



Early and Middle Childhood ART

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: A Portrait of Teaching over Time	2-1
Entry 2: Learning about Making Art	2-5
Entry 3: Learning to Study, Interpret, and Evaluate Art	2-9
Entry 4: Documented Accomplishments: Contributions to Student Learning.....	2-13
SCORING RUBRICS FOR ASSESSMENT CENTER EXERCISES	2-17
Exercise 1: Art-Making Processes	2-17
Exercise 2: Studying and Interpreting Art	2-19
Exercise 3: The Functions of Art	2-21
Exercise 4: The Nature and Value of Art	2-23
Exercise 5: The Evolution of Art	2-25
Exercise 6: Forming Processes	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: A Portrait of Teaching over Time

In this entry: You demonstrate how you plan and develop sequenced instruction to further students' growth in art and their understanding and attainment of an overarching art education goal, and how you assess student progress. You provide a Photo Storyboard containing 10 photographs taken during a period of instruction, a Written Commentary, and assessment materials.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to select and justify an overarching art education goal that is appropriate for his or her students, plan and implement sequenced instruction over time, and assess students' progress toward understanding the selected goal.

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

- that the teacher has selected a well-defined, worthwhile, and appropriate overarching art education goal that is important for these students in this instructional context.
- of the teacher's ability to develop and implement an instructional sequence that engages students in active art learning and links to the selected art education goal. The rationale for the sequence is strong and convincing, given his or her instructional context and the stated goal for these students.
- of the teacher's ability to implement instructional strategies and procedures in a logical sequence that shows high expectations for all students and enables them to progress over time toward the overarching art education goal.
- that the teacher's deep knowledge of students' individual and developmental learning needs, interests, and abilities informs instructional decisions.
- that the teacher demonstrates a thorough knowledge of art content linked with appropriate art pedagogy to facilitate students' deeper understanding of how and why art is made, seamlessly interweaving multiple aspects of art content into the instruction.
- of the teacher's ability to appropriately describe, analyze, and assess student progress through the use of summative assessment, showing in-depth knowledge of the students and differentiated insight into their learning.
- of the teacher's ability to describe his or her practice accurately, analyze his or her teaching fully and thoughtfully, and reflect on its implications and significance for future teaching, depicting a strong understanding of past teaching and providing substantive suggestions for future practice.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to select and justify an overarching art education goal that is appropriate for his or her students, plan and implement sequenced instruction over time, and assess students' progress toward understanding the selected goal.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to select and justify an overarching art education goal that is appropriate for his or her students, plan and implement sequenced instruction over time, and assess students' progress toward understanding the selected goal.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher has selected a worthwhile and appropriate overarching art education goal that is important for these students in this instructional context.
- that the teacher is able to develop and implement an instructional sequence that engages students in art learning and links to the selected art education goal. The rationale for the sequence is convincing, given his or her instructional context and the stated goal for these students, though the rationale may not be as strong or well articulated as in a Level 4 response.
- of the teacher's ability to implement instructional strategies and procedures in a logical sequence that shows high expectations for all students and enables them to progress over time toward the overarching art education goal.
- that the teacher's knowledge of students' individual and developmental learning needs, interests, and abilities informs instructional decisions.
- that the teacher demonstrates knowledge of art content linked with appropriate art pedagogy to facilitate students' understanding of how and why art is made, with multiple aspects of art content being addressed in the instruction.
- of the teacher's ability to appropriately describe, analyze, and assess student progress through the use of summative assessment, showing knowledge of the students and insight into their learning. The analysis may not be as deep or detailed as in a Level 4 response.
- of the teacher's ability to describe his or her practice, analyze his or her teaching, and reflect on its implications and significance for future teaching, depicting a clear understanding of past teaching and providing substantive suggestions for future practice. However, the reflection may not be as insightful as in a Level 4 performance.

The Level 3 performance may show an imbalance in the analysis and/or evidence presented for each student. One part of the response may be more indicative of accomplished practice than other parts, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to select and justify an overarching art education goal that is appropriate for his or her students, plan and implement sequenced instruction over time, and assess students' progress toward understanding the selected goal.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence that the teacher is able to select and justify an overarching art education goal that is appropriate for his or her students, plan and implement sequenced instruction over time, and assess students' progress toward understanding the selected goal.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher has selected an appropriate overarching art education goal that is important for these students in this instructional context. The goal may be vague, of limited significance, or loosely related to the instruction.
- that the teacher is able to develop and implement an instructional sequence that engages students in art learning and links to the selected art education goal. The rationale for the sequence may be vague or somewhat weak, given his or her instructional context and the stated goal for these students.
- that the teacher is able to adjust his or her practice to meet the needs of individual learners to understand the stated goal.
- of the teacher's ability to implement instructional strategies and procedures in a logical sequence that shows high expectations for all students and enables them to progress over time toward the overarching art education goal.
- that the teacher's knowledge of students' individual and developmental learning needs, interests, and abilities informs instructional decisions. The sequence may be composed of disconnected parts or provide limited avenues for student progress or be described in an ambiguous or confusing fashion.
- that the teacher demonstrates knowledge of art content linked to art pedagogy; students may be given limited opportunities to learn about how and why art is made.
- of the teacher's ability to appropriately describe, analyze, and assess student progress through the use of summative assessment. The analysis contains limited evidence of the teacher's knowledge of students and understanding of their development as art learners. The approach to assessment may not be summative in nature.
- of the teacher's ability to describe his or her practice, analyze his or her teaching, and reflect on its implications and significance for future teaching. The reflection may be global or sketchy and 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 that the teacher is able to select and justify an overarching art education goal that is appropriate for his or her students, plan and implement sequenced instruction over time, and assess students' progress toward understanding the selected goal.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to select and justify an overarching art education goal that is appropriate for his or her students, plan and implement sequenced instruction over time, and assess students' progress toward understanding the selected goal.

