



Early Adolescence

SOCIAL STUDIES–HISTORY

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: Teaching Reasoning through Writing	2-1
Entry 2: Fostering Civic Competence	2-5
Entry 3: Promoting Social Understanding	2-9
Entry 4: Documented Accomplishments: Contributions to Student Learning	2-13
SCORING RUBRICS FOR ASSESSMENT CENTER EXERCISES	2-17
Exercise 1: Documents (U.S. History and Political Science)	2-17
Exercise 2: Population Movements (Geography and World History)	2-19
Exercise 3: Systems (Economics and Political Science) (Prompt #1)	2-21
Exercise 3: Systems (Economics and Political Science) (Prompt #2)	2-22
Exercise 4: Social Movements (Political Science and U.S. or World History)	2-23
Exercise 5: Resources (Geography and Economics)	2-25
Exercise 6: Conflict (U.S. and/or World History)	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: Teaching Reasoning through Writing

In this entry: You demonstrate how you use writing assignments to teach reasoning skills to students. You choose three writing assignments/prompts and two student responses to each assignment/prompt. You also submit a Written Commentary that provides a context for your writing assignments and describes, analyzes, and reflects on the student work and your teaching.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher's ability to use writing assignments to advance students' analytic, persuasive, or interpretive writing skills and to enhance their reasoning about important social studies–history topics by drawing on various sources of evidence.

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

- that the teacher has a thorough knowledge of students as individual learners, sets high, worthwhile and appropriate goals for student learning that address social studies–history content and processes, and fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment.
- that student writing has been fully incorporated into overall goals for student learning in social studies–history.
- that the teacher engages students in using interpretive, persuasive, and/or analytic writing, and in using a rich variety of sources of evidence to advance and support reasoning, and enhance learning in social studies–history.
- that the teacher selects, adapts, and/or creates a variety of instructional resources and elicits writing from students that demonstrates students' understanding of intradisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary connections in social studies–history. The inter- or intradisciplinary connections are strongly made, and their use enhances student understanding.
- that the teacher is able to accurately describe, analyze, and evaluate each student's work on the basis of criteria that are known to students and clearly connected to the learning goals.
- that the teacher is able to provide supportive and constructive feedback that enhances student learning. The teacher's solid social studies–history content knowledge is evident in the response.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice accurately, and to reflect insightfully on its implications and significance for his or her future teaching.

Overall, the Level 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher's ability to use writing assignments to advance students' analytic, persuasive, or interpretive writing skills and to enhance their reasoning about important social studies–history topics by drawing on various sources of evidence.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use writing assignments to advance students’ analytic, persuasive, or interpretive writing skills and to enhance their reasoning about important social studies–history topics by drawing on various sources of evidence.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher has a knowledge of students as individual learners, sets clear and appropriate goals for student learning that address social studies–history content and processes, and fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment.
- that student writing has been incorporated into overall goals for student learning in social studies–history.
- that the teacher engages students in using interpretive, persuasive, and/or analytic writing, and in using evidence to advance and support reasoning, and enhance learning in social studies–history. The sources of evidence that students draw on may not be as rich or varied as in a Level 4 performance.
- that the teacher selects, adapts and/or creates a variety of instructional resources and elicits writing from students that demonstrates students’ understanding of intradisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary connections in social studies–history, though the connections may not be as strongly made as in a Level 4 performance.
- that the teacher is able to accurately describe, analyze, and evaluate each student’s work on the basis of criteria that are known to students and clearly connected to the learning goals, though the analysis may not be as deep or insightful as in a Level 4 performance.
- that the teacher is able to provide feedback that enhances student learning, though the feedback may not be as detailed or as extensive as in a Level 4 performance. The teacher’s social studies–history content knowledge is evident in the performance.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice accurately and to reflect on its implications and significance for his or her future teaching. A Level 3 performance may show imbalance in the analysis and/or evidence presented for each student or assignment.

