate. Lesson context includes such things as genre, context in which students are asked to apply the learning target, type of application of skills—e.g., not "I can write a 5-paragraph essay" but "I can write a persuasive essay"; not "I can write a linear equation" but "When given two points on a line, I can write the equation of the line in standard form."

- **Criterion 2:** Plans include opportunities for students to communicate an understanding of why the learning targets are important, e.g., how and when the learning target would be used, description of what the student would be able to do when achieving the learning target that s/he could not do now and how that would improve their work, how the learning target is applied in the community setting.

  - For students with emergent communication skills who communicate nonverbally or with a single word or phrase, students might need to use alternative or assistive communication, e.g., selecting a picture representing the general context in which the learning target would be used or responding with one word indicating a general context, like "store" where the student might use addition skills.

- **Criterion 2:** For tools or strategies that the students do not routinely use, plans include modeling of their use that goes beyond procedural instructions to support students in communicating their understanding of the learning targets and why they are important.

  - **If students are experienced in using the planned tools or strategies,** this requirement for modeling of their use is not applicable and the evidence should meet the first criterion and reflect opportunities for students to express why the learning target is important.

  - If students are not familiar with the tool or strategy, then the evidence must meet all parts of both criteria.

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

- **Criterion 1:** The candidate considers the context for the lessons and scaffolds the learning targets for the series of lessons. The scaffolding of the learning targets gradually deepens student knowledge and skills related to a larger goal that is the ultimate target of the learning segment. In special education and some early childhood settings, the scaffolding across the learning segment for students might be contingent on signs of progress toward a single learning target.

- **Criterion 2:** Plans address how the candidate and students will work together to develop tools or strategies to support student reflection on their own learning progress, revision of the learning targets, and new goal setting. This may be heavily guided, take the form of choices among alternatives, or lay the foundation for cognition or metacognitive reflection for students with emergent or developing cognitive, metacognitive, or communication skills, but plans should reflect students as active participants.

Student Voice Rubric 17: Supporting Student Understanding of the Learning Target and Use of Tools and/or Strategies to Learn and Monitor Their Own Progress

GQ17: How does the candidate support students to understand the learning target and monitor their own learning progress?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question refers to how the candidate provides at least one tool or strategy so that students communicate their own understanding of the learning target(s), and use a tool (e.g., rubric, checklist) or strategy (e.g., comparing to a model, answering candidate questions) to help them become aware of what they understand and what they need to improve to meet the learning target at a developmentally appropriate level.

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Instruction Commentary Prompts 3a and 4c (For Agricultural Education, it is Prompts 4a and 5c. For Classical Languages and World Language, it is Prompts 3a and 4d. For English as an Additional Language, it is Prompts 3b and 4c. For Special Education, it is Prompts 4a and 5b.)

Video Clip(s)

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- **Criterion 1 (same as Criterion 1 for Level 2):** There is **video evidence** of one or more students communicating their understanding of the learning target in a developmentally appropriate way.

- **Criterion 2:** Candidate may provide evidence that students are reflecting on what they need to improve to reach the learning target.

  - **Option 1: Video evidence.** The video evidence shows that students have an opportunity to reflect on where their current (individual) learning is in relation to the learning target and **identify areas for improvement**. Learners at emergent levels of communication development who communicate nonverbally or with a single word or phrase may express their understanding of progress in only a general way; for infants and young toddlers as well as a learner with a disability severely limiting the ability to communicate, the candidate may model for the learner how to express their learning progress in ways that they can understand.

  - **Option 2: Written evidence.** The candidate **describes** in the commentary the tool used to identify specific areas for improvement and **explains** how s/he and the students use it for reflection on the students' own learning progress. Note that this is in contrast to the guidance for national rubrics that the primary source of evidence from the Instruction task is the video.

- For either option, for students who can communicate and think concretely, who are at most beginning to develop abstract thinking skills, the self-reflection may be more general, e.g., responses such as easy/hard or Got it!/Need more practice/Need help for specific concepts or skills in the learning target or responses to yes/no questions about their work.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below</u> Level 3:

- **Criterion 1:** The candidate and/or the students are seen communicating the learning target in developmentally appropriate ways.

- **Criterion 2:** There is no evidence that students are asked to reflect on their learning in relation to the learning target.