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

- that the teacher has selected an appropriate overarching art education goal that is important for these students in this instructional context. The goal may not be an overarching art education goal at all, but rather an activity. When stated, the goal is vague, trivial, inappropriate, or not connected to the instruction.
- that the teacher is able to develop and implement an instructional sequence that engages students in art learning and links to the selected art education goal. The rationale for the sequence may be missing or very weak.
- that the teacher is able to adjust his or her practice to meet the needs of individual learners.
- of the teacher's ability to implement instructional strategies and procedures in a logical sequence that shows high expectations for all students and enables them to progress over time toward the overarching art education goal.
- that the teacher's knowledge of students' individual and developmental learning needs, interests, and abilities informs instructional decisions. The learning experiences may be trivial, entirely closed-ended, or inappropriate for these students.
- that the teacher demonstrates knowledge of art content; students may be given little or no opportunity to learn about how and why art is made.
- of the teacher's ability to accurately describe, analyze, and assess student progress through the use of summative assessment. The analysis contains little or no evidence of the teacher's knowledge of students or understanding of their development as art learners.
- of the teacher's ability to describe his or her practice, analyze his or her teaching, and reflect on its implications and significance for future teaching. The reflection may be missing or unconnected to the instructional evidence and includes little or no evidence of an accurate understanding of past teaching and implications for future practice.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to select and justify an overarching art education goal that is appropriate for his or her students, plan and implement sequenced instruction over time, and assess students' progress toward understanding the selected goal.

Entry 2: Learning about Making Art

In this entry: You demonstrate how you teach and monitor student learning about art-making processes. You also demonstrate how you involve students in the assessment of their own progress, and you demonstrate how you utilize space and resources to create a physical teaching area that supports the learning of art in a safe environment. You provide an 18-minute video recording that includes a 2-minute visual pan of the classroom and two 8-minute segments from one lesson that show you helping students learn about making art. You also provide a Written Commentary analyzing the video recording and assessment materials.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate student learning about how and why art is made and demonstrate how he or she involves students in the assessment of their own progress.

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

- that the teacher sets well-defined, worthwhile goals that are central to art education, appropriate for the learning needs of students, and connect to the instruction.
- that the teacher's deep knowledge of students' individual and developmental needs, interests, and abilities informs the instruction.
- that the teacher makes thoughtful choices about organization, structure, and pacing of the lesson to address the learning needs of these students.
- that the teacher demonstrates a strong command of art content to facilitate students' deeper understanding of how and why art is made, seamlessly interweaving multiple aspects of art content addressed in the instruction.
- that the teacher has established a healthy and safe environment in which students can actively and creatively participate in the making of art.
- that the teacher fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which students are encouraged to participate in the making of art.
- that the teacher uses a rich variety of appropriate instructional resources to enhance student learning about making art.
- that the teacher is able to work interactively with students in ways that value students and their work.
- that the teacher engages students in dialogue about their work.
- that the teacher engages students in the reflection and assessment of their own work or the work of their peers.
- that the teacher engages in reflective thinking, describes his or her practice accurately, analyzes it fully and thoughtfully, and reflects on its implications and significance for future teaching.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate student learning about how and why art is made and demonstrate how he or she involves students in the assessment of their own progress.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate student learning about how and why art is made and demonstrate how he or she involves students in the assessment of their own progress.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher sets worthwhile goals that are central to art education, appropriate for the learning needs of students, and connect to the instruction.
- that the teacher’s knowledge of students’ individual and developmental needs, interests, and abilities informs the instruction.
- that the teacher’s choices about organization, structure, and pacing of the lesson address the learning needs of these students.
- that the teacher demonstrates knowledge of art content to facilitate students’ understanding of how and why art is made, with multiple aspects of art content addressed in the instruction.
- that the teacher has established a healthy and safe environment in which students can actively and creatively participate in the making of art.
- that the teacher fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which students are encouraged to participate in the making of art.
- that the teacher uses a variety of appropriate instructional resources to enhance student learning about making art, though the resources may not be as rich or as varied as in a Level 4 response.
- that the teacher is able to work interactively with students in ways that value students and their work.
- that the teacher engages students in dialogue about their work.
- that the teacher engages students in the reflection and assessment of their own work or the work of their peers.
- that the teacher engages in reflective thinking, describes his or her practice accurately, analyzes it fully, and reflects on its implications and significance for future teaching.