One part of the performance may be more indicative of accomplished practice than the other, but overall, there is *clear* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use writing assignments to advance students’ analytic, persuasive, or interpretive writing skills and to enhance their reasoning about important social studies–history topics by drawing on various sources of evidence.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use writing assignments to advance students’ analytic, persuasive, or interpretive writing skills and to enhance their reasoning about important social studies–history topics by drawing on various sources of evidence.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher has knowledge of students as individual learners, sets goals for student learning and fosters a learning environment that may be fair, equitable, and accessible, but not necessarily for all students. The goals may be vaguely articulated, of limited significance, or only loosely related to the instruction. The goals may emphasize content only or process only.

There is some evidence that student writing has been incorporated into overall goals for student learning, but may only be done in a cursory way.

- that the teacher engages students in using interpretive, persuasive, and/or analytic writing, but concepts, ideas, and activities may be limited in scope or depth.
- that students draw on sources of evidence in their writing, but the sources may be of a limited range or the students’ use of them may be tangential.
- that the teacher selects, adapts, and/or creates a variety of instructional resources and elicits writing from students that relates to intradisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary connections in social studies–history, but the connections may be somewhat strained and/or student understandings of the connections may be limited.
- that the teacher is able to describe, analyze, and evaluate each student’s work. The criteria on which the work is evaluated may be known to students, but they may be only loosely connected to the learning goals or of limited scope.
- that the teacher provides feedback to students, and the feedback may be incomplete, inaccurate, or not focused on the ideas in the writing. Evidence of the teacher’s social studies–history content knowledge may be limited.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice, but the reflection may be vague, restricted, or focused solely on procedural aspects of teaching.

The Level 2 performance may be characterized by evidence that hints at accomplished practice, but overall, there is *limited* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use writing assignments to advance students’ analytic, persuasive, or interpretive writing skills and to enhance their reasoning about important social studies–history topics by drawing on various sources of evidence.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use writing assignments to advance students’ analytic, persuasive, or interpretive writing skills and to enhance their reasoning about important social studies–history topics by drawing on various sources of evidence.

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

- that the teacher has knowledge of students as individual learners and that he or she fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment. The goals for student learning may not be goals at all, but rather activities. When stated, the goals are vague, trivial, inappropriate, or not connected to the instruction.
- that student writing has been incorporated into overall goals for student learning in social studies–history.
- that the teacher engages students in using interpretive, persuasive, and/or analytic writing; the writing may be trivial or inappropriate for these students or the selected topics.
- that students are expected or taught to use evidence to support their reasoning or the use of evidence may be very inappropriate.
- that the teacher selects, adapts, and/or creates a variety of instructional resources and elicits writing from students that relates to intradisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary connections in social studies–history.
- that the teacher is able to describe, analyze, and evaluate each student’s work. The criteria on which the work is evaluated may not be known to students, may be unrelated to the learning goals, or unrelated to students’ development as writers and thinkers about social studies–history.
- that the teacher provides appropriate feedback to students; feedback may be minimal, absent, or incorrect.
- of the teacher’s social studies–history content knowledge; or the response may show signs of serious misunderstandings of content.
- that the teacher is able to reflect on his or her practice. The reflection may be missing or unconnected to the instructional evidence.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use writing assignments to advance students’ analytic, persuasive, or interpretive writing skills and to enhance their reasoning about important social studies–history topics by drawing on various sources of evidence.

Entry 2: Fostering Civic Competence

In this entry: You demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of social studies–history, and your ability to deepen student understanding of an important topic/concept/theme in social studies–history. You submit a 15-minute video recording that shows how you engage your students in a whole-class lesson that links an important social studies–history topic to the world outside the classroom and a Written Commentary that contextualizes, analyzes, and evaluates your teaching efforts to foster civic competence in your students. You also submit instructional materials related to the lesson on the video recording.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher's ability to deepen student understanding of important social studies–history ideas and concepts that foster civic competence and connect social studies–history to the world beyond the classroom through a whole-class lesson.

