



Early Adolescence

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Scoring Guide *for Candidates*

- **Part 1** provides you with the tools to understand and interpret your scores.
- **Part 2** provides the scoring rubrics for your certificate area, guiding you as you develop your portfolio entries and prepare for your assessment center exercises.

*National Board Certification
Promotes Better Teaching,
Better Learning, Better Schools*

Contents

ABOUT THIS SCORING GUIDE	i
---------------------------------------	----------

PART 1: UNDERSTANDING AND INTERPRETING YOUR SCORES

HOW THE FIVE CORE PROPOSITIONS AND THE STANDARDS INFORM THE ASSESSMENTS AND THE SCORING PROCESS	1-2
What Are the Five Core Propositions?	1-2
What Are the Standards?	1-3
Who Are the Assessors?	1-4
INTERPRETING YOUR SCORES	1-6
Accessing Your Score Report	1-7
Understanding Your Score Report	1-8
Key Aspects of the Scoring Process	1-10
Evaluating Your Performance	1-10
MOVING FORWARD WITH YOUR SCORES	1-17
Identifying Your Strengths and Weaknesses	1-17
Next Steps	1-17
Retake Considerations	1-18
Preparing Your Retake Submissions	1-23
Filing an Appeal	1-24
APPENDIX: LINKS TO RESOURCES	1-26

PART 2: UNDERSTANDING AND APPLYING THE SCORING CRITERIA

SCORING RUBRICS FOR PORTFOLIO ENTRIES	2-1
Entry 1: Analysis of Student Growth in Reading and Writing	2-1
Entry 2: Instructional Analysis: Whole-Class Discussion	2-5
Entry 3: Instructional Analysis: Small Groups	2-9
Entry 4: Documented Accomplishments: Contributions to Student Learning	2-13
SCORING RUBRICS FOR ASSESSMENT CENTER EXERCISES	2-17
Exercise 1: Literary Analysis	2-17
Exercise 2: Universal Themes	2-19
Exercise 3: Teaching Reading	2-21
Exercise 4: Language Study	2-23
Exercise 5: Analysis of Writing	2-25
Exercise 6: Teaching Writing	2-27

About This Scoring Guide

The *Scoring Guide for Candidates* is a comprehensive overview of the National Board's scoring process. It is essential reading for anyone pursuing National Board Certification®. Together the two parts of the *Scoring Guide for Candidates* will help you on your path toward becoming a National Board Certified Teacher® (NBCT®).

Part 1: Understanding and Interpreting Your Scores

Part 1 guides you through the scoring process, providing you with the tools to understand and interpret your scores. Applicable to all certificate areas, **Part 1** includes crucial information about the role of the National Board Standards, which represent a professional consensus on the critical aspects of practice that distinguish accomplished teachers in the field and function as the foundation of each assessment.

Additionally, you will find information in **Part 1** about NBPTS® assessors—the qualified professionals who assign your scores. You will also find the score ranges, which will allow you to match your score to the appropriate level of performance. **Part 1** also discusses the National Board's retake policies, relevant to you if you do not meet the performance standard on your initial certification attempt. In **Part 1** you will learn how to interpret your individual scores and, if necessary, develop strategies to improve them.

Part 2: Understanding and Applying the Scoring Criteria

Part 2 provides the scoring rubrics for each portfolio entry and assessment center exercise in your certificate area, guiding you as you develop your portfolio entries and prepare for your assessment center exercises. The rubrics are presented here in a bulleted format to highlight the vital information contained in each. Reading the scoring rubrics will help you think about ways to strengthen your practice and best demonstrate your teaching expertise. The rubrics are the tool that assessors use to determine the appropriate scores for performance in your field.

The NBPTS Web site provides additional documents to assist you in the process of developing your portfolio entries and evaluating your performance. One such document is the [Evaluation of Evidence Guide](#). Each certificate-specific guide corresponds to an individual portfolio entry for your certificate area, and each includes questions that shape how assessors view the evidence you submit.

Other resources that will help you prepare for your assessment include the following certificate-specific documents, all of which are available online at www.nbpts.org:

- *Assessment at a Glance*
- Standards for Accomplished Teaching
- *Portfolio Instructions*



Part 1:

Understanding and Interpreting Your Scores

This resource is available as a PDF file. You may select the link below to view or print **Part 1**.

[Scoring Guide for Candidates, Part 1: Understanding and Interpreting Your Scores](#)



Part 2:

Understanding and Applying the Scoring Criteria

Part 2: Understanding and Applying the Scoring Criteria presents the scoring rubrics for your certificate area. You should read the rubrics while developing your portfolio entries and preparing for your assessment center exercises. These rubrics, which are derived from the Standards, define the levels of accomplished teaching that you must demonstrate. This reference information will help you understand how the rubrics guide assessors in evaluating your work.

Each rubric begins with an overarching statement that summarizes the quality of performance at each of the rubric levels. For example, the overarching statement for a Level 4 rubric might read: "The Level 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher's knowledge and practice in his or her field." This precise language is used to distinguish between the four levels of the score scale. The body of the rubric consists of statements organized in a manner that reflects the order of tasks or questions within the entry or exercise. If you are asked to discuss your goals in the first response, for example, then the quality statement about goals will be stated at the beginning of the body of the rubric.

One way to understand the meaning of the entire rubric and how it relates to the quality of a performance is to read across the rubric. You can do this by reading the first sentence for Level 4, the first sentence for Level 3, and so on. This reveals the gradations of quality delineated for each feature of the response. A careful reading of the rubrics is an invaluable step in helping you successfully develop your portfolio entries and prepare for your assessment center exercises.