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

- **Criterion 1 (same as Criterion 1 for Level 3):** Candidate asks students to communicate their own understanding of the learning target in a developmentally appropriate way. At least one student is seen in a video clip doing this.

- **Criterion 2:** In the commentary, the candidate refers to at least one tool or strategy to support student self-reflection, but there is no depiction in the clips or specific description in the commentary of any tool or strategy and how the candidate and students use it to identify what they did well and/or areas for improvement. For strategies such as smilie/neutral/frownie faces or numerical categories like 1–5 fingers, they must be described as addressing specific aspects of the learning target, e.g., understanding of specific concepts or skills in the learning target.

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

- **Criterion 1:** Either the learning target is not discussed at all or the only person in the video communicating about the learning target is the candidate. However, if the candidate is working with a very young learner or a student with a severe disability affecting communication and attempts to elicit appropriate responses from the learner fail, then the candidate should not be penalized for then modeling a response.

- **Criterion 2:** There is no evidence in the clips or reference in the commentary about any tools or strategies to support developmentally appropriate students' individual self-reflection about what they did well and/or what they need to improve related to the learning target.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above</u> Level 3:

- **Criterion 1:** Students communicate their understanding of the learning target and why it is important in a developmentally appropriate way.

- **Criterion 2:** Students reflect on what they understand and what they need to improve in relation to the learning target. Candidate either models an unfamiliar tool or strategy or collaborates with students to develop a tool or strategy to assist students in identifying what they are doing well and/or what they need to improve.

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

- **Criterion 1:** Candidate prompts students to describe in developmentally appropriate ways the learning target and why it is important to learn, e.g., what they will be able to do once they reach the learning target and how that improves their work or allows them to do more, either at home or in the community.

  - Students with emergent communication skills who communicate nonverbally or with a single word or phrase may use assistive or alternative communication or one word or phrase to respond in a general way about what the learning target will allow them to do or identify the context in which they will use the skill.

- **Criterion 2:** For a tool or strategy for self-reflection that students do not use routinely, the candidate models its use for supporting students in communicating what they are doing well and/or what they need to improve to reach the learning target. Modeling should go beyond only providing instructions for the procedural use of the tool or strategy, and must include attempts to help students understand how and why communicating what they are doing well and/or what they need to improve is important, e.g., providing or eliciting sample responses (from the candidate or students), comparing the usefulness of vague vs. specific responses, using a thinkaloud to illustrate how a student might respond. Students with emergent communication skills who communicate nonverbally or with a single word or phrase may communicate their impression of what they did well or need to improve in a general way as described in Level 3.

  - Note: If students are familiar with the tool or strategy they used to identify what they need to improve to meet the learning target the candidate does not need to model the use of the tool or strategy (i.e., only the first criterion is applicable).

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

- **Criterion 1:** Candidate works with students to jointly define the learning target(s) and why they are important. In special education for learners with emergent cognitive and communication skills and for very young children, an example of a developmentally appropriate strategy is giving the learner choices, e.g., among different contexts in which to develop the knowledge and skills associated with the learning target, which spelling or sight words to learn first.

- **Criterion 2:** Candidate works with students to create or revise a tool or strategy to assist students in reflecting on what they are doing well and/or what they need to improve to reach the learning target. For example, candidate might work with students to generate a checklist after viewing a sample response, construct a rubric after reviewing a range of responses, or revise a general rubric for the specific topic of the learning segment. Again, in special education for learners with emergent cognitive and communication skills and with very young children, an example of a developmentally appropriate strategy for a focus learner with emergent communication skills is giving the learner choices of how to demonstrate their understanding of their progress toward the learning target.

Student Voice Rubric 18: Reflecting on Student Voice Evidence to Improve Instruction

GQ18: How does the candidate use student voice evidence to identify instructional improvements?

The Guiding Question

The Guiding Question refers to how the candidate draws upon student voice evidence in reflecting on student performance as well as the effectiveness of the tool or strategy used to collect student self-reflections.

Primary Sources of Evidence:

Assessment Commentary, Prompts 1c–f and 4c (For Early Childhood, it is Prompts 1d–1f and 4c. For Physical Education, it is Prompts 1c, 1e–g, and 4c. For Special Education, it is Prompts 1e, 1g, and 4c. For Classical Languages and World Language, it is Prompts 1c–f and 3c.)