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

- that the teacher has a thorough knowledge of students as members of the classroom community with diverse perspectives on social studies–history issues.
- that the teacher sets well-defined, appropriate, and worthwhile learning goals and incorporates them into overall goals designed to promote active student participation in examining social studies–history ideas and concepts that foster civic competence.
- that the teacher is able to engage students in a meaningful lesson that examines a significant social studies–history topic and uses appropriate procedures and strategies to help students connect social studies–history to the world beyond the classroom. Discourse on the video recording is characterized by students' active engagement with each other and with the teacher about the topic in a way that fosters democratic values and enables students to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to be responsible citizens of a constitutional democracy.
- that the teacher establishes a supportive classroom environment that encourages and fosters trust and equity, and enhances students' learning through the use of a stimulating variety of questioning, prompting, and other instructional strategies that elicit an appreciation of diverse perspectives on the part of students. The teacher effectively uses instructional resources to support student learning. The teacher's solid social studies–history content knowledge is evident in the performance.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice accurately, and to reflect insightfully on its implications and significance for his or her future teaching.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher's ability to deepen student understanding of important social studies–history ideas and concepts that foster civic competence and connect social studies–history to the world beyond the classroom through a whole-class lesson.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence of the teacher’s ability to deepen student understanding of important social studies–history ideas and concepts that foster civic competence and connect social studies–history to the world beyond the classroom through a whole-class lesson.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher has a knowledge of students as members of the classroom community with diverse perspectives on social studies–history issues.
- that the teacher sets appropriate learning goals and incorporates them into overall goals designed to promote student participation in examining social studies–history ideas and concepts, though participation may not be as active as in a Level 4 performance.
- that the teacher is able to engage students in a meaningful lesson that examines a significant social studies–history topic and that uses appropriate procedures and strategies to help students connect social studies–history to the world beyond the classroom. Discourse on the video recording is characterized by students’ engagement with each other and with the teacher about the topic in a way that fosters democratic values and enables students to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to be responsible citizens of a constitutional democracy.
- that the teacher establishes a supportive classroom environment that encourages and fosters trust and equity, and enhances students’ learning through the use of questioning, prompting, and other instructional strategies that elicit an appreciation of diverse perspectives on the part of students. The opportunities to think through and exchange ideas may not be as evident as in a Level 4 performance. The teacher effectively uses instructional resources to support student learning. The teacher’s social studies–history content knowledge is evident in the performance.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice accurately, and to reflect on its implications and significance for future teaching. A Level 3 performance may show imbalance or unevenness in the evidence.

One part of the performance may be more indicative of accomplished practice than the other, but overall, there is *clear* evidence of the teacher’s ability to deepen student understanding of important social studies–history ideas and concepts that foster civic competence and connect social studies–history to the world beyond the classroom through a whole-class lesson.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence of the teacher’s ability to deepen student understanding of important social studies–history ideas and concepts that foster civic competence and connect social studies–history to the world beyond the classroom through a whole-class lesson.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher has knowledge of students as members of the classroom community and sets goals for student learning related to a social studies–history topic. The goals may be vaguely articulated, of limited significance, or only loosely related to the instruction.
- that the teacher is able to engage students in a meaningful lesson about the social studies–history topic and that he or she is able to help connect social studies–history to the world beyond the classroom, and the connection may be trivial or irrelevant to the students.

There are limited opportunities for students to engage with each other in ways that foster democratic values and enable students to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to be responsible citizens of a constitutional democracy.

- that the teacher establishes a classroom environment that encourages involvement and fosters trust and equity. The teacher’s use of instructional strategies in the discussion may not elicit a greater appreciation of diverse perspectives on the part of students.
- of the teacher’s ability to use instructional resources to promote student learning. Evidence of the teacher’s social studies–history content knowledge may be limited.
- that the teacher is able to describe and analyze his or her practice, and the reflection may be vague, restricted, or focused solely on procedural aspects of teaching.

The Level 2 performance may be characterized by evidence that hints at accomplished practice, but overall, there is *limited* evidence of the teacher’s ability to deepen student understanding of important social studies–history ideas and concepts that foster civic competence and connect social studies–history to the world beyond the classroom through a whole-class lesson.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence of the teacher’s ability to deepen student understanding of important social studies–history ideas and concepts that foster civic competence and connect social studies–history to the world beyond the classroom through a whole-class lesson.