Your portfolio entries and assessment center exercises are scored holistically. To score holistically, an assessor must look at the entry and exercise for its overall quality and evaluate the work as a whole. The response may have characteristics of adjacent performance levels, but the assessor must assign the score that best describes the work as a whole. When scoring, an assessor reads completely, and views, when applicable, the entire entry and exercise before assigning a score. An assessor should read and review supportively, looking for and rewarding those things done well in the entry or exercise.

For more information about understanding and interpreting your scores, please refer to **Part 1**.

Contents:

- Scoring Rubrics for Portfolio Entries
- Scoring Rubrics for Assessment Center Exercises

Scoring Rubrics for Portfolio Entries

Entry 1: Analysis of Student Growth in Reading and Writing

In this entry: You select four student work samples from two students. Two samples are responses to print and nonprint text, and two samples are responses to writing prompts. Your analysis of the submitted student responses should show how you support and analyze students' growth and development as readers/interpreters of text and as writers. Besides the student work samples and Written Commentary, you provide the assignments/prompts as well as the rubrics or scoring criteria you used to evaluate the student work.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to use analysis and assessment of student responses to literature and student writing to support growth as both interpreters of text and as writers.

The Level 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence:

- that the teacher has a thorough knowledge of students as individual learners and sets high, worthwhile, and attainable goals for growth in student learning.
- that the teacher encourages active exploration and critical interpretation of print and nonprint text and recognizes multiple interpretations while requiring them to be grounded in the text.
- that the teacher understands the complex, recursive, individual nature of the writing process and provides a context that encourages students' active exploration of their own writing processes.
- that students engage in writing for multiple purposes and audiences.
- that the teacher employs varied, rich, and appropriate instructional resources, including print and nonprint media formats, to support students' growth as interpreters of text and as writers.
- that the teacher is able to accurately and thoughtfully describe and analyze student work in ways that recognize students' progress and offers means for students to build on their accomplishments.
- that the teacher uses appropriate assessment methods (formal or informal) on an ongoing basis to monitor student progress, encourage student self-assessment, and plan future instruction.
- of detailed and effective communication with students that directs their attention to the salient features of their work and encourages them to reflect upon how their work can be improved.
- that the teacher is able to describe his or her practice fully and accurately and reflect insightfully on its effectiveness in meeting the challenges of teaching texts and writing.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to use analysis and assessment of student responses to literature and student writing to support growth as both interpreters of text and as writers.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to use analysis and assessment of student responses to literature and student writing to support growth as both interpreters of text and as writers.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher has a knowledge of students as individual learners and sets appropriate goals for growth in student learning.
- that the teacher encourages active exploration and critical interpretation of print and nonprint text and recognizes multiple interpretations while requiring them to be grounded in text, though the text may not be as stimulating nor the range of student responses as broad as in a Level 4 response.
- that the teacher understands the complex, recursive, individual nature of the writing process and provides a context that encourages students' exploration of their own writing processes, though the evidence may not be as well developed as in a Level 4 response.
- that students engage in writing for multiple purposes and audiences, and that the teacher employs appropriate instructional resources, including print and nonprint media formats, to support students' growth as interpreters of text and as writers.
- that the teacher is able to accurately describe and analyze student work in ways that recognize students' progress and offers means for students to build on their accomplishments.
- that the teacher uses appropriate assessment methods (formal or informal) on an ongoing basis to monitor student progress, encourage student self-assessment, and plan future instruction. However, the assessment and/or feedback may not be as detailed or insightful as in a Level 4 response, or the area of student self-assessment may not be fully addressed.
- of effective communication with students that directs their attention to the salient features of their work and encourages them to reflect upon how their work can be improved.
- that the teacher is able to describe his or her practice and reflect on its effectiveness in meeting the challenges of teaching texts and writing. However, the reflection may not be as detailed or insightful as in a Level 4 response.

One part of the response may be more indicative of accomplished practice than another, but overall, there is *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to use analysis and assessment of student responses to literature and student writing to support growth as both interpreters of text and as writers.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence that the teacher is able to use analysis and assessment of student responses to literature and student writing to support growth as both interpreters of text and as writers.

The Level 2 response provides *limited* evidence:

- of the teacher's knowledge of students as individual learners and sets goals for growth in student learning. The goals may be general, of limited significance, or only loosely related to the instruction.
- that the teacher encourages active and critical interpretation of texts which may be only loosely grounded in the text with little or no comment on this by the teacher.
- that the teacher understands the complex, recursive, individual nature of the writing process.
- that students engage in writing for multiple purposes and audiences and the teacher employs appropriate instructional resources, including print and nonprint media formats, to support students' growth as interpreters of text and as writers. Instructional resources and activities may be formulaic, lacking a convincing rationale, or restricted to a single media format.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze student work. The analysis may recognize students' progress but may not offer students ways to build on their accomplishment.
- that the teacher uses appropriate assessment methods to monitor student progress. Assessment may not be ongoing or may not be used by the teacher to plan future instruction.
- of communication with students about their work, or the feedback may be too general to offer students ways to improve their work or may not promote student self-reflection.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice, but the reflection may be vague, general, or focused solely on the procedural aspects of teaching. The Level 2 performance may be characterized by evidence that hints at accomplished practice, but is too fragmented or uneven to support a classification as a Level 3 performance.

Overall, there is *limited* evidence that the teacher is able to use analysis and assessment of student responses to literature and student writing to support growth as both interpreters of text and as writers.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to use analysis and assessment of student responses to literature and student writing to support growth as both interpreters of text and as writers.

