



Early and Middle Childhood LITERACY: READING–LANGUAGE ARTS

Scoring Guide *for Candidates*

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

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

Contents

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

PART 1: UNDERSTANDING AND INTERPRETING YOUR SCORES

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

PART 2: UNDERSTANDING AND APPLYING THE SCORING CRITERIA

SCORING RUBRICS FOR PORTFOLIO ENTRIES	2-1
Entry 1: Promoting Literacy Development through Writing	2-1
Entry 2: Constructing Meaning through Reading	2-5
Entry 3: Integration of Speaking, Listening, and Viewing	2-9
Entry 4: Documented Accomplishments: Contributions to Student Learning.....	2-13
SCORING RUBRICS FOR ASSESSMENT CENTER EXERCISES	2-17
Exercise 1: Reading Comprehension	2-17
Exercise 2: Oral Language Acquisition Skills for Learners of English as a New Language	2-19
Exercise 3: Emergent Literacy	2-21
Exercise 4: Analyzing Student Reading	2-23
Exercise 5: Interpreting Visual Text	2-25
Exercise 6: Writing Development	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: Promoting Literacy Development through Writing

In this entry: You select one student to feature as an example of your work with students in promoting literacy development through writing. You submit two work samples from the selected student. You will also submit a Written Commentary. Your approach to assessment of the student's needs, analysis of that assessment in the design and implementation of instruction, and selected work samples demonstrating the student's writing development over a period of time are the focus of this entry.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher's ability to use assessment(s) to design instruction, to analyze and assess student writing, and to use literacy instruction and feedback to promote student growth.

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

- that the teacher accurately recognizes and acknowledges individual growth of students as it relates to social, verbal, and cognitive development and thoroughly explains how it affects the writing process.
- that the teacher thoughtfully formulates purposeful, short-term and long-term, data-driven instructional goals that are firmly based on local, state, and/or national standards and curricula.
- that the teacher uses assessment methods, formative and/or summative, to gain in-depth understanding of strengths and weaknesses in the students' writing, and to effectively monitor the students' progress over time.
- that the teacher employs a variety of developmentally appropriate and specific writing strategies to foster writing development and connect the reading-writing process to help students construct meaning.

In the Level 4 performance, the analysis of student ability, goals, and instruction are tightly connected and instruction seamlessly combines the reading and writing processes.

In the Level 4 performance, the teacher insightfully leads students to develop a variety of useful, practical, authentic, and developmentally appropriate approaches to proficiency in writing and in constructing meaning in their written work.

In the Level 4 performance, the teacher actively fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which students are strongly encouraged to participate and are shown genuine appreciation of and respect for their individual differences and unique needs.

In the Level 4 performance, the teacher thoughtfully engages in insightful reflection through critical analyses and evaluation of classroom practices to make thoughtful suggestions for future instruction.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher's ability to use assessment(s) to design instruction, to analyze and assess student writing, and to use literacy instruction and feedback to promote student growth.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use assessment(s) to design instruction, to analyze and assess student writing, and to use literacy instruction and feedback to promote student growth.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher accurately recognizes and acknowledges individual growth of students as it relates to social, verbal, and cognitive development and thoroughly explains how it affects the writing process.
- that the teacher thoughtfully formulates purposeful, short-term and long-term, data-driven instructional goals that are firmly based on local, state, and/or national standards and curricula.
- that the teacher uses assessment methods, formative and/or summative, to gain an understanding of the students’ strengths and weaknesses, and to effectively monitor the students’ progress over time.

The Level 3 performance indicates that the teacher clearly employs a variety of developmentally appropriate and specific writing strategies to foster writing development and connect the reading-writing process to help students construct meaning.

In the Level 3 performance, the analysis of student ability, goals, and instruction are connected and instruction combines the reading and writing processes.

In the Level 3 performance, the teacher leads students to develop a variety of useful, practical, authentic, and developmentally appropriate approaches to proficiency in writing and in constructing meaning in their written work.

In the Level 3 performance, the teacher actively fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which students are strongly encouraged to participate and are shown genuine appreciation of and respect for their individual differences and unique needs.