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

- that the teacher has knowledge of students as members of the classroom community.
- of the teacher’s ability to set goals that promote student understanding of important social studies–history concepts and ideas. The goals for student learning may not be goals at all, but rather activities, or the goals may be confused, trivial, or unconnected to the instruction.
- that the teacher is able to engage students in a lesson about the social studies–history topic and use appropriate procedures and strategies to help students connect social studies–history to the world beyond the classroom. There may be little involvement of the students at all, with the interactions depicted on the video recording emphasizing recall and regurgitation of facts.
- of opportunities for students to engage with each other in ways that foster democratic values and enable students to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to be responsible citizens of a constitutional democracy.
- that the teacher establishes a classroom environment that fosters trust and equity, or enhances student learning. The teacher’s use of instructional strategies in the discussion may be extremely repetitious or restricted and does not elicit an appreciation of diverse perspectives on the part of students.
- that the teacher effectively uses instructional resources. The teacher’s analysis of the instruction on the video recording may be extremely vague or completely disconnected from the evidence on the video recording.
- of the teacher’s social studies–history content knowledge, or the response may show signs of serious misunderstandings of content.
- that the teacher is able to reflect on his or her practice. The reflection may be missing or unconnected to the instructional evidence.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence of the teacher’s ability to deepen student understanding of important social studies–history ideas and concepts that foster civic competence and connect social studies–history to the world beyond the classroom through a whole-class lesson.

Entry 3: Promoting Social Understanding

In this entry: You demonstrate the teaching strategies you use for examining a significant topic in social studies–history through small-group interactions. You submit a 15-minute video recording that shows you circulating among and interacting with students who are engaged in small-group work that promotes students’ social understanding and develops their civic competence. You submit a Written Commentary in which you provide a context for your teaching, analyze and evaluate the students’ participation in the small groups, and in which you reflect on your teaching and how you might improve your teaching practice. You also provide instructional materials related to the lesson featured on the video recording.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use small-group interaction to examine an important topic in social studies–history in order to develop students’ civic competence and promote social understanding.

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

- that the teacher uses knowledge of students as individuals with diverse backgrounds and as social studies–history learners to inform instruction.
- that the teacher has established a worthwhile topic and related learning goals as central to social studies–history and can justify them as appropriate for his or her students and the specific teaching context. There is a direct link between important social studies–history content and appropriate instruction.
- that the teacher can effectively manage small-group interaction in order to meet the challenges of developing student understanding of important social studies–history topics.
- of the teacher’s ability to use instructional strategies that develop students’ ability to engage in significant interactions that promote students’ social understanding and develop their civic competence. The strategies reflect consideration of the unique learning needs of the students and show high expectations for all students. The dynamic interactions between students and between students and the teacher are focused on learning and are respectful.
- that the teacher has established a fair, equitable, and accessible learning environment in which all students are empowered to participate in class activities in ways that are instructionally sound for them as learners.
- that the teacher is able to employ appropriate assessment to obtain useful information about student learning and development.
- that the teacher is able to accurately describe, analyze, and evaluate classroom interactions and student understanding of the topic.
- of the teacher’s ability to engage in reflective thinking which describes his or her practice accurately, analyzes it fully and thoughtfully, and evaluates ways to refine it.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use small-group interaction to examine an important topic in social studies–history in order to develop students’ civic competence and promote social understanding.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use small-group interactions to examine an important topic in social studies–history in order to develop students’ civic competence and promote social understanding.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher uses knowledge of students as individuals with diverse backgrounds and as social studies–history learners to inform instruction.
- that the teacher has established a worthwhile topic and related learning goals as central to social studies–history and can justify them as appropriate for his or her students and the specific teaching context, though it may not be as well articulated as in a Level 4 performance. There is a link between important social studies–history content and appropriate instruction.
- that the teacher can effectively manage small-group interaction in order to meet the challenges of developing student understanding of important social studies–history topics.
- of the teacher’s ability to use instructional strategies that develop students’ ability to engage in interactions that promote students’ social understanding and develop their civic competence. The strategies reflect consideration of the unique learning needs of the students and show high expectations for all students, though the effectiveness of the strategies may not be as strong as they are in a Level 4 performance. The interactions between students and between students and the teacher are focused on learning and are respectful, though they may not be as dynamic as in a Level 4 performance.
- that the teacher has established a fair, equitable, and accessible learning environment in which all students are empowered to participate in class activities in ways that are instructionally sound for them as learners.
- that the teacher is able to employ appropriate assessment to obtain useful information about student learning and development.
- that the teacher is able to accurately describe, analyze, and evaluate classroom interactions and student understanding of the topic.
- of the teacher’s ability to engage in reflective thinking which describes his or her practice accurately, analyzes it fully, and evaluates ways to refine it. However, the reflection may not be as insightful as in a Level 4 performance. A Level 3 performance may show imbalance or unevenness in the evidence.