The Level 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence:

- that the teacher has a knowledge of students as individual learners and sets appropriate goals for growth in student learning. The goals for student learning may not be goals at all, but rather activities. When stated, the goals may be confused, trivial, inappropriate, or not connected to the instruction.
- that the teacher encourages active and critical interpretation of texts in different media; instead, students may be expected to simply recall elements of the text.
- that the teacher understands the complex, recursive, individual nature of the writing process and may even contain misconceptions about the writing process.
- that students engage in writing for multiple purposes and audiences. Instructional resources, including print and nonprint media formats, may be inappropriate and/or completely unengaging to these students. Questions and/or prompts may be entirely closed-ended with “right” and “wrong” answers. There may be no recognition of nonprint media as text.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze student work. The analysis may fail to recognize students’ progress and instead focus on students’ mistakes, or it may be so superficial that it misses important elements of the work that merit attention. There may be an exclusive emphasis on the grammar and mechanics of students’ writing, as opposed to addressing students’ thinking.
- that the teacher uses appropriate assessment methods to monitor student progress or communicate effectively with students about their work. Assessment and feedback may be superficial, infrequent, and may actually discourage students from reflecting upon their work.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice. The reflection may be missing or disconnected from the instructional evidence.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to use analysis and assessment of student responses to literature and student writing to support growth as both interpreters of text and as writers.

Entry 2: Instructional Analysis: Whole-Class Discussion

In this entry: You submit a 15-minute video recording to demonstrate teaching strategies that you use for whole-class discussion in which the students engage with you and with each other in meaningful discourse about a topic, concept, or text related to English language arts. You also provide evidence of your ability to integrate English language arts strands and to describe, analyze, and reflect on your work. You also provide a Written Commentary analyzing the video recording, and instructional materials.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to engage students in a substantial whole-class discussion on a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

The Level 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence:

- that the teacher has established a safe, inclusive, and challenging environment that promotes active student engagement in the activities and substance of English language arts instruction.
- that the teacher draws on a detailed knowledge of students' backgrounds, needs, abilities, interests, and his or her knowledge of English language arts in selecting high, worthwhile, and attainable goals and in selecting instructional approaches that support those goals.
- that the teacher integrates reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing activities that are connected to the learning goals, and that the instruction is sequenced and structured so that students can achieve the goals.
- of the teacher's understanding of the dynamics of whole-class discussion.
- of the teacher's ability to foster student engagement and learning, and of the teacher's skill in using open-ended questions, listening, and feedback to support active learning in a whole-class environment.
- that the teacher encourages students to explore, clarify, and challenge each other's ideas in a respectful and fair manner.
- that the teacher uses appropriate, rich, and thought-provoking instructional resources to engage students in learning important English language arts content.
- that the teacher is able to describe his or her practice accurately, analyze it fully and thoughtfully, and reflect insightfully on its implications for future teaching.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of engaging students in a substantial whole-class discussion on a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to engage students in a substantial whole-class discussion on a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher has established a safe, inclusive, and challenging environment that promotes active student engagement in the activities and substance of English language arts instruction.
- that the teacher draws on knowledge of students' backgrounds, needs, abilities, interests, and his or her knowledge of English language arts in selecting worthwhile and attainable goals and instructional approaches that support those goals.
- that the teacher integrates reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing activities that are connected to the learning goals, and that the instruction is organized so that students can achieve the goals. However, the activities may not be as adeptly sequenced or structured as in a Level 4 response, and the integration may not be as seamless or as balanced as in a Level 4 response.
- of the teacher's understanding of the dynamics of whole-class discussion.
- of the teacher's ability to foster student engagement and learning, and of the teacher's skill in using open-ended questions, listening, and feedback to support active learning in a whole-class environment.
- that the teacher encourages students to explore, clarify, and challenge each other's ideas in a respectful and fair manner.
- that the teacher uses appropriate instructional resources to engage students in learning important English language arts content, though the resources may not be as rich or thought-provoking as in a Level 4 response.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice accurately and reflect on its implications for future teaching, though the reflection may not be as insightful as in a Level 4 response.

A Level 3 performance may show imbalance or unevenness in the different sources of evidence. One part of the response may be more indicative of accomplished practice than another, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence of engaging students in a substantial whole-class discussion on a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence that the teacher is able to engage students in a substantial whole-class discussion on a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher has established a safe environment that promotes some measure of student engagement in English language arts instruction. The level of challenge may be limited, and/or attention to inclusiveness may not be evident.
- that the teacher draws on knowledge of students' backgrounds, needs, abilities, interests, and his or her knowledge of English language arts in selecting appropriate goals and in selecting instructional approaches that support those goals. The goals for student learning may be general, of limited significance, or only loosely related to the instruction.
- that the teacher integrates reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing activities. The activities may be only loosely connected to the learning goals, and the integration may be very limited, with one area dominating and others touched on very tangentially.
- of the teacher's understanding of the dynamics of whole-class discussion.
- of the teacher's ability to foster student engagement and learning and of the teacher's skill in using open-ended questions, listening, and feedback to support active learning in a whole-class environment.
- that the teacher encourages students to explore, clarify, and challenge each other's ideas in a respectful and fair manner. The discourse on the video recording may be dominated by teacher questions, and the questions may be closed-ended or of limited scope in relation to the content being addressed.
- that the teacher uses appropriate instructional resources to engage students in learning English language arts content.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice accurately. The reflection may be global or sketchy and may show limited understanding of implications for future teaching.