One part of the response may be more indicative of accomplished practice than other parts, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate student learning about how and why art is made and demonstrate how he or she involves students in the assessment of their own progress.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate student learning about how and why art is made and demonstrate how he or she involves students in the assessment of their own progress.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher sets worthwhile goals that are central to art education, appropriate for the learning needs of students, and connect to the instruction. The goals may be vague, of limited significance, or only loosely related to the instruction.
- that the teacher’s knowledge of students’ individual and developmental needs, interests, and abilities informs the instruction.
- that the teacher’s choices about organization, structure, and pacing of the lesson address the learning needs of the students.
- that the teacher’s knowledge of art content is used to facilitate students’ deeper understanding of how and why art is made. The art content addressed may be limited in its significance or may be treated in a surface manner.
- that the teacher has established a healthy and safe environment for the making of art. Opportunities for students to make art actively and creatively may be limited by the way that the teacher utilizes space and materials and sets up the instruction.
- that the teacher fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which students are encouraged to participate in the making of art. Opportunities for students to participate in the making of art in an equitable and accessible environment may be limited because of the way the teacher sets up instruction and interacts with students.
- that the teacher uses appropriate instructional resources. The resources used may promote primarily closed-ended or formulaic responses from students.
- that the teacher values students and their work. The teacher–student dialogue may be limited to procedural issues or simply limited.
- that the teacher engages students in the reflection and assessment of their own work or the work of their peers. The assessment practice used may be limited in the sources of evidence of student progress considered or be focused on a limited area of artistic development.
- that the teacher engages in reflective thinking, describes and analyzes his or her practice accurately, and reflects on its impact for future teaching. The reflection may be global or sketchy and show limited understanding of past teaching and implications and significance for future teaching.

The Level 2 performance may be characterized by evidence that hints at accomplished practice, but overall, there is *limited* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate student learning about how and why art is made and demonstrate how he or she involves students in the assessment of their own progress.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate student learning about how and why art is made and demonstrate how he or she involves students in the assessment of their own progress.

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

- that the teacher sets worthwhile goals that are central to art education, appropriate for the learning needs of students, and connect to the instruction. The goals for student learning may not be goals at all, but rather activities. When stated, goals are vague, trivial, inappropriate, or not connected to the instruction.
- that the teacher’s knowledge of students’ individual and developmental needs, interests, and abilities informs the instruction.
- that the teacher’s choices about organization, structure, and pacing of the lesson address the learning needs of these students.
- that the teacher’s knowledge of art content is used to facilitate students’ understanding of how and why art is made. There may be little or no art content in the instruction or there may be evidence of significant misunderstandings on the teacher’s part about how and why art is made.
- that the teacher has established a healthy and safe environment for the making of art. There may be little or no opportunity for students to actively and creatively make art because of the way the teacher utilizes space and materials and sets up the instruction.
- that the teacher fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which students are encouraged to participate in the making of art. There may be little or no opportunity for students to participate in an equitable and accessible environment because of the way the teacher sets up instruction and interacts with students.
- that the teacher uses appropriate instructional resources. The resources used may exclusively promote closed-ended or formulaic responses from students or may be inappropriate.
- that the teacher is able to work interactively with students.
- that the teacher values students and their work, and teacher–student dialogue may be trivial or nonexistent or not related to art learning.
- that the teacher engages students in the reflection and assessment of their own work or the work of their peers. The assessment practice used may be very restricted, inappropriate, focused on an insignificant area of artistic development, or missing.
- that the teacher engages in reflective thinking, describes and analyzes his or her practice accurately, and reflects on its implications and significance for future teaching. The reflection may be missing or disconnected from the instructional evidence and includes little or no evidence of an accurate understanding of past teaching and implications for future practice.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate student learning about how and why art is made and demonstrate how he or she involves students in the assessment of their own progress.

Entry 3: Learning to Study, Interpret, and Evaluate Art

In this entry: You demonstrate how you work with students to help them learn to study, interpret, and evaluate art. You also demonstrate how you assess student learning that resulted from the interactions seen on the video recording. You provide a 15-minute video recording of one lesson and a Written Commentary analyzing the video recording. You also provide assessment materials.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate students' learning to study, interpret, and evaluate art, and to assess the discussion.