One part of the performance may be more indicative of accomplished practice than the other, but overall, there is *clear* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use small-group interaction to examine an important topic in social studies–history in order to develop students’ civic competence and promote social understanding.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use small-group interactions to examine an important topic in social studies–history in order to develop students’ civic competence and promote social understanding.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher uses knowledge of students as individuals with diverse backgrounds and as social studies–history learners to inform instruction.
- that the teacher has established a topic and related learning goals, but the goals may be vague or nonspecific, or may be inappropriate for the students and the specific teaching context, or show limited expectations for students. The connection between social studies–history content and instruction may be loose.
- that the teacher can effectively manage small-group interaction in order to meet the challenges of developing student understanding of important social studies–history topics.
- of the teacher’s ability to use instructional strategies that develop students’ ability to engage in interactions that promote students’ social understanding and develop their civic competence. The strategies may be formulaic and ineffective at promoting student learning. The interactions may be teacher-dominated or show a lack of respect for different perspectives.
- that the teacher has established a fair, equitable, and accessible learning environment in which all students are empowered to participate in class activities in ways that are instructionally sound for them as learners.
- that the teacher is able to employ appropriate assessment to obtain useful information about student learning and development. Assessment may not directly relate to the goals and instruction.
- that the teacher is able to accurately describe, analyze, and evaluate classroom interactions and student understanding of the topic.
- of the teacher’s ability to engage in reflective thinking which describes his or her practice accurately, analyzes it fully, and evaluates ways to refine it. The reflection may be vague, restricted, or focused solely on procedural aspects of teaching.

The Level 2 performance may be characterized by evidence that hints at accomplished practice, but overall, there is *limited* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use small-group interaction to examine an important topic in social studies–history in order to develop students’ civic competence and promote social understanding.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use small-group interactions to examine an important topic in social studies–history in order to develop students’ civic competence and promote social understanding.

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

- that the teacher uses knowledge of students as individuals with diverse backgrounds and as social studies–history learners to inform instruction.
- that the teacher has established a topic and related learning goals that are appropriate for the students and the specific teaching context. The goals for student learning may not be goals at all, but rather activities, or the goals may be confused, trivial, or unconnected to the instruction. The connection between social studies–history content and instruction may be superficial or illogical. The activities featured on the video recording may not address the selected topic at all.
- of the teacher’s ability to use instructional strategies that develop students’ ability to engage in interactions that promote students’ social understanding and develop their civic competence. The strategies may be formulaic and ineffective at promoting student learning.
- that the teacher can effectively manage small-group interaction in order to meet the challenges of developing student understanding of important social studies–history topics.
- that the teacher has established a fair, equitable, and accessible learning environment in which all students are empowered to participate in class activities in ways that are instructionally sound for them as learners. The interactions on the video recording may be trivial or superficial or may indicate negative, inappropriate reactions to students.
- that the teacher is able to employ appropriate assessment to obtain useful information about student learning and development. Assessment may be unrelated to the goals and instruction.
- that the teacher is able to accurately describe, analyze, and evaluate classroom interactions and student understanding of the topic.
- of the teacher’s ability to engage in reflective thinking which describes his or her practice accurately, analyzes it fully, and evaluates ways to refine it. The reflection may be missing or unconnected to the instructional evidence.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use small-group interaction to examine an important topic in social studies–history in order to develop students’ civic competence and promote social understanding.

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 performance 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.
- 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 performance 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: Documents (U.S. History and Political Science)

In this exercise: You identify the topic of a historical document, explain issues relevant to the creation of the document, explain the motivation of the author(s) for creating the document, and explain an opposing point of view from the same time period about the topic addressed in the document.

THE LEVEL 4 response provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately analyze a historical document, thoroughly explain the historical issues relevant to the creation of the document, explain the motivation of the author(s) for creating this document, and provide an in-depth explanation of an opposing point of view from the same time period about the topic addressed in the document.