In the Level 3 performance, the teacher thoughtfully engages in insightful reflection through critical analyses and evaluation of classroom practices to make thoughtful suggestions for future instruction.

One part of the response may be more indicative of accomplished practice than others, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use assessment(s) to design instruction, to analyze and assess student writing, and to use literacy instruction and feedback to promote student growth.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use assessment(s) to design instruction, to analyze and assess student writing, and to use literacy instruction and feedback to promote student growth.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher accurately recognizes and acknowledges individual growth of students as it relates to social, verbal, and cognitive development and may not adequately explain how it affects the writing process.

In a Level 2 performance, short-term and long-term, data-driven instructional goals may be inappropriate and loosely based on local, state, and/or national standards and curricula.

- of the use of assessment methods, formative and/or summative, to gain in-depth understanding of strengths and weaknesses in the students’ writing, and to monitor the students’ progress over time is minimal.

In a Level 2 performance, strategies to foster writing development may be inappropriate and only vaguely connect the reading-writing process to help students construct meaning.

In the Level 2 performance, the analysis of student ability, goals, and instruction is somewhat connected and instruction vaguely connects the reading and writing processes.

- of ability to lead students to develop a variety of useful, practical, authentic, and developmentally appropriate approaches to proficiency in writing and in constructing meaning in their written work.

Evidence of ability to actively foster an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which students are strongly encouraged to participate and are shown genuine appreciation of and respect for their individual differences and unique needs may be weak or only somewhat effective. Reflection may be oversimplified or sketchy and understanding of implications and significance for future practice may be weak.

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 assessment(s) to design instruction, to analyze and assess student writing, and to use literacy instruction and feedback to promote student growth.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use assessment(s) to design instruction, to analyze and assess student writing, and to use literacy instruction and feedback to promote student growth.

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

- of recognition and acknowledgement of individual growth of students as it relates to social, verbal, and cognitive development and the explanation of how it affects the writing process may be inaccurate or incomplete. The goals may not be goals at all, but rather activities. Goals may be trivial or unrelated to the instructional sequence or to local, state, and/or national standards and curricula.
- of assessment methods, formative and/or summative.
- of understanding of strengths and weaknesses in the students’ writing, and monitoring of the students’ progress over time may be ineffective.

In the Level 1 performance, the analysis of student ability, goals, and instruction is loose or disconnected and connections between the reading and writing processes are sketchy or absent.

In a Level 1 performance, strategies to foster writing development may be missing or ineffective.

- of ability to lead students to develop a variety of useful, practical, authentic, and developmentally appropriate approaches to proficiency in writing and in constructing meaning in their written work.

Evidence of ability to actively foster an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which students are strongly encouraged to participate and are shown genuine appreciation of and respect for their individual differences and unique needs may be missing or ineffective. The reflection may be missing or unrelated to future instruction.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence of the teacher’s ability to use assessment(s) to design instruction, to analyze and assess student writing, and to use literacy instruction and feedback to promote student growth.

Entry 2: Constructing Meaning through Reading

In this entry: You submit a 15-minute video recording, a Written Commentary, and instructional materials that demonstrate your knowledge of the reading process and your ability to nurture learners in their growth as readers through your use of assessment and instructional materials.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the teacher's ability to support diverse learners in their growth as readers, and to engage students in constructing meaning from texts that are developmentally appropriate for them.

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

- of accurate recognition and acknowledgement of individual growth of students as it relates to social, verbal, and cognitive development and an insightful explanation of how these attributes affect the literacy development.
- of in-depth knowledge of how literacy develops and effective use of this knowledge to help set attainable and appropriate learning goals for students.
- of the effective use of varied assessment tools.
- of thorough knowledge of current literature and reading theories to inform planning, implementation, and evaluation of a differentiated and purposeful lesson.

In a Level 4 performance, instruction is designed to use a variety of purposeful strategies for students to construct meaning from reading.