The Level 2 performance may be characterized by evidence that hints at accomplished practice, but, overall, there is *limited* evidence of engaging students in a substantial whole-class discussion on an important English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to engage students in a substantial whole-class discussion on a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

The Level 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence:

- that the teacher has established a safe environment that promotes student engagement in English language arts instruction. The level of challenge may be very low, and the attention to inclusiveness may not be evident.
- that the teacher draws on knowledge of students' backgrounds, needs, abilities, interests, and his or her knowledge of English language arts in selecting goals and instructional approaches. The goals for student learning may not be goals at all, but rather activities. When stated, goals may be confused, trivial, inappropriate, or unconnected to instruction.
- that the teacher integrates reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing activities. The activities may be unconnected to the learning goals, and integration may be inappropriate or entirely absent.
- of the teacher's understanding of the dynamics of whole-class discussion.
- of the teacher's ability to foster student engagement and learning and of the teacher's skill in using open-ended questions, listening, and feedback to support active learning in a whole-class environment.
- that the teacher encourages students to explore, clarify, and challenge each other's ideas in a respectful and fair manner. The discussion may be entirely dominated by the teacher, whether questioning or lecturing, to the extent that it may not be a discussion at all. If questions are used, they may be closed-ended, trivial, or suggest "only one right answer."
- that the teacher uses appropriate instructional resources to engage students in learning important English language arts content.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice accurately. The reflection may be missing or unconnected to the instructional evidence and show little or no understanding of implications for future teaching.

Viewed as a whole, there is *little or no* evidence of engaging students in a substantial whole-class discussion on an important English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

Entry 3: Instructional Analysis: Small Groups

In this entry: You submit a 15-minute video recording to demonstrate the teaching strategies that you use for small-group discussion in which the students engage with you and with each other in meaningful discourse about a topic, concept, or text related to English language arts. You also provide evidence of your ability to integrate English language arts strands and to describe, analyze, and reflect on your work. You also provide a Written Commentary analyzing the video recording, and instructional materials.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to foster active engagement of students, with the teacher and with each other, in a small-group exploration of a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

The Level 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence:

- that the teacher has established a safe, inclusive, and challenging environment that promotes active student engagement in the activities and substance of English language arts instruction.
- that the teacher draws on a detailed knowledge of students' backgrounds, needs, abilities, interests, and his or her knowledge of English language arts in selecting high, worthwhile, and attainable goals and in selecting instructional approaches that support those goals.
- that the teacher integrates reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing activities that are connected to the learning goals and that the instruction is sequenced and structured so that students can achieve those goals.
- of the teacher's understanding of the dynamics of small-group discussion.
- of the teacher's ability to foster student engagement and learning and of the teacher's skill in using open-ended questions, listening, and feedback to support active learning in a small-group environment.
- that the teacher encourages students to explore, clarify, and challenge each other's ideas in a respectful and fair manner.
- that the teacher uses appropriate, rich, and thought-provoking instructional resources to engage students in learning important English language arts content as part of the small-group exploration.
- that the teacher is able to describe his or her practice accurately, analyze it fully and thoughtfully, and reflect insightfully on its implications for future teaching.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the fostering of active engagement of students, with the teacher and with each other, in the small-group discussion of a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to foster active engagement of students, with the teacher and with each other, in a small-group exploration of a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher has established a safe, inclusive, and challenging environment that promotes active student engagement in the activities and substance of English language arts instruction.
- that the teacher draws on knowledge of students' backgrounds, needs, abilities, interests, and his or her knowledge of English language arts in selecting worthwhile and attainable goals and instructional approaches that support those goals.
- that the teacher integrates reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing activities that are connected to the learning goals and that the instruction is organized so that students can achieve those goals. However, the activities may not be as adeptly sequenced or structured as in a Level 4 response, and the integration may not be as seamless or as balanced as in a Level 4 response.
- of the teacher's understanding of the dynamics of small-group discussion.
- of the teacher's ability to foster student engagement and learning and of the teacher's skill in using open-ended questions, listening, and feedback to support active learning in a small-group environment.
- that the teacher encourages students to explore, clarify, and challenge each other's ideas in a respectful and fair manner.
- that the teacher uses appropriate instructional resources to engage students in learning important English language arts content in small-group exploration, though the resources may not be as rich or thought-provoking as in a Level 4 response.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice accurately and reflect on its implications for future teaching, though the reflection may not be as insightful as in a Level 4 response.

A Level 3 performance may show imbalance or unevenness in the different sources of evidence, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence of the fostering of active engagement of students, with the teacher and with each other, in the small-group discussion of a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence that the teacher is able to foster active engagement of students, with the teacher and with each other, in a small-group exploration of a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher has established a safe environment that promotes some measure of student engagement in English language arts instruction. The level of challenge may be limited, and/or attention to inclusiveness may not be evident.
- that the teacher draws on knowledge of students' backgrounds, needs, abilities, interests, and his or her knowledge of English language arts in selecting appropriate goals and in selecting instructional approaches that support those goals. The goals for student learning may be general, of limited significance, or only loosely related to the instruction.
- that the teacher integrates reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing activities. The activities may be only loosely connected to the learning goals, and the integration may be very limited, with one area dominating and others touched on very tangentially.
- of the teacher's understanding of the dynamics of small-group discussion.
- of the teacher's ability to foster student engagement and learning in small groups. Evidence of the teacher's skill in using open-ended questions, listening, and feedback to support active learning is limited. The discourse on the video recording may be dominated by teacher questions, and the questions may be mostly closed-ended or of limited scope in relation to the content being addressed.
- that the teacher encourages students to explore, clarify, and challenge each other's ideas in a respectful and fair manner.
- that the teacher uses appropriate instructional resources to engage students in learning English language arts content in small-group exploration.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice accurately. The reflection may be global or sketchy and may show limited understanding of implications for future teaching.