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

- that the teacher sets well-defined, worthwhile and appropriate learning goals that are central to art education and connect to the instruction.
- that the teacher's deep knowledge of students' individual and developmental needs, interests, and abilities informs the instruction.
- that the teacher makes thoughtful choices about the organization, structure, and pacing of the lesson and strategies used in the classroom to address the learning needs of students.
- that the teacher's thorough knowledge of art content is used to engage students in meaningful discussion(s) concerning the description, analysis, and evaluation of art, seamlessly interweaving multiple aspects of art content in the instruction.
- that the teacher fosters a purposeful, equitable, and supportive learning environment in which students are encouraged to participate in open dialogue about why and how art is made. The dialogue evidenced on the video recording shows students engaged in a rich and dynamic discussion about why and how art is made.
- that the teacher uses a rich variety of appropriate instructional resources to enhance student learning about the study, interpretation, and evaluation of art.
- that the teacher describes, analyzes, and assesses classroom discussions in a way that demonstrates insight into students' understanding as evidenced through the teacher's use of informal or formal assessment.
- that the teacher describes his or her practice accurately, analyzes it fully and thoughtfully, and reflects on its implications and significance for future teaching. The teacher demonstrates a strong understanding of past teaching and substantive suggestions for future teaching.

Overall, the Level 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate students' learning to study, interpret, and evaluate art, and to assess the discussion.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate students' learning to study, interpret, and evaluate art, and to assess the discussion.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher sets worthwhile and appropriate learning goals that are central to art education and connect to the instruction.
- that the teacher's knowledge of students' individual and developmental needs, interests, and abilities informs the instruction.
- that the teacher makes choices about the organization, structure, and pacing of the lesson and strategies used in the classroom to address the learning needs of students.
- that the teacher's thorough knowledge of art content is used to engage students in meaningful discussion(s) concerning the description, analysis, and evaluation of art, with multiple aspects of art content in the instruction.
- that the teacher fosters an equitable and supportive learning environment in which students are encouraged to participate in open dialogue about why and how art is made. The dialogue evidenced on the video recording may not be as rich or dynamic as in a Level 4 response, but there is evidence that students are engaged in a meaningful discussion about why and how art is made.
- that the teacher uses a variety of appropriate instructional resources to enhance student learning about the study, interpretation, and evaluation of art. The resources may not be as rich or as dynamic as in a Level 4 response, but there is evidence that students are engaged in a meaningful discussion about why and how art is made.
- that the teacher describes, analyzes, and assesses classroom discussions in a way that demonstrates insight into students' understanding as evidenced through the teacher's use of informal or formal assessment.
- that the teacher describes his or her practice accurately, analyzes it fully, and reflects on its implications and significance for future teaching. The teacher demonstrates an understanding of past teaching and suggestions for future teaching. However, the reflection may not be as insightful as in a Level 4 performance.

One part of the response may be more indicative of accomplished practice than other parts, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate students' learning to study, interpret, and evaluate art.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate students' learning to study, interpret, and evaluate art, and to assess the discussion.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher sets appropriate learning goals that are central to art education and connect to the instruction. The goals for student learning may be vague, of limited significance, or only loosely related to the instruction.
- that the instruction is informed by knowledge of students' individual and developmental needs, interests, and abilities.
- that the teacher's choices about the organization, structure, and pacing of the lesson and strategies used in the classroom address the learning needs of students.
- that the teacher's knowledge of art content is used to engage students in discussion(s) concerning the description, analysis, and evaluation of art. The art content addressed may be limited in its significance or may be treated in a surface manner.
- that the teacher fosters a learning environment in which students are encouraged to participate in open dialogue about why and how art is made. The lesson featured on the video recording does address why and how art is made, but the dialogue may be largely dominated by teacher questions, and/or the teacher's questions may not promote in-depth thinking about art on the students' part.
- that the teacher uses appropriate instructional resources. The resources used may promote primarily closed-ended or formulaic responses from students.
- that the teacher describes, analyzes, and assesses classroom discussions in a way that demonstrates insight into students' understanding as evidenced through the teacher's use of informal or formal assessment.
- that the teacher describes and analyzes his or her practice accurately, and reflects on its implications for future teaching. The reflection may be global and sketchy and 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 that the teacher is able to facilitate students' learning to study, interpret, and evaluate art, and to assess the discussion.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate students' learning to study, interpret, and evaluate art, and to assess the discussion.