- of instruction that is effectively designed and implemented with learning activities based on the interrelatedness of reading with the other language arts and/or content areas.
- of insightful utilization of a rich variety of developmentally appropriate resources including commercial, teacher, and student-generated materials.
- of an active fostering of a learning environment in which instructional resources are developmentally appropriate and where all students feel welcomed, valued, and respected.

In the Level 4 performance, reflection on the effectiveness of instruction and plans for future instruction is worthwhile and thoughtful.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the ability to support diverse learners in their growth as readers, and to engage students in constructing meaning from texts that are developmentally appropriate for them.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence of the teacher’s ability to support diverse learners in their growth as readers, and to engage students in constructing meaning from texts that are developmentally appropriate for them.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- of accurate recognition and acknowledgement of individual growth of students as it relates to social, verbal, and cognitive development and an insightful explanation of how these attributes affect the literacy development.
- of in-depth knowledge of how literacy develops and effective use of this knowledge to help set attainable and appropriate learning goals for students.
- of the effective use of varied assessment tools.
- of thorough knowledge of current literature and reading theories to inform planning, implementation, and evaluation of a differentiated and purposeful lesson.

In a Level 3 performance, instruction is designed to use a variety of appropriate strategies for students to construct meaning from reading.

- of instruction that is effectively designed and implemented with learning activities based on the interrelatedness of reading with the other language arts and/or subject areas.
- of insightful utilization of a variety of developmentally appropriate resources including commercial, teacher, and student-generated materials.
- of an active fostering of a learning environment in which instructional resources are developmentally appropriate and where all students feel welcomed, valued, and respected.

In the Level 3 performance, reflection on the effectiveness of instruction and plans for future instruction is worthwhile and thoughtful.

One part of the response may be more indicative of accomplished practice than another, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence of the ability to support diverse learners in their growth as readers, and to engage students in constructing meaning from texts that are developmentally appropriate for them.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence of the teacher’s ability to support diverse learners in their growth as readers, and to engage students in constructing meaning from texts that are developmentally appropriate for them.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- of recognition and acknowledgement of individual growth of students as it relates to social, verbal, and cognitive development and a weak explanation of how these attributes affect the literacy development.
- of in-depth knowledge of how literacy develops and provides sketchy use of this knowledge to help set attainable and appropriate learning goals for students.
- of the use of varied assessment tools.

In the Level 2 performance, there is insufficient knowledge of current literature and reading theories to inform planning, implementation, and evaluation of a differentiated and purposeful lesson.

In a Level 2 performance, instruction may include a few appropriate strategies for students to construct meaning from reading.

- of instruction that is effectively designed and implemented with learning activities based on the interrelatedness of reading with the other language arts and/or subject areas.

In a Level 2 performance, resources used may be restricted to a few types of material and these may not be appropriate in furthering the goals of the lesson.

- of an active fostering of a learning environment in which instructional resources are developmentally appropriate and where all students feel welcomed, valued, and respected. The reflection may be oversimplified or weak and show sketchy understanding of implications and significance for future practice.

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 support diverse learners in their growth as readers, and to engage students in constructing meaning from texts that are developmentally appropriate for them.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence of the teacher’s ability to support diverse learners in their growth as readers, and to engage students in constructing meaning from texts that are developmentally appropriate for them.

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

- of recognition and acknowledgement of individual growth of students as it relates to social, verbal, and cognitive development and the explanation of how these attributes affect literacy development is missing or minimal.
- of knowledge of how literacy develops and use of this knowledge to help set attainable and appropriate learning goals for students is inadequate.
- of the use of varied assessment tools.
- of knowledge of current literature and reading theories to inform planning, implementation, or of evaluation of a differentiated and purposeful lesson.

In a Level 1 performance, instruction fails to use appropriate strategies for students to construct meaning from reading.

- of instruction that is effectively designed and implemented and learning activities do not foster the interrelatedness of reading with the other language arts and/or subject areas.

In a Level 1 performance, few resources are used and these may not be appropriate in furthering the goals of the lesson.