The Level 2 performance may hint at accomplished practice, but, overall, there is *limited* evidence of the fostering of active engagement of students, with the teacher and with each other, in the small-group discussion of a significant English language arts topic that is part of a sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to foster active engagement of students, with the teacher and with each other, in a small-group exploration of a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

The Level 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence:

- that the teacher has established a safe environment that promotes student engagement in English language arts instruction. The level of challenge may be very low, and the attention to inclusiveness may not be evident.
- that the teacher draws on knowledge of students' backgrounds, needs, abilities, interests, and his or her knowledge of English language arts in selecting goals and instructional approaches. The goals for student learning may not be goals at all, but rather activities. When stated, goals may be confused, trivial, inappropriate, or unconnected to instruction.
- that the teacher integrates reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing activities. The activities may be unconnected to the learning goals, and integration may be inappropriate or entirely absent.
- of the teacher's understanding of the dynamics of small-group discussion.
- of the teacher's ability to foster student engagement and learning in small groups.
- that the teacher uses open-ended questions, listening, or feedback that supports student learning. The discourse on the video recording may be entirely dominated by the teacher, whether questioning or lecturing. If questions are used, they may be closed-ended, trivial, or suggest "only one right answer."
- that the teacher encourages students to explore, clarify, and challenge each other's ideas in a respectful and fair manner.
- that the teacher uses appropriate instructional resources to engage students in learning important English language arts content in small-group exploration.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice accurately. The reflection may be missing or unconnected to the instructional evidence and show little or no understanding of implications for future teaching.

Viewed as a whole, there is *little or no* evidence of the fostering of active engagement of students, with the teacher and with each other, in the small-group discussion of a significant English language arts topic that is part of a learning sequence effectively integrating reading, writing, listening, speaking, and/or viewing.

Entry 4: Documented Accomplishments: Contributions to Student Learning

In this entry: You illustrate your partnerships with students' families and community, and your development as a learner and collaborator with other professionals by submitting descriptions and documentation of your activities and accomplishments in those areas. Your description must make the connection between each accomplishment and its impact on student learning.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher's ability to impact student learning through work with colleagues, professionals, families, and the community, and as a learner.

The Level 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence:

- that the teacher treats parents and other interested adults as valued partners in the child's education, and uses thoughtfully chosen, appropriate strategies for reaching out to the families of his or her students. The selected strategies may or may not be original to the teacher, but they are implemented with skill and enthusiasm and are effective in engaging parents and other interested adults in communication that is highly interactive, fostering extensive two-way dialogue focused primarily on substantive teaching and learning issues and individual student progress.
- that the teacher facilitates ongoing, mutually beneficial communications between students and the wider community in a way that enhances teaching and learning.
- that the teacher has strengthened his or her own teaching practice through conscious and deliberate professional development to strengthen knowledge, skills, and abilities in areas that are relevant to his or her teaching and learning context for the purpose of impacting student learning.
- that the teacher has worked collaboratively with colleagues to improve teaching and learning, either within the school or in the wider professional community.
- that the teacher has shared his or her expertise in a leadership role with other educators through facilitating the professional development of other teachers, improving instructional practices, or advocating for positive change in educational policy.
- that the teacher's work outside the classroom has been driven by a conscious and deliberate focus on improving teaching and learning, as opposed to merely fulfilling job requirements. The descriptions and documentation provide a rich, detailed, coherent view of a teacher who has made an impact on student learning through work with other colleagues, professionals, families, and the community, and as a learner.
- that the teacher accurately analyzes and thoughtfully reflects on the significance of all accomplishments taken together, and can appropriately plan for future opportunities to impact student learning.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher's ability to impact student learning through work with colleagues, professionals, families, and the community, and as a learner.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence of the teacher's ability to impact student learning through work with colleagues, professionals, families, and the community, and as a learner.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher treats parents and other interested adults as valued partners in the child's education, and uses appropriate strategies for reaching out to the families of his or her students. The selected strategies may or may not be original to the teacher, but they are effective in engaging parents and other interested adults in communication that is interactive, fostering two-way dialogue focused primarily on substantive teaching and learning issues and individual student progress.
- that the teacher facilitates ongoing, mutually beneficial communications between students and the wider community in a way that enhances teaching and learning, although the communications may not be as effective as those in a Level 4 performance.
- that the teacher has strengthened his or her own teaching practice through conscious and deliberate professional development to strengthen knowledge, skills, and abilities in areas that are relevant to his or her teaching and learning context.
- that the teacher has worked with colleagues as a partner or collaborator to improve teaching and learning, either within the school or in a larger professional context, such as within a professional organization.
- that the teacher has shared his or her expertise in a leadership role with other educators through facilitating the professional development of other teachers, improving instructional practices, or advocating for positive changes in educational policy.
- that the teacher's work outside the classroom has been driven by a conscious focus on improving teaching and learning, as opposed to merely fulfilling job requirements. The descriptions and evidence provide a coherent view of a teacher who has made an impact on student learning through work with other colleagues, professionals, families, and the community, and as a learner.
- that the teacher accurately analyzes and thoughtfully reflects on the significance of all accomplishments taken together, and can appropriately plan for future opportunities to impact student learning.