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

- that the teacher sets appropriate learning goals that are central to art education and connect to the instruction. 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 the instruction is informed by knowledge of students' individual and developmental needs, interests, and abilities. The teacher's choices about the organization, structure, and pacing of the lesson and strategies may actually impede students' learning.
- that the teacher's knowledge of art content is used to engage students in discussion(s) concerning the description, analysis, and evaluation of art. There may be little or no art content addressed in the lesson or there may be evidence of significant misunderstandings on the teacher's part about why and how art is made.
- that the teacher fosters a learning environment in which students are encouraged to participate in open dialogue about why and how art is made. The lesson featured on the video recording may not address art, or the event featured may not provide opportunities for dialogue or discussion at all or may reveal inappropriate, negative responses to students.
- that the teacher uses appropriate instructional resources. The resources used may exclusively promote closed-ended or formulaic responses from students or may be inappropriate.
- that the teacher analyzes and assesses classroom discussions in a way that demonstrates insight into students' understanding as evidenced through the teacher's use of informal or formal assessment. The assessment may be missing, disconnected from the instruction, or inappropriate for these students.
- that the teacher describes and analyzes his or her practice accurately, and reflects on its implications for future teaching. The reflection may be missing or disconnected from the instructional evidence and includes little or no evidence of an accurate understanding of past teaching and implications for future teaching.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to facilitate students' learning to study, interpret, and evaluate art, and to assess the discussion.

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.
- 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.
- 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 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, the 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: Art-Making Processes

In this exercise: You create an art product before you attend your assessment center appointment, using stimulus materials mailed to you in advance. At the assessment center, you are asked to describe, analyze, and reflect on the art-making processes you considered and used as you created an art product.

THE LEVEL 4 response offers *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the ability to describe and analyze the art-making processes used to create a simple art product and to reflect on the effectiveness of the options and challenges considered, choices made, and processes engaged in while developing the product, and to describe modifications for future artmaking.

Characteristics:

- Description of the candidate's personal art-making processes, both what was done and why it was done, is thorough and clear.
- Description of challenges and options that emerged during this art-making process is clear and convincing.
- Discussion of successful decisions and less successful decisions is thorough, with specific references to what the decisions were and convincing discussion about the effectiveness of the choices that were made.
- Description of how choices and planning might be modified to be more successful next time is clear and convincing.

THE LEVEL 3 response offers *clear* evidence of the ability to describe and analyze the art-making processes used to create a simple art product and to reflect on the effectiveness of the options and challenges considered, choices made, and processes engaged in while developing the product, and to describe modifications for future artmaking.

Characteristics:

- Description of the candidate's art-making process, both what was done and why it was done, is clear, although either what was done or why it was done may be more fully discussed than the other.
- Description of challenges and options that emerged during this art-making process is clear.
- Discussion of successful decisions and less successful decisions is clear, with some specific references to what the decisions were and why each decision was successful or less successful, although the discussion of the decisions and their effectiveness may not be equally thorough.
- Description of how it would be modified to be more successful next time is clear.

THE LEVEL 2 response offers *limited* evidence of the ability to describe and analyze the art-making processes used to create a simple art product and to reflect on the effectiveness of the options and challenges considered, choices made, and processes engaged in while developing the product, and to describe modifications for future artmaking.

Characteristics:

- Description of the candidate's art-making process discusses what was done or why it was done in only some detail, or discusses both what was done and why it was done in generalities.
- Description of the challenges and options that emerged during this art-making process is general or weak.
- Discussions of decisions made is brief and/or vague, with limited reference to what decisions and choices there were and/or reference to why decisions were successful or less successful.
- Description of how it would be modified to be more successful next time is limited and/or overbroad.

THE LEVEL 1 response offers *little or no* evidence of the ability to describe and analyze the art-making processes used to create a simple art product and to reflect on the effectiveness of the options and challenges considered, choices made, and processes engaged in while developing the product, and to describe modifications for future artmaking.

Characteristics:

- Description of the candidate's art-making process is confusing, very general, or missing.
- Description of the challenges and options that emerged during this art-making process is trivial, inappropriate, or missing.
- Discussion of decisions and choices made is confusing or vague, addresses trivial decisions, or is missing.
- Description of how it would be modified to be more successful next time is confusing, inappropriate, or missing.

Exercise 2: Studying and Interpreting Art

In this exercise: You use your knowledge of art criticism and your understanding of specific art concepts to analyze a work of art in terms of expressive, sensory, and formal qualities, and to discuss how these qualities, as well as symbolism and metaphor, contribute to the meaning of the work of art.

THE LEVEL 4 response offers *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of an understanding of art criticism, as demonstrated through a thoughtful analysis of a work of art that provides an informed discussion of how the expressive, sensory, and/or formal qualities of art affect its meaning and how symbolism and metaphor impact meaning in the work of art.

Characteristics:

- The analysis of the work of art demonstrates a clear, concise, and convincing understanding of art criticism.
- Discussion of how the expressive, sensory, and/or formal qualities contribute to the meaning and impact of the image is clear, convincing, specific, and firmly grounded in the work of art.
- Discussion of how symbolism and metaphor impact the meaning of the image is clear, convincing, specific, and firmly grounded in the work of art.

THE LEVEL 3 response offers *clear* evidence of an understanding of art criticism, as demonstrated through a thoughtful analysis of a work of art that provides an informed discussion of how the expressive, sensory, and/or formal qualities of art affect its meaning and how symbolism and metaphor impact meaning in the work of art.