- of an active fostering of a learning environment in which instructional resources are developmentally appropriate and where all students feel welcomed, valued, and respected. The reflection may be missing or weak with minimal insight into implications and significance for future practice.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence of the teacher’s ability to support diverse learners in their growth as readers, and to engage students in constructing meaning from texts that are developmentally appropriate for them.

Entry 3: Integration of Speaking, Listening, and Viewing

In this entry: You submit a 15-minute video recording, a Written Commentary, and instructional materials of an interdisciplinary lesson using technology that demonstrates your knowledge and understanding of the relationship between speaking, listening, and viewing in literacy development.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the ability to plan and facilitate an interdisciplinary learning experience that incorporates technology in fostering effective speaking, listening, and viewing for a specific purpose and audience.

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

- of in-depth knowledge of students' language and literacy background to appropriately incorporate instructional strategies to integrate speaking, listening, and viewing.
- of use of observation and/or assessment to recognize the skills and abilities that students bring to their learning and to logically develop goals and thoughtfully plan ongoing instruction that is developmentally appropriate.
- of a deep knowledge of speaking, listening, and viewing strategies and use of this knowledge to guide student development.

The Level 4 performance provides reasonable opportunities for students to use speaking, listening, and viewing to construct meaning by making connections with other disciplines.

- of appropriately formulated instruction to help student(s) progress as speakers, listeners, and viewers.

In a Level 4 performance, instruction is effectively differentiated to accommodate learners of diverse abilities, backgrounds, and/or experiences.

- of developmentally appropriate technology and a variety of instructional resources to support student investigations of language and the world.
- of a learning environment in which student(s) feel comfortable speaking and are respectful listeners.
- of dynamic listening and viewing activities that encourage opportunities for students to demonstrate clarity, awareness of audience, purpose, and/or context in speaking.
- of thoughtful reflection and an active effort to improve teaching by honest examination of instruction and modifications of that instruction for the future.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the ability to plan and facilitate an interdisciplinary learning experience that incorporates technology in fostering effective speaking, listening, and viewing for a specific purpose and audience.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence of the ability to plan and facilitate an interdisciplinary learning experience that incorporates technology in fostering effective speaking, listening, and viewing for a specific purpose and audience.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- of in-depth knowledge of students' language and literacy background to appropriately incorporate instructional strategies to integrate speaking, listening, and viewing.
- of use of observation and/or assessment to recognize the skills and abilities that students bring to their learning and to logically develop goals and thoughtfully plan ongoing instruction that is developmentally appropriate.
- of knowledge of speaking, listening, and viewing strategies and use of this knowledge to guide student development.

The Level 3 performance provides opportunities for students to use speaking, listening, and viewing to construct meaning by making connections with other disciplines.

- of appropriately formulated instruction to help student(s) progress as speakers, listeners, and viewers.

In a Level 3 performance, instruction is differentiated to accommodate learners of diverse abilities, backgrounds, and/or experiences.

- of use of developmentally appropriate technology and a variety of instructional resources to support student investigations of language and the world.
- of a learning environment in which student(s) feel comfortable speaking and are respectful listeners.
- of dynamic listening and viewing activities that encourage opportunities for students to demonstrate clarity, awareness of audience, purpose, and/or context in speaking.
- of thoughtful reflection and an active effort to improve teaching by honest examination of instruction and modifications of that instruction for the future.

One part of the response may be more indicative of accomplished practice than another, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence of the ability to plan and facilitate an interdisciplinary learning experience that incorporates technology in fostering effective speaking, listening, and viewing for a specific purpose and audience.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence of the ability to plan and facilitate an interdisciplinary learning experience that incorporates technology in fostering effective speaking, listening, and viewing for a specific purpose and audience.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- of knowledge of students' language and literacy background to appropriately incorporate instructional strategies to integrate speaking, listening, and viewing.
- of the use of observation and/or assessment to recognize the skills and abilities that students bring to their learning and to develop goals and plan ongoing instruction that is developmentally appropriate.
- of knowledge of speaking, listening, and viewing strategies and use of this knowledge to guide student development.