Overall, there is *clear* evidence of the teacher's ability to impact student learning through work with colleagues, professionals, families, and the community, and as a learner.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence of the teacher’s ability to impact student learning through work with colleagues, professionals, families, and the community, and as a learner.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher treats parents and other interested adults as valued partners in the child’s education, and uses appropriate strategies for reaching out to the families of his or her students. The rationale for the selected strategies may be a bit vague and/or there may be limited evidence that the strategies are effective in engaging parents and other interested adults. There may be evidence that though the strategies work with many families, some families are not being fully engaged.
- that the communications with families are focused on substantive teaching and learning issues. Instead, many of the communications may be dominated by procedural issues, behavior, or disciplinary matters, or the communications may not show much differentiation between individual students, with the same communication going to all families.
- that the communications with families are interactive. There may be frequent communications home but these may rely primarily on one-way media, such as notes home or newsletters. The evidence may suggest that parents are well informed about what is going on in the classroom, but there is limited evidence of two-way dialogue with families.
- regarding meaningful communications between the students and the wider community for the purpose of enhancing teaching and learning.
- that the teacher has strengthened his or her own teaching practice through professional development; even if the teacher has engaged in extensive professional development activities, it may be unclear how these activities relate to the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are relevant to his or her teaching and learning context.
- that the teacher has shared what he or she has learned with colleagues by working with them in a role as a partner, collaborator, or leader.

The evidence in a Level 2 response may indicate that the teacher is an accomplished practitioner within his or her own classroom, but that he or she has not shared his or her expertise with others in a significant way through professional development of other teachers, improving instructional practices, or advocating for positive change in educational policy.

The evidence may suggest that the preponderance of the teacher’s activities outside of the classroom has been to fulfill job requirements, as opposed to being a conscious and deliberate effort to impact student learning and improve teaching and learning.

- that the teacher analyzes and reflects on the significance of all accomplishments taken together, and can appropriately plan for future opportunities to impact student learning.

The Level 2 performance may be characterized by evidence that occasionally hints at accomplished practice, but overall, there is *limited* evidence of the teacher’s ability to impact student learning through work with colleagues, professionals, families, and the community, and as a learner.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence of the teacher’s ability to impact student learning through work with colleagues, professionals, families, and the community, and as a learner.

The Level 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence:

- that the teacher treats parents and other interested adults as partners in the child’s education, and uses appropriate strategies for reaching out to the families of his or her students. The rationale for the selected strategies may be very vague, unclear, or absent. There is little or no evidence that the strategies are effective in engaging parents and other interested adults. There may be evidence that some families are overlooked or ignored.
- that the communications with families are focused on substantive teaching and learning issues. Instead, the communications are taken up almost exclusively by procedural issues, behavior, or disciplinary matters.
- that the communications with families are interactive. Communications with families are entirely one-way and/or infrequent. Parents may not be kept informed about what is going on in the classroom. If evidence regarding outreach to the wider community is present, the connections may promote trivial interactions with little impact on student learning.

The Level 1 response may contain negative or disparaging comments about parents, community, or professionals with little or no evidence of the teacher’s efforts to improve the situation.

- that the teacher has strengthened his or her own teaching practice through professional development. If professional development activities are cited, they may be very sketchy or weak or of little or no relevance to the teacher’s context.
- that the teacher has worked with colleagues as a partner, collaborator, or leader. If school projects are cited, there may be little or no evidence of their impact on teaching and learning, or the teacher’s role in the project may be very unclear or very passive.

There may be evidence that the teacher is an accomplished practitioner within his or her own classroom, but there is little or no evidence that he or she has shared his or her expertise with others.

The evidence may suggest that the teacher’s work outside of the classroom has been carried out solely to fulfill job requirements, as opposed to being a conscious and deliberate effort to improve teaching and learning.

- that the teacher analyzes and reflects on the significance of all accomplishments taken together, and can appropriately plan for future opportunities to impact student learning.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence of the teacher’s ability to impact student learning through work with colleagues, professionals, families, and the community, and as a learner.

Scoring Rubrics for Assessment Center Exercises

Exercise 1: Literary Analysis

In this exercise: You analyze the connection between literary devices and meaning. You are asked to read a poem, discuss theme and effect, and use details from the poem to show how identified literary devices affect the text.

THE LEVEL 4 response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to provide an insightful analysis of literature and an in-depth explanation of the relationship between literary devices and meaning and effect of text.

Characteristics:

- Interpretation of theme and description of effect are insightful.
- Support for the theme and effect, using examples from the text, is thorough.
- Identification of three different literary devices is accurate.
- Explanation of the relationship between devices and effect is thorough and connected.

THE LEVEL 3 response shows *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to provide an insightful analysis of literature and an in-depth explanation of the relationship between literary devices and meaning and effect of text.

Characteristics:

- Interpretation of theme and description of effect are complete and appropriate.
- Support for the theme and effect, using examples from the text, is complete.
- Identification of three literary devices is accurate.
- Explanation of the relationship between devices and effect is connected.

THE LEVEL 2 response shows *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to provide an insightful analysis of literature and an in-depth explanation of the relationship between literary devices and meaning and effect of text.

Characteristics:

- Interpretation of theme and description of effect are simplistic or confusing.
- Support for the theme and effect, using examples from the text, is minimal.
- Some literary devices may be described inaccurately.
- Explanation of the relationship between devices and effect is loosely connected.

THE LEVEL 1 response shows *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to provide an insightful analysis of literature and an in-depth explanation of the relationship between literary devices and meaning and effect of text.

Characteristics:

- Interpretation of theme and description of effect are inaccurate or may be missing.
- Support for the theme and effect, using examples from the text, is ambiguous or missing.
- Identification of three literary devices is inaccurate or may be missing.
- Explanation of the relationship between devices and effect is minimal, confused, or missing.