Characteristics:

- The analysis of the work of art demonstrates a clear understanding of art criticism.
- Discussion of how expressive, sensory, and/or formal qualities contribute to the meaning and impact of the image is informed and firmly grounded in the work of art, although the discussion of some qualities may be unequal in clarity or specifics or the discussion as a whole is not as specific or convincing as in a Level 4 response.
- Discussion of how symbolism and metaphor impact the meaning of the image is clear and grounded in the work of art, although the discussion is not as specific and convincing as in a Level 4 response.

THE LEVEL 2 response offers *limited* evidence of an understanding of art criticism, as demonstrated through a thoughtful analysis of a work of art that provides an informed discussion of how the expressive, sensory, and/or formal qualities of art affect its meaning and how symbolism and metaphor impact meaning in the work of art.

Characteristics:

- The analysis of the work of art demonstrates a limited and/or unclear understanding of art criticism.
- Discussion of how expressive, sensory, and/or formal qualities contribute to the meaning and impact of the image may be limited to a broad discussion only and/or may be very general, or loosely grounded in the work of art.
- Discussion of how symbolism and metaphor impact the meaning of the art image may be limited to a broad discussion only and/or may be very general, or loosely grounded in the work of art.

THE LEVEL 1 response offers *little or no* evidence of an understanding of art criticism, as demonstrated through a thoughtful analysis of a work of art that provides an informed discussion of how the expressive, sensory, and/or formal qualities of art affect its meaning and how symbolism and metaphor impact meaning in the work of art.

Characteristics:

- The analysis of the work of art demonstrates little or no understanding of art criticism.
- Discussion of how expressive, sensory, and/or formal qualities contribute to the meaning and impact of the image shows little or no understanding of these artistic qualities, is not grounded in the work of art, is vague, or may be missing.
- Discussion of how symbolism and metaphor impact the meaning of the art image shows little or no understanding, may be vague, is not grounded in the work of art, or may be missing.

Exercise 3: The Functions of Art

In this exercise: You use your knowledge of art history and your understanding of the functions of art to describe a work of art created in a specific culture, time, and place. You are asked to discuss the role, purpose, and/or function of the work in its respective culture, time, and place.

THE LEVEL 4 response offers *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of an in-depth understanding of the role, purpose, and/or function of art made in a specific culture, time, and place, as demonstrated through a detailed description of the work, and a thoughtful discussion of its social, political, and/or historical contexts.

Characteristics:

- The description of the image or work of art is clear, detailed, and convincing.
- Discussion of the image or work of art:
 - is clearly, specifically, and convincingly grounded in the selected image;
 - clearly, specifically, and convincingly addresses the role, purpose, and/or function of the selected image;
 - makes specific, appropriate, and convincing references to the social, cultural, political, and/or historical context in which the work was made and viewed.

THE LEVEL 3 response offers *clear* evidence of an in-depth understanding of the role, purpose, and/or function of art made in a specific culture, time, and place, as demonstrated through a detailed description of the work, and a thoughtful discussion of its social, political, and/or historical contexts.

Characteristics:

- The description of the image or work of art is clear and detailed, although not as convincing as the Level 4 response.
- Discussion of the image or work of art:
 - is clearly grounded in the selected image;
 - clearly addresses the role, purpose, and/or function of the selected image;
 - makes specific and appropriate references to the social, cultural, political, and/or historical context in which the work was made and viewed, although the discussion of some qualities may be more specific and convincing than others, or the discussion as a whole is not as specific or convincing as in a Level 4 response.

THE LEVEL 2 response offers *limited* evidence of an in-depth understanding of the role, purpose, and/or function of art made in a specific culture, time, and place, as demonstrated through a detailed description of the work, and a thoughtful discussion of its social, political, and/or historical contexts.

Characteristics:

- The description of the image or work of art is limited or very general.
- Discussion of the image or work of art:
 - is loosely grounded in the selected image;
 - briefly or vaguely addresses the role, purpose, and/or function of the selected image;
 - makes brief or vague references to the social, cultural, political, and/or historical context in which the work was made and viewed; discussion of one aspect may be more skeletal or global than the other.

THE LEVEL 1 response offers *little or no* evidence of an in-depth understanding of the role, purpose, and/or function of art made in a specific culture, time, and place, as demonstrated through a detailed description of the work, and a thoughtful discussion of its social, political, and/or historical contexts.

Characteristics:

- The description of the image or work of art shows little or no understanding of the characteristics of the work, is not grounded in the selected image, or may be missing.
- Discussion of the image or work of art:
 - is not grounded in the selected image;
 - inadequately addresses or omits the role, purpose, and/or function of the selected image;
 - makes superficial, vague, or inaccurate references to the social, cultural, political, and/or historical context in which the work was made and viewed; discussion may be trivial or missing.