Student Work Samples

Student Self-Reflections

Unpacking Rubric Levels

Level 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:

- **Criterion 1 (same as Criterion 1 for Level 2):** Candidate analyzes student self-reflections, with specific references to what students thought they did well and/or what they needed to improve about their performance on the assessment. For example, the candidate includes multiple sentences addressing what the students believed, such as "most students thought they understood cause and effect."

- The analysis is consistent with the self-reflections. In most fields, this analysis will be across the class; for special education, it will be an analysis of the self-reflection related to the work sample provided for the focus learner. In addition, for early childhood education, the analysis of self-reflections should be on the common assessment.

    - **For a student with emergent communication skills who communicates nonverbally or through a single word or phrase,** the self-reflection may be a global impression of progress rather than specific identification of what was done well and/or what needed improvement. Nonetheless, the candidate should analyze the self-reflection as to the impression of progress being communicated.

        - Example: The candidate analyzes the learner's global perception of progress through representation on a visual like a bar chart, a thermometer, or other symbol of extent of progress.

    - **For students who can communicate and think concretely who are at most beginning to develop abstract thinking skills,** the candidate may analyze what they found hard or easy or their responses to concrete elements of the learning target such as easy/hard or Got it!/Need more practice/Need help.

- **Criterion 2 (same as Criterion 2 for Level 4):** Candidate identifies ways in which the tool or strategy used to collect student self-reflections did and/or did not provide useful information to guide further learning. The identification may be general, e.g., "gauging how prepared students are for the next step in the lesson." If there is a rationale for the changes or continued use of the same tool or strategy, it is weak.

Below 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below</u> Level 3:

- **Criterion 1:** Candidate collects examples of student self-reflections. The candidate may or may not analyze them.

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

- **Criterion 1 (same as Criterion 1 for Level 3):** Candidate analyzes student self-reflections to understand their perceptions of what they thought they did well and/or what they need to improve. See Level 3 description for Criterion 1 for more detail.

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

- **Criterion 1:** Candidate collects self-reflections. Either the analysis of the self-reflections is missing or the candidate makes a superficial attempt to use them to understand student perceptions of what they did well and/or what they needed to improve relative to the learning target. For some candidates, the analysis at this level may be limited due to the tool or lack of developmentally appropriate information elicited by the tool or strategy used to collect the self-reflection.

  - Example: The candidate makes no reference to the content of the self-reflections.

  - Example: The student self-reflection tool does not address what they did well or what they needed to improve.

  - Example: The analysis is limited to a statement about the accuracy of the self-reflection compared to the corresponding work sample (e.g., "Most students felt they understood the learning target and their work shows that they were able to complete the multiplication problems I gave them."). There is no additional detail about what students perceived about their own learning progress.

Above 3

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above</u> Level 3:

- **Criterion 1:** Candidate compares student perceptions of specific elements of what they understood and/or what they did well to the same elements of their actual performance.

- **Criterion 2:** Candidate reflects on the effectiveness of the tool or strategy used to collect the self-reflections and may propose revisions or justify continued use of the unrevised tool or strategy.

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

- **Criterion 1:** Candidate summarizes specific elements of individual student perceptions of what they understood and/or what they did well and/or what they need to improve compared to the same elements of their actual performance. The comparison is specifically related to key elements of the learning target (e.g., "Most students who thought they understood how to compare could list comparisons"; "The assessment data indicates that students need more work on problem solving, but their self-reflections indicate that few of them realized this") and not general ("students' self-reflections generally matched their performance"; "students' level of confidence matched their performance"). Again, the self-reflection may be global for a learner with emergent communication skills, but the candidate should still compare the self-reflection to the work sample.

- **Criterion 2 (same as Criterion 2 for Level 3):** Candidate identifies ways in which the tool or strategy used to collect student self-reflections did and/or did not provide useful information to guide further learning. The identification may be general, e.g., "gauging how prepared students are for the next step in the lesson." If there is a rationale for the changes or continued use the same tool or strategy, it is weak.

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

- **Criterion 1:** Provides a strong explanation of why the proposed revisions are likely to improve the effectiveness of the tool or strategy in eliciting student perceptions of what they are doing well and/or what they need to improve OR

- **Criterion 2:** Provides a strong rationale for its continued use without revisions.