Exercise 2: Universal Themes

In this exercise: You demonstrate the ability to analyze and understand text. You are asked to read a prose selection, determine the theme, and relate it to the human condition. You also select a nonprint text and connect it to both the passage and the theme.

THE LEVEL 4 response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the text and its connection to the human condition and provide an insightful analysis of print and nonprint texts, showing how both enhance the theme.

Characteristics:

- Interpretation of theme and its connection to the human condition is insightful.
- Support for the theme and its connection to the human condition, using examples from the text, is thorough.
- Choice of a nonprint work is insightful.
- Connection of the nonprint work, the passage, and theme, focusing on their similar components, is thorough.

THE LEVEL 3 response shows *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the text and its connection to the human condition and provide an insightful analysis of print and nonprint texts, showing how both enhance the theme.

Characteristics:

- Interpretation of theme and its connection to the human condition is detailed.
- Support for the theme and its connection to the human condition, using examples from the text, is effective.
- Choice of a nonprint work is appropriate.
- Connection of the nonprint work, the passage, and theme, focusing on their similar components, is complete.

THE LEVEL 2 response shows *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the text and its connection to the human condition and provide an insightful analysis of print and nonprint texts, showing how both enhance the theme.

Characteristics:

- Interpretation of theme and its connection to the human condition is simplistic or unclear.
- Support for the theme and its connection to the human condition, using examples from the text, is minimal.
- Choice of a nonprint work is loosely related to the theme.
- Connection of the nonprint work, the passage, and theme, focusing on their similar components, is sketchy.

THE LEVEL 1 response shows *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the text and its connection to the human condition and provide an insightful analysis of print and nonprint texts, showing how both enhance the theme.

Characteristics:

- Interpretation of theme and its connection to the human condition is inappropriate.
- Support for the theme and its connection to the human condition, using examples from the text, is ambiguous or missing.
- Choice of a nonprint work is inappropriate.
- Connection of the nonprint work, the passage, and theme, focusing on their similar components, is minimal or missing.

Exercise 3: Teaching Reading

In this exercise: You show your knowledge of the reading process and ability to analyze student reading. You are asked to read a passage, a student prompt, and a student response, and to determine the reasons for misconceptions in the reading. You also provide strategies to correct the misconceptions.

THE LEVEL 4 response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to provide a thorough explanation of a reader's misunderstanding in the reading process and an in-depth description of strategies used to correct misconceptions.

Characteristics:

- Identification of the misconception is accurate and informed.
- Support for the identification of the misconception is thorough.
- The two strategies are substantive and targeted to address the misconception.
- The rationale for each strategy is tightly connected to the misconception.

THE LEVEL 3 response shows *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to provide a thorough explanation of a reader's misunderstanding in the reading process and an in-depth description of strategies used to correct misconceptions.

Characteristics:

- Identification of the misconception is accurate and informed.
- Support for the identification of the misconception is appropriate.
- The two strategies are effective and targeted to address the misconception.
- The rationale for each strategy is connected to the misconception.

THE LEVEL 2 response shows *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to provide a thorough explanation of a reader's misunderstanding in the reading process and an in-depth description of strategies used to correct misconceptions.

Characteristics:

- Identification of the misconception is over-broad or unclear.
- Support for the identification of the misconception is minimal.
- The two strategies are vague and loosely related to the misconception.
- The rationale for each strategy is partially connected to the misconception.

THE LEVEL 1 response shows *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to provide a thorough explanation of a reader's misunderstanding in the reading process and an in-depth description of strategies used to correct misconceptions.

Characteristics:

- Identification of the misconception is inaccurate or misinformed.
- Support for the identification of the misconception is ambiguous or missing.
- The two strategies are either inappropriate or misinformed.
- The rationale for each strategy is missing or disconnected from the misconception.

Exercise 4: Language Study

In this exercise: You demonstrate an understanding of language study and ability to determine patterns in a student's language development. You are asked to read a second-language learner's oral and written response to a prompt, analyze patterns, and provide strategies to further develop that student's language.

THE LEVEL 4 response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to provide an in-depth analysis of discourse and a thorough description of teaching strategies used to facilitate the acquisition of English by second-language learners.

Characteristics:

- Identification of a significant feature of the student's oral discourse is accurate.
- Identification of a significant feature of the student's written discourse is accurate.
- Explanation of the student's second-language development is insightful.
- The two instructional strategies are informed and closely linked to the features of the student's second-language development.
- The rationales are tightly connected to each strategy.

THE LEVEL 3 response shows *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to provide an in-depth analysis of discourse and a thorough description of teaching strategies used to facilitate the acquisition of English by second-language learners.

Characteristics:

- Identification of a significant feature of the student's oral discourse is accurate.
- Identification of a significant feature of the student's written discourse is accurate.
- Explanation of the student's second-language development is appropriate.
- The two instructional strategies are appropriate and targeted to the features of the student's second-language development.
- The rationales are connected to each strategy.

THE LEVEL 2 response shows *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to provide an in-depth analysis of discourse and a thorough description of teaching strategies used to facilitate the acquisition of English by second-language learners.

Characteristics:

- Identification of a significant feature of the student's oral discourse is over-broad or unclear.
- Identification of a significant feature of the student's written discourse is over-broad or unclear.
- Explanation of the student's second-language development is minimal.
- The two instructional strategies are vague and loosely linked to the features of the student's second-language development.
- The rationales are weak or loosely connected to each strategy.

THE LEVEL 1 response shows *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to provide an in-depth analysis of discourse and a thorough description of teaching strategies used to facilitate the acquisition of English by second-language learners.