The Level 2 performance provides few opportunities for students to use speaking, listening, and viewing to construct meaning by making connections with other disciplines.

- of instruction that actively guides students to progress as speakers, listeners, and viewers.

In a Level 2 performance, instruction is minimally differentiated to accommodate learners of diverse abilities, backgrounds, and/or experiences.

In a Level 2 performance, technologies used may be marginally appropriate and instructional resources are not varied or only weakly support student investigations of language and the world.

- of a learning environment in which student(s) feel comfortable speaking and are respectful listeners.

In a Level 2 performance, listening and viewing activities may only minimally encourage opportunities for students to demonstrate clarity, awareness of audience, purpose, and/or context in speaking.

- of thoughtful reflection and there is some effort to improve teaching by examination of instruction with sketchy modifications of that instruction for the future.

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 plan and facilitate an interdisciplinary learning experience that incorporates technology in fostering effective speaking, listening, and viewing for a specific purpose and audience.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence of the ability to plan and facilitate an interdisciplinary learning experience that incorporates technology in fostering effective speaking, listening, and viewing for a specific purpose and audience.

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

- of in-depth knowledge of students' language and literacy background to appropriately incorporate instructional strategies to integrate speaking, listening, and viewing.
- of the use of observation and/or assessment to recognize the skills and abilities that students bring to their learning and to logically develop goals and thoughtfully plan ongoing instruction that is developmentally appropriate.
- of knowledge of speaking, listening, and viewing strategies and use of this knowledge to guide student development.

The Level 1 performance fails to provide opportunities for students to use speaking, listening, and viewing to construct meaning by making connections with other disciplines.

In the Level 1 performance, instruction may be inappropriate and fail to help student(s) progress as listeners, viewers, and speakers.

In a Level 1 performance, instruction is not differentiated to accommodate learners of diverse abilities, backgrounds, and/or experiences.

In a Level 1 performance, technology used may be minimal or inappropriate and instructional resources may not be varied or support student investigations of language and the world.

- of a learning environment in which student(s) feel comfortable speaking and are respectful listeners.

In a Level 1 performance, listening and viewing activities do not give adequate opportunity for students to demonstrate clarity, awareness of audience, purpose, and/or context in speaking.

In a Level 1 performance the reflection may be missing or weak with minimal insight into implications and significance for future practice.

In a Level 1 performance, there is *little or no* evidence of the teacher's ability to plan and facilitate an interdisciplinary learning experience that incorporates technology in fostering effective speaking, listening, and viewing for a specific purpose and audience.

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. There is limited evidence 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/she has learned with colleagues by working with them in a role as a partner, collaborator, or leader.

The evidence in a Level 2 response may indicate that the teacher is an accomplished practitioner within his or her own classroom, but that he/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 response may contain negative or disparaging comments about parents, community, or professionals with little or no evidence of the teacher’s efforts to improve the situation.

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

There may be evidence that the teacher is an accomplished practitioner within his or her own classroom, but there is little or no evidence that he/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: Reading Comprehension

In this exercise: You analyze a student’s comprehension of an excerpt of text and suggest a strategy to use with this student to improve comprehension.

THE LEVEL 4 response provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of a thorough and complete knowledge of analysis of reading comprehension and an appropriate application of this knowledge by proposing a teaching strategy designed to improve student comprehension.

Characteristics:

- One strength and one weakness in the student’s comprehension are thoroughly and accurately analyzed.
- Specific examples cited from the student’s response are insightful and tightly connected.
- One developmentally appropriate teaching strategy that might be used to support student comprehension is described in-depth and is solidly based on analysis.
- An appropriate rationale for the strategy is provided which includes evidence of research or theory.

THE LEVEL 3 response provides *clear* evidence of a thorough and complete knowledge of analysis of reading comprehension and an appropriate application of this knowledge by proposing a teaching strategy designed to improve student comprehension.

Characteristics:

- One strength and one weakness in the student’s comprehension are correctly analyzed.
- Examples cited are connected to the student’s response.
- One strategy that might be used to support student comprehension is described and is solidly based on analysis.
- An adequate rationale for the strategy is provided, which includes evidence of research or theory.