Exercise 4: The Nature and Value of Art

In this exercise: You use your knowledge and understanding of aesthetic theories and the nature and value of art to examine and analyze the aesthetic and artistic qualities of a work of art. You are asked to justify the interpretations and judgments you have made about the image.

THE LEVEL 4 response offers *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of a candidate's understanding of the aesthetic and artistic qualities of a work of art, as demonstrated through a thoughtful analysis and evaluation of the selected image and an informed rationale grounded in aesthetic theory that supports the analysis and evaluation of the image.

Characteristics:

- Discussion of the aesthetic and artistic qualities:
 - is clearly, specifically, convincingly, and firmly grounded in the selected image;
 - specifically and convincingly addresses the basic philosophical questions about the essence and the essential character of the selected work of art;
 - specifically and convincingly provides a thoughtful analysis of the artistic qualities of the work;
 - specifically and convincingly includes aspects of social, cultural, political, and/or historical contexts.
- An explanation that supports the analysis and evaluation made about the selected image is clear, convincing, coherent, grounded in aesthetic theory, and grounded in the work of art.

THE LEVEL 3 response offers *clear* evidence of a candidate's understanding of the aesthetic and artistic qualities of a work of art, as demonstrated through a thoughtful analysis and evaluation of the selected image and an informed rationale grounded in aesthetic theory that supports the analysis and evaluation of the image.

Characteristics:

- Discussion of the aesthetic and artistic qualities:
 - is clearly grounded in the selected image;
 - clearly and appropriately addresses the basic philosophical questions about the essence and the essential character of the selected work of art;
 - clearly provides an analysis of the artistic qualities of the work;
 - clearly includes aspects of social, cultural, political, and/or historical contexts.
- An explanation that supports the analysis and evaluation made about the selected image is clear, grounded in aesthetic theory, and grounded in the work of art; the explanation is specific although it might not be as convincing as a Level 4 response.

THE LEVEL 2 response offers *limited* evidence of a candidate's understanding of the aesthetic and artistic qualities of a work of art, as demonstrated through a thoughtful analysis and evaluation of the selected image and an informed rationale grounded in aesthetic theory that supports the analysis and evaluation of the image.

Characteristics:

- Discussion of the aesthetic and artistic qualities:
 - is loosely or vaguely grounded in the selected image;
 - briefly, tangentially, or vaguely addresses the basic philosophical questions about the essence and the essential character of the selected work of art;
 - provides a limited analysis of the artistic qualities of the work; this discussion may be inappropriate or general;
 - includes loosely related or general aspects of social, cultural, political, and/or historical contexts.
- An explanation that supports the analysis and evaluation made about the selected image is loosely grounded in aesthetic theory, and/or loosely grounded in the work of art; this discussion may be sketchy, global, or missing.

THE LEVEL 1 response offers *little or no* evidence of a candidate's understanding of the aesthetic and artistic qualities of a work of art, as demonstrated through a thoughtful analysis and evaluation of the selected image and an informed rationale grounded in aesthetic theory that supports the analysis and evaluation of the image.

Characteristics:

- Discussion of the aesthetic and artistic qualities:
 - is not grounded in the selected image;
 - inaccurately addresses or omits the basic philosophical questions about the essence and the essential character of the selected work of art;
 - provides an inappropriate analysis of the artistic qualities of the work; this discussion may be trivial, vague, or missing;
 - includes inaccurate, superficial, or inappropriate aspects of social, cultural, political, and/or historical contexts.
- An explanation that supports the analysis and evaluation made about the selected image is superficial or inaccurate, not grounded in aesthetic theory, and not grounded in the work of art; it may be trivial, or missing.

Exercise 5: The Evolution of Art

In this exercise: You use your knowledge of art history and your understanding of the contextual factors that affect the creation of art to discuss the social, historical, and/or political contexts of Western art through the examination of one artwork representative of an artist's body of work. You are asked to discuss the nature and significance of an important artist's work in the world of art.

THE LEVEL 4 response offers *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of an understanding of how Western art has been perceived as it has evolved, as demonstrated through a thoughtful discussion of the social, historical, and/or political contexts and the nature and significance of an important piece of Western art.

Characteristics:

- Discussion of key concepts that support the conclusion that the selected Western work of art was significant in the world of art:
 - is clearly, specifically, and convincingly grounded in the selected work of art, as representative of an artist's body of work;
 - makes specific, appropriate, and convincing references to the social, historical, and/or political context in which the work was made and viewed;
 - specifically, accurately, and convincingly addresses why this work, as representative of an artist's body of work, was considered important in the evolution of art;
 - specifically, accurately, and convincingly addresses the impact of this artist's body of work on the development of the world of art.

THE LEVEL 3 response offers *clear* evidence of an understanding of how Western art has been perceived as it has evolved, as demonstrated through a thoughtful discussion of the social, historical, and/or political contexts and the nature and significance of an important piece of Western art.