Characteristics:

- Identification of a significant feature of the student's oral discourse is inaccurate or misinformed.
- Identification of a significant feature of the student's written discourse is inaccurate or misinformed.
- Explanation of the student's second-language development is weak or confused.
- The two instructional strategies are simplistic or inappropriate to the features of the student's second-language development.
- The rationales are missing or disconnected from each strategy.

Exercise 5: Analysis of Writing

In this exercise: You demonstrate an understanding of audience and purpose in writing and an ability to analyze techniques authors employ to make a passage effective. You are asked to read a nonfiction passage, discuss audience and purpose, and analyze techniques that make the piece effective for the audience and purpose.

THE LEVEL 4 response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to provide a thorough explanation of the art of writing for a variety of audiences and purposes and an in-depth analysis of the relationship between audience and purpose and writing techniques.

Characteristics:

- Identification of audience and purpose is insightful.
- Support for choice of audience and purpose is thorough.
- Two chosen techniques are significant and tightly connected to audience and purpose.
- Support for the relationship between techniques and audience and purpose is thorough.

THE LEVEL 3 response shows *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to provide a thorough explanation of the art of writing for a variety of audiences and purposes and an in-depth analysis of the relationship between audience and purpose and writing techniques.

Characteristics:

- Identification of audience and purpose is accurate.
- Support for choice of audience and purpose is appropriate.
- Two chosen techniques are significant and connected to audience and purpose.
- Support for the relationship between techniques and audience and purpose is appropriate.

THE LEVEL 2 response shows *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to provide a thorough explanation of the art of writing for a variety of audiences and purposes and an in-depth analysis of the relationship between audience and purpose and writing techniques.

Characteristics:

- Identification of audience and purpose is simplistic or confusing.
- Support for choice of audience and purpose is sketchy.
- Two chosen techniques are vague and loosely connected to audience and purpose.
- Support for the relationship between techniques and audience and purpose is sketchy.

THE LEVEL 1 response shows *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to provide a thorough explanation of the art of writing for a variety of audiences and purposes and an in-depth analysis of the relationship between audience and purpose and writing techniques.

Characteristics:

- Identification of audience and purpose is inaccurate.
- Support for choice of audience and purpose is ambiguous or missing.
- Two chosen techniques are inappropriate and unconnected to audience and purpose.
- Support for the relationship between techniques and audience and purpose is minimal or missing.

Exercise 6: Teaching Writing

In this exercise: You show an understanding of the writing process. You are asked to read a student response, identify and discuss weaknesses, and provide strategies for correction.

THE LEVEL 4 response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to provide an in-depth description of patterns of writing and writing conventions and a thorough understanding of the recursive nature of the writing process.

Characteristics:

- Identification of the two significant weaknesses in conventions is accurate.
- Identification of the one significant weakness in organization or content is informed and substantive.
- Explanation of the weakness in organization or content is thorough.
- Two identified strategies are significant and tightly connected to the weakness in organization or content.
- Choice of the appropriate stage for application of the strategy is informed and aligned with the strategy and the identified weakness in organization or content.
- Rationale for choice of strategies is thorough.

THE LEVEL 3 response shows *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to provide an in-depth description of patterns of writing and writing conventions and a thorough understanding of the recursive nature of the writing process.

Characteristics:

- Identification of the two significant weaknesses in conventions is accurate.
- Identification of the one significant weakness in organization or content is accurate.
- Explanation of the weakness in organization or content is appropriate.
- Two identified strategies are worthwhile and connected to the weakness in organization or content.
- Choice of the appropriate stage for application of the strategy is appropriate and aligned with the strategy and the identified weakness in organization or content.
- Rationale for choice of strategies is appropriate.

THE LEVEL 2 response shows *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to provide an in-depth description of patterns of writing and writing conventions and a thorough understanding of the recursive nature of the writing process.

Characteristics:

- Identification of the two significant weaknesses in conventions is weak or confusing.
- Identification of the one significant weakness in organization or content is vague.
- Explanation of the weakness in organization or content is minimal.
- Two identified strategies are simplistic and loosely connected to the weakness in organization or content.
- Choice of the appropriate stage for application of the strategy is unclear and loosely connected with the strategy and the identified weakness in organization or content.
- Rationale for choice of strategies is weak.

THE LEVEL 1 response shows *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to provide an in-depth description of patterns of writing and writing conventions and a thorough understanding of the recursive nature of the writing process.

Characteristics:

- Identification of the two significant weaknesses in conventions is inaccurate.
- Identification of the one significant weakness in organization or content is inappropriate or inaccurate.
- Explanation of the weakness in organization or content is weak or missing.
- Two identified strategies are weak and loosely connected to the weakness in organization or content.
- Choice of the appropriate stage for application of the strategy is misinformed and disconnected from the strategy and the identified weakness in organization or content.
- Rationale for choice of strategies is weak or missing.

Produced for the



by

PEARSON

© 2009 by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards logo, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, NBPTS, National Board Certified Teacher, NBCT, National Board Certification, Take One!, 1-800-22TEACH, Accomplished Teacher, and Profile of Professional Growth are registered trademarks of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Other marks are trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective organizations.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Inc. has been funded, in part, with grants from the U.S. Department of Education and the National Science Foundation. Through September 2008, NBPTS has been appropriated federal funds of \$177.3 million, of which \$159.5 million was expended. Such amount represents approximately 31 percent of the National Board's total cumulative costs. Approximately \$360.8 million (69 percent) of the National Board's costs were financed by non-federal sources.

The contents of this publication were developed in whole or in part under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Prepared by Pearson for submission under contract with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards®.

Pearson and its logo are trademarks in the U.S. and/or other countries of Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliate(s).