THE LEVEL 2 response provides *limited* evidence of a thorough and complete knowledge of analysis of reading comprehension and an appropriate application of this knowledge by proposing a teaching strategy designed to improve student comprehension.

Characteristics:

- One strength and one weakness may be inaccurately analyzed.
- Examples may be only vaguely connected to the student's response to text.
- The description of a strategy may be sketchy or may only tangentially support reading comprehension.
- A weak or loosely connected rationale for the strategy is provided, which may or may not include evidence of research or theory.

THE LEVEL 1 response provides *little or no* evidence of a thorough and complete knowledge of analysis of reading comprehension and an appropriate application of this knowledge by proposing a teaching strategy designed to improve student comprehension.

Characteristics:

- Identification of one strength and one weakness may be missing or inaccurate.
- Examples may be disconnected from the student's response.
- The strategy described may be inappropriate or may not support reading comprehension.
- A rationale for the strategy is missing or ineffective. Research or theory is not addressed or is incorrect.

Exercise 2: Oral Language Acquisition Skills for Learners of English as a New Language

In this exercise: You identify one strength and two weaknesses in the oral language development of a student for whom English is a new language. You describe two developmentally appropriate teaching strategies, other than teacher correction, to build upon the identified strength or address weaknesses in order to further the student’s oral language development.

THE LEVEL 4 response provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of a thorough identification of one strength and two weaknesses in the oral language skills of a student for whom English is a new language, and the description of two insightful instructional strategies to further the development of the student’s oral language development.

Characteristics:

- One strength and two weaknesses in a student’s oral language development are accurately identified.
- Examples from the conversational transcript strongly support the identification.
- Two insightful and appropriate teaching strategies are described, other than teacher correction. Strategies are tightly connected to the identified strength or weakness(es).
- The rationale for using these strategies is insightful and logical.

THE LEVEL 3 response provides *clear* evidence of a thorough identification of one strength and two weaknesses in the oral language skills of a student for whom English is a new language, and the description of two insightful instructional strategies to further the development of the student’s oral language development.

Characteristics:

- One strength and two weaknesses in a student’s oral language development are correctly identified.
- Examples from the conversational transcript support the identification.
- Two appropriate teaching strategies are described, other than teacher correction. Strategies are connected to the identified strength or weakness(es).
- The rationale for using these strategies is sensible.

THE LEVEL 2 response provides *limited* evidence of a thorough identification of one strength and two weaknesses in the oral language skills of a student for whom English is a new language, and the description of two insightful instructional strategies to further the development of the student’s oral language development.

Characteristics:

- Strength and weaknesses may be inaccurately or vaguely identified.
- Examples may only loosely support the identification.
- Strategies proposed may not be connected to the identified strength or weakness(es), or may be inappropriate for the student.
- The rationale for using these strategies may be weak.

THE LEVEL 1 response provides *little or no* evidence of a thorough identification of one strength and two weaknesses in the oral language skills of a student for whom English is a new language, and the description of two insightful instructional strategies to further the development of the student’s oral language development.

Characteristics:

- Strength and weaknesses may be incorrectly identified or missing altogether.
- Examples may not be connected to the identification.
- Strategies proposed may be missing or inaccurate.
- The rationale for using these strategies may be missing or illogical.

Exercise 3: Emergent Literacy

In this exercise: You analyze a student's writing sample, describe the developmental characteristics of the student's writing, and propose two developmentally appropriate teaching strategies to address an identified area of weakness or build upon an identified strength.

THE LEVEL 4 response provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of a thoughtful analysis of a student's writing sample, identification of one area of strength and one area of weakness, a detailed description of the developmental characteristics of the student's writing, and an explanation of two developmentally appropriate strategies to address the weakness or build upon the strength.

Characteristics:

- One area of strength and one area of weakness from the student-writing sample are thoroughly and accurately analyzed, and examples closely support analysis.
- The developmental level of the student's writing is described in detail.
- The two instructional strategies explained are developmentally appropriate and are insightful and effective strategies for furthering the given student's skills in writing.
- The rationale for how these strategies are connected to the stated strength or weakness is appropriate.