Characteristics:

- Discussion of key concepts that support the conclusion that the selected Western work of art was significant in the world of art:
 - is clearly grounded in the selected work of art, as representative of an artist's body of work;
 - makes clear and appropriate references to the social, historical, and/or political context in which the work was made and viewed, but may not be as thorough as the Level 4 response;
 - clearly addresses why this work, as representative of an artist's body of work, was considered important in the evolution of art, but may not be as substantial as the Level 4 response;
 - clearly addresses the impact of this body of work on the development of the world of art.

THE LEVEL 2 response offers *limited* evidence of an understanding of how Western art has been perceived as it has evolved, as demonstrated through a thoughtful discussion of the social, historical, and/or political contexts and the nature and significance of an important piece of Western art.

Characteristics:

- Discussion of key concepts that support the conclusion that the selected Western work of art was significant in the world of art:
 - is not clearly grounded in the selected work of art, as representative of an artist's body of work;
 - makes brief or unclear references to the social, historical, and/or political context in which the work was made and viewed;
 - briefly or unclearly addresses why this work, as representative of an artist's body of work, was considered important in the evolution of art;
 - briefly or unclearly addresses the impact of this body of work on the development of the world of art; the discussion may be sketchy, global, or missing.

THE LEVEL 1 response offers *little or no* evidence of an understanding of how Western art has been perceived as it has evolved, as demonstrated through a thoughtful discussion of the social, historical, and/or political contexts and the nature and significance of an important piece of Western art.

Characteristics:

- Discussion of key concepts that support the conclusion that the selected Western work of art was significant in the world of art:
 - is not grounded in the selected work of art, as representative of an artist's body of work;
 - makes trivial or inaccurate references to the social, historical, and/or political context in which the work was made and viewed; may be missing;
 - inaccurately addresses, or omits, why this work, as representative of an artist's body of work, was considered important in the evolution of art;
 - superficially or inaccurately addresses the impact of this body of work on the development of the world of art; the discussion may be supported by inappropriate evidence or missing.

Exercise 6: Forming Processes

In this exercise: You use your knowledge and understanding of the creative process to describe and analyze the media, tools, and techniques present in two works of art. You are asked to discuss how the artists' choices of forming processes affect the visual impact and meaning of both works of art.

THE LEVEL 4 response offers *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of an understanding of the creative process, as demonstrated through a thoughtful analysis of the media, tools, and techniques used for both works of art and an informed analysis of how the artists' choices of forming processes affects the visual impact of both works of art.

Characteristics:

- An analysis of the media, tools, and techniques used by each artist is clear, convincing, and specific, and firmly grounded in **both** works of art.
- Discussion of ways in which the visual impact and meaning of **both** works of art are enhanced by each artists' choice and use of media, tools, and techniques is clear, convincing, specific, and firmly grounded in **both** works of art.

THE LEVEL 3 response offers *clear* evidence of an understanding of the creative process, as demonstrated through a thoughtful analysis of the media, tools, and techniques used for both works of art and an informed analysis of how the artists' choices of forming processes affects the visual impact of both works of art.

Characteristics:

- An analysis of the media, tools, and techniques used by each artist is clear and grounded in **both** works of art.
- Discussion of ways in which the visual impact and meaning of **both** works of art are enhanced by each artists' choice and use of media, tools, and techniques is clear and grounded in **both** works of art although the discussion is not as specific and convincing as in a Level 4 response.

THE LEVEL 2 response offers *limited* evidence of an understanding of the creative process, as demonstrated through a thoughtful analysis of the media, tools, and techniques used for both works of art and an informed analysis of how the artists' choices of forming processes affects the visual impact of both works of art.

Characteristics:

- An analysis of the media, tools, and techniques used by each artist is unclear, very general, and not grounded in **both** works of art; the discussion may address only one work or may be inconsistent, tangential, or global.
- Discussion of ways in which the visual impact and meaning of **both** works of art are enhanced by each artists' choice and use of media, tools, and techniques is limited and/or unclear, very general, and not grounded in **both** works of art; the discussion may address only one work or may be inconsistent, tangential, or global.

THE LEVEL 1 response offers *little or no* evidence of an understanding of the creative process, as demonstrated through a thoughtful analysis of the media, tools, and techniques used for both works of art and an informed analysis of how the artists' choices of forming processes affects the visual impact of both works of art.

Characteristics:

- An analysis of the media, tools, and techniques used by each artist shows little or no understanding of these aspects of art, is not grounded in **both** works of art, or may be trivial, inaccurate, or missing.
- Discussion of ways in which the visual impact and meaning of **both** works of art are enhanced by each artists' choice and use of media, tools, and techniques may show little or no understanding of these aspects of art, is not grounded in **both** works of art, or may be trivial, inaccurate, 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).