Characteristics:

- Topic is accurately identified.
- Historical issues are fully explained in detail and are directly relevant to the creation of the document.
- Explanation of the motivation of the author(s) for creating this document is rich and insightful.
- Opposing point of view is from the same time period, directly connected to the topic, and is explained in depth.

THE LEVEL 3 response provides *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately analyze a historical document, thoroughly explain the historical issues relevant to the creation of the document, explain the motivation of the author(s) for creating this document, and provide an in-depth explanation of an opposing point of view from the same time period about the topic addressed in the document.

Characteristics:

- Topic is accurately identified.
- Historical issues are fully explained and are directly relevant to the creation of the document, but may not present as much detail as a Level 4 response.
- Explanation of the motivation of the author(s) for creating this document is thorough.
- Opposing point of view is from the same time period and is explained in detail.

THE LEVEL 2 response provides *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately analyze a historical document, thoroughly explain the historical issues relevant to the creation of the document, explain the motivation of the author(s) for creating this document, and provide an in-depth explanation of an opposing point of view from the same time period about the topic addressed in the document.

Characteristics:

- Topic may not be identified, or may be inaccurately identified.
- Historical issues may be sketchy or incorrect.
- Explanation of the motivation of the author(s) for creating this document is vague.
- Opposing point of view may not be from the same time period or may only tangentially relate to the topic addressed in the document.

THE LEVEL 1 response provides *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately analyze a historical document, thoroughly explain the historical issues relevant to the creation of the document, explain the motivation of the author(s) for creating this document, and provide an in-depth explanation of an opposing point of view from the same time period about the topic addressed in the document.

Characteristics:

- Topic may not be identified, or may be inaccurately identified.
- Historical issues are incorrect or unrelated to the document.
- Explanation of the motivation of the author(s) for creating this document may be vague or missing.
- Opposing point of view may not be from the same time period or may be missing.

Exercise 2: Population Movements (Geography and World History)

In this exercise: You describe the motivation for a specific population movement, the identified region before the population movement occurred, then analyze the impact of the population movement on the identified region.

THE LEVEL 4 response provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately describe and analyze a specific population movement, provide a detailed description of an identified region before the population movement occurred, and provide an in-depth analysis of two ways in which the specific population movement impacted the identified region.

Characteristics:

- Description of the motivation for the population movement is thorough and detailed.
- Detailed description of the region before the population movement occurred accurately and specifically addresses each of the identified characteristics.
- Analysis of two ways in which the specific population movement impacted the identified region is rich and in-depth.

THE LEVEL 3 response provides *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately describe and analyze a specific population movement, provide a detailed description of an identified region before the population movement occurred, and provide an in-depth analysis of two ways in which the specific population movement impacted the identified region.

Characteristics:

- Description of the motivation for the population movement is accurate and complete.
- Description of the region before the population movement occurred accurately addresses each of the identified characteristics.
- Analysis of two ways in which the specific population movement impacted the identified region is in-depth, but may not contain as much detail as the Level 4 response.

THE LEVEL 2 response provides *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately describe and analyze a specific population movement, provide a detailed description of an identified region before the population movement occurred, and provide an in-depth analysis of two ways in which the specific population movement impacted the identified region.

Characteristics:

- Description of the motivation for the population movement may be unclear, inaccurate, or incomplete.
- Description of the region before the population movement occurred may only vaguely address each of the identified characteristics, or may only address one or two of the characteristics.
- Analysis of two ways in which the specific population movement impacted the identified region is only loosely related to the population movement, or details may only be tangentially related to the population movement.

THE LEVEL 1 response provides *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately describe and analyze a specific population movement, provide a detailed description of an identified region before the population movement occurred, and provide an in-depth analysis of two ways in which the specific population movement impacted the identified region.

Characteristics:

- Description of the motivation for the population movement may be inaccurate or missing.
- Description of the region before the population movement occurred may not address the identified characteristics, may be incorrect, or may be missing.
- Analysis of two ways in which the specific population movement impacted the identified region may be vague, incorrect, or missing.

Exercise 3: Systems (Economics and Political Science) (Prompt #1)

Please note that Exercise 3 consists of two prompts, each of which is scored separately using rubrics based on a 2-1-0 scale. Once the individual prompts have been scored on the 2-1-0 scale, the results are converted to the National Board score scale of 0.75–4.25.

In this exercise: You define a political and economic system, explain the relevance of specific principles of these systems, and provide an example of the political or economic principle.

THE LEVEL 2 response provides *clear and consistent* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately define a political system, explain the relevance of a particular principle or concept within the identified system, and provide an appropriate example.

Characteristics:

- Definition of the political system is complete.
- Explanation of the relevance of the political principle is accurately connected to the political system.
- Example of the political principle and how it operates within the political system is appropriate.

THE LEVEL 1 response provides *limited and/or inconsistent* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately define a political system, explain the relevance of a particular principle or concept within the identified system, and provide an appropriate example.

Characteristics:

- Definition of the political system may be incomplete or only partially correct.
- Explanation of the relevance of the political principle is accurate, but may not include appropriate detail.
- An inappropriate example may be provided.

THE LEVEL 0 response provides *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately define a political system, explain the relevance of a particular principle or concept within the identified system, and provide an appropriate example.

Characteristics:

- Definition of political system is inaccurate.
- Relevance of political principle is sketchy, missing, or inaccurate.
- Example is incorrect or missing.

Exercise 3: Systems (Economics and Political Science) (Prompt #2)

Please note that Exercise 3 consists of two prompts, each of which is scored separately using rubrics based on a 2-1-0 scale. Once the individual prompts have been scored on the 2-1-0 scale, the results are converted to the National Board score scale of 0.75–4.25.

In this exercise: You define a political and economic system, explain the relevance of specific principles of these systems, and provide an example of the political or economic principle.

THE LEVEL 2 response provides *clear and consistent* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately define an economic system, explain the relevance of a particular principle or concept within the identified system, and provide an appropriate example.

Characteristics:

- Definition of the economic system is complete.
- Explanation of the relevance of the economic principle or concept is accurately connected to the identified system.
- Example of the economic principle or concept and how it operates within the economic system is appropriate.

THE LEVEL 1 response provides *limited and/or inconsistent* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately define an economic system, explain the relevance of a particular principle or concept within the identified system, and provide an appropriate example.

Characteristics:

- Definition of the economic system may be incomplete or only partially correct.
- Explanation of the relevance of the economic principle is accurate, but may not include appropriate detail.
- An inappropriate example may be provided.

THE LEVEL 0 response provides *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately define an economic system, explain the relevance of a particular principle or concept within the identified system, and provide an appropriate example.

Characteristics:

- Definition of economic system is inaccurate.
- Relevance of economic principle is sketchy, missing, or inaccurate.
- Example is incorrect or missing.

Exercise 4: Social Movements (Political Science and U.S. or World History)

In this exercise: You explain historical circumstances precipitating a specific social movement, identify a specific strategy and how it was used to draw attention to the social movement and/or effect change, and analyze societal changes resulting from the movement.

THE LEVEL 4 response provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately describe and analyze a specific social movement, identify specific strategies used, and provide an in-depth analysis of two societal changes that resulted from the movement.

Characteristics:

- Explanation of the historical circumstances that precipitated the movement is thorough and detailed.
- A specific strategy is identified and an accurate explanation of how it was used to draw attention to the movement and/or effect change is included.
- An in-depth analysis of two societal changes that resulted from this movement is included and is closely connected to the specific social movement.

THE LEVEL 3 response provides *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately describe and analyze a specific social movement, identify specific strategies used, and provide an in-depth analysis of two societal changes that resulted from the movement.

Characteristics:

- Explanation of the historical circumstances that precipitated the movement is accurate and complete.
- A specific strategy is identified and an accurate explanation of how it was used to draw attention to the movement and/or effect change is included.
- An accurate analysis of two societal changes that resulted from this movement is connected to the specific social movement, but may not contain as much detail as the Level 4 response.

THE LEVEL 2 response provides *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately describe and analyze a specific social movement, identify specific strategies used, and provide an in-depth analysis of two societal changes that resulted from the movement.

Characteristics:

- Explanation of the historical circumstances that precipitated the movement may be inaccurate or incomplete.
- A strategy and an explanation of how it was used to draw attention to the movement and/or effect change may only vaguely be mentioned or strategy may only be loosely related to the social movement.
- Analysis of two societal changes that resulted from this movement may not be connected to the specific social movement, or details may only be tangentially related to the social movement.

THE LEVEL 1 response provides *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately describe and analyze a specific social movement, identify specific strategies used, and provide an in-depth analysis of two societal changes that resulted from the movement.

Characteristics:

- Explanation of the historical circumstances that precipitated the movement may be inaccurate or missing.
- A strategy and an explanation of how it was used to draw attention to the movement and/or effect change may be incorrect, or may be absent.
- Analysis of two societal changes that resulted from this movement may be vague, incorrect, or missing.

Exercise 5: Resources (Geography and Economics)

In this exercise: You interpret a graphical display of data displaying a trend relating to the use of natural resources in a region outside the U.S., explain reasons for the occurrence of the trend, and analyze an economic and geographic impact of the trend on the region identified.

THE LEVEL 4 response provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately describe and explain a graphical representation of data, provide a detailed explanation of two reasons for the trend displayed in the data, and analyze one economic and one geographic impact of the trend on the region identified.

Characteristics:

- Description of the trend displayed is accurate and appropriate.
- Explanation of two reasons for the trend is detailed and substantive.
- An in-depth analysis of one economic and one geographic impact of this trend on the region identified is logical and informed.

THE LEVEL 3 response provides *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately describe and explain a graphical representation of data, provide a detailed explanation of two reasons for the trend displayed in the data, and analyze one economic and one geographic impact of the trend on the region identified.

Characteristics:

- Description of the trend displayed is accurate and appropriate.
- Explanation of two reasons for the trend is detailed.
- An accurate analysis of one economic and one geographic impact of this trend on the region identified is included, but may not contain as much detail as the Level 4 response.

THE LEVEL 2 response provides *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately describe and explain a graphical representation of data, provide a detailed explanation of two reasons for the trend displayed in the data, and analyze one economic and one geographic impact of the trend on the region identified.

Characteristics:

- Description of the trend displayed may be inaccurate.
- Explanation of two reasons for the trend may be overly broad, insignificant, or sketchy.
- Analysis of one economic and one geographic impact of this trend on the region identified may be weak or uninformed.

THE LEVEL 1 response provides *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to accurately describe and explain a graphical representation of data, provide a detailed explanation of two reasons for the trend displayed in the data, and analyze one economic and one geographic impact of the trend on the region identified.

Characteristics:

- Description of the trend displayed may be inaccurate or missing.
- Explanation of two reasons for the trend may be incorrect, or may be absent.
- Analysis of one economic and one geographic impact of this trend on the region identified may be vague, incorrect, or nonexistent.

Exercise 6: Conflict (U.S. and/or World History)

In this exercise: You analyze the causes and consequences of a particular conflict in society.

THE LEVEL 4 response provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to provide a detailed analysis of two causes of an identified conflict in society, and provide an in-depth evaluation of two consequences of the conflict.

Characteristics:

- Analysis of two causes of an identified conflict in society is accurate and detailed.
- Evaluation of two consequences of the conflict is in-depth and substantive.

THE LEVEL 3 response provides *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to provide a detailed analysis of two causes of an identified conflict in society, and provide an in-depth evaluation of two consequences of the conflict.

Characteristics:

- Analysis of two causes of an identified conflict in society is accurate and complete.
- Evaluation of two consequences of the conflict is detailed, but may not contain as much detail as the Level 4 response.

THE LEVEL 2 response provides *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to provide a detailed analysis of two causes of an identified conflict in society, and provide an in-depth evaluation of two consequences of the conflict.

Characteristics:

- Analysis of two causes of an identified conflict in society may be inaccurate.
- Evaluation of two consequences of the conflict may be uninformed, insignificant, or sketchy.

THE LEVEL 1 response provides *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to provide a detailed analysis of two causes of an identified conflict in society, and provide an in-depth evaluation of two consequences of the conflict.

Characteristics:

- Analysis of two causes of an identified conflict in society may be inaccurate or missing.
- Evaluation of two consequences of the conflict may be incorrect, or may be absent.

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).