THE LEVEL 3 response provides *clear* evidence of a thoughtful analysis of a student's writing sample, identification of one area of strength and one area of weakness, a detailed description of the developmental characteristics of the student's writing, and an explanation of two developmentally appropriate strategies to address the weakness or build upon the strength.

Characteristics:

- One area of strength and one area of weakness from the student-writing sample are accurately analyzed, and examples support analysis.
- The developmental level of the student's writing is described in some detail.
- The two instructional strategies explained are developmentally appropriate and are effective strategies for furthering the given student's skills in writing.
- The rationale for how these strategies are connected to the stated strength or weakness is logical.

THE LEVEL 2 response provides *limited* evidence of a thoughtful analysis of a student’s writing sample, identification of one area of strength and one area of weakness, a detailed description of the developmental characteristics of the student’s writing, and an explanation of two developmentally appropriate strategies to address the weakness or build upon the strength.

Characteristics:

- Areas of strength and weakness from the student-writing sample are vaguely analyzed, and examples are loosely connected to the analysis.
- The description of the developmental level of the student’s writing is incomplete or inaccurate.
- The two instructional strategies may not be developmentally appropriate or are ineffective strategies for furthering the given student’s skills in writing.
- The rationale for these strategies is loosely connected to the stated strength or weakness.

THE LEVEL 1 response provides *little or no* evidence of a thoughtful analysis of a student’s writing sample, identification of one area of strength and one area of weakness, a detailed description of the developmental characteristics of the student’s writing, and an explanation of two developmentally appropriate strategies to address the weakness or build upon the strength.

Characteristics:

- The areas of strength and/or weakness from the student-writing sample are missing or inaccurate, and examples are not connected to the analysis.
- The description of the developmental level of the student’s writing is incorrect.
- The two instructional strategies identified are developmentally inappropriate, are illogical strategies for furthering the given student’s skills in writing, or are missing altogether.
- The rationale for using these strategies is disconnected to the stated strength or weakness.

Exercise 4: Analyzing Student Reading

In this exercise: You analyze a transcript of a student’s oral reading, identify two significant patterns of error, and discuss an appropriate teaching strategy to address one of the identified patterns of error.

THE LEVEL 4 response provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of analysis of a student’s oral reading transcript, identification of two significant patterns of errors, and description of an appropriate teaching strategy to thoughtfully address one of the identified patterns of errors.

Characteristics:

- a thorough analysis of two significant patterns of student errors in an oral reading
- Examples from the student’s transcript are detailed and strongly support the identified patterns of errors.
- An appropriate teaching strategy to address one of the identified patterns of errors is described in-depth.
- An explanation of how the strategy will promote the student’s reading development is detailed and sensible.

THE LEVEL 3 response provides *clear* evidence of analysis of a student’s oral reading transcript, identification of two significant patterns of errors, and description of an appropriate strategy to thoughtfully address one of the identified patterns of errors.

Characteristics:

- a solid analysis of two significant patterns of student errors in an oral reading
- Examples from the student’s transcript support the identified patterns of errors.
- A teaching strategy to address one of the identified patterns of errors is appropriate.
- An explanation of how the strategy will promote the student’s reading development is logical.

THE LEVEL 2 response provides *limited* evidence of analysis of a student’s oral reading transcript, identification of two significant patterns of errors, and description of an appropriate strategy to thoughtfully address one of the identified patterns of errors.

Characteristics:

- Patterns of errors described may be trivial, incomplete, or vague.
- Examples from the student’s transcript are only tangentially connected to the patterns of errors identified.
- The teaching strategy may only vaguely address one of the identified patterns of errors or may be inappropriate.
- Explanation of how the strategy will promote the student’s reading development is vague.

THE LEVEL 1 response provides *little or no* evidence of analysis of a student’s oral reading transcript, identification of two significant patterns of errors, and description of an appropriate strategy to thoughtfully address one of the identified patterns of errors.

Characteristics:