### edTPA Rubric 1: Planning for Mathematical Understandings

How do the candidate’s plans build students’ conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem solving skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s plans focus solely on facts and/or procedures with no connections to concepts or reasoning/problem solving skills.</td>
<td>Plans for instruction support student learning of facts and procedures with vague connections to concepts OR reasoning/problem solving skills.</td>
<td>Plans for instruction build on each other to support learning of facts and procedures with clear connections to concepts OR reasoning/problem solving skills.</td>
<td>Plans for instruction build on each other to support learning of facts and procedures with clear and consistent connections to concepts AND reasoning/problem solving skills.</td>
<td>Level 4 plus: Candidate explains how they will use learning tasks and materials to lead students to make clear and consistent connections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

- Plans for instruction are **logically sequenced** to facilitate students’ learning.
- Plans are presented in a **linear sequence** in which each lesson builds on the previous one(s). In addition, the sequencing of the plans supports students’ learning by **connecting facts and procedures to concepts** OR mathematical reasoning or problem solving during the learning segment. These connections are explicitly written in the plans or commentary and how the connections are made is not left to the determination of the scorer.
- Be sure to pay attention to each component of the subject-specific emphasis (facts, concepts, procedures, mathematical reasoning or problem solving).

**Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:**

- Plans for instruction support student **learning of facts** and/or computations/procedures but **with little or no planned instruction to guide understanding** of the underlying concepts of facts and procedures or why the procedures work.
- The candidate is paying some attention to helping students understand what they are doing with facts or procedures, but the **connections to concepts or mathematical reasoning are fleeting or vague** so that students are largely left to make sense of these on their own.

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

- Learning tasks are designed to support students to make clear, consistent connections between facts, procedures, concepts, AND mathematical reasoning or problem-solving skills.
- Consistent connections require students to routinely apply understandings of concepts and explain their reasoning or problem-solving strategies as they use facts or procedures throughout the learning segment.
- The candidate addresses connections between and among concepts, procedures, and mathematical reasoning or problem solving in every lesson. Be sure to pay attention to each component of the subject-specific emphasis (facts, concepts, procedures, and mathematical reasoning or problem solving).
- The candidate uses these connections to deepen student understanding of the central focus.
**edTPA Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied**

**Learning Needs**
How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students to develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem solving skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is little or no evidence of planned supports. OR Candidate does NOT attend to requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.</td>
<td>Planned supports are loosely tied to learning objectives or the central focus of the learning segment. AND Candidate attends to requirements in IEPs and 504 plans</td>
<td>Planned supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus with attention to the characteristics of the class as a whole. AND Candidate attends to requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.</td>
<td>Planned supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus. Supports address the needs of specific individuals or groups with similar needs. AND Candidate attends to requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.</td>
<td>Level 4 plus: Supports include specific strategies to identify and respond to preconceptions, common errors, and misunderstandings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level 3**
Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:
- Supports are related to the learning objectives and central focus.
- Candidate plans supports for students that address the learning needs of the whole class while assisting them in achieving the learning objectives. None of the supports are differentiated for any students other than those required in an IEP or 504 plan.
- Candidate addresses at least one of the requirements from IEPs and 504 plans as described in the Context for Learning Information. Failure to do so is automatic 1

**Below 3**
Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:
Candidate plans insufficient supports to develop students’ learning relative to the identified objectives or the central focus. Evidenced by ONE or more of the following:
- Candidate does not plan supports for students
- Planned supports are not closely tied to learning objectives or the central focus
- Plans do not reflect ANY instructional requirements in IEPs or 504 plans.
- The instructional supports would work for almost any learning objective. Therefore, supports are not closely connected to the learning objectives (e.g., check on students who are usually having trouble, without any specific indication of what the candidate might be checking for, such as setting up equation correctly from a word problem).

**Above 3**
**Aim here!**
Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:
- Plans address specific student needs through supports that will help students meet the learning objectives
- Candidate addresses at least one of the requirements from IEPs and 504 plans as described in the Context for Learning Information.
- The candidate explains how the supports tied to the learning objectives are intended to meet specific needs of individuals or groups of students with similar needs, in addition to the whole class. Supports should be provided for more than one student--either more than one individual or for a specific group of students with similar needs (e.g., more instruction in a prerequisite skill).
### edTPA Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s justification of learning tasks is either missing OR represents a deficit view of students and their backgrounds.</td>
<td>Candidate justifies learning tasks with limited attention to students’ prior academic learning OR personal/cultural/community assets.</td>
<td>Candidate justifies why learning tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using examples of students’ prior academic learning OR examples of personal/cultural/community assets Candidate makes superficial connections to research and/or theory.</td>
<td>Candidate justifies why learning tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using examples of students’ prior academic learning examples of personal/cultural/community assets Candidate makes connections to research and/or theory.</td>
<td>Level 4 plus: Candidate’s justification is supported by principles from research and/or theory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 3

**Evidence that demonstrates performance at Level 3:**
- The candidate’s justification of the learning tasks includes **explicit connections to what students have already learned** or knowledge of student’s cultural backgrounds or personal lived experiences/interests.
- The candidate refers to research or theory in relation to the plans to support student learning. The connections between the research/theory and the tasks are not clearly made.

### Below 3

**Evidence that demonstrates performance below 3:**
- There is a **limited** amount of evidence that the candidate has **considered his/her particular class in planning**. OR
- The candidate **justifies the plans through a deficit view of students** and their backgrounds. This constitutes and automatic 1
- the candidate’s justification of the learning tasks makes some connection with what they know about students’ prior academic learning OR personal/cultural/community assets. **These connections are not strong**, but are instead vague or unelaborated, or involve a listing of what candidates know about their students in terms of prior knowledge or background without making a direct connection to how that is related to planning.

### Above 3

**Above 3 Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3:**
- The candidate’s justification not only uses knowledge of students – as both academic learners AND as individuals who **bring in personal, cultural or community assets** – but also uses research or theory to inform planning.
- the evidence includes a balance of specific examples from students’ **prior academic learning AND knowledge of students’ personal/cultural/community assets**, and explains how the plans reflect this knowledge. The explanation needs to include explicit connections **between the learning tasks and the examples** provided.
- The candidate explains how research or theory informed the selection or design of at least one learning task or the way in which it was implemented. The connection between the research or theory and the learning task(s) must be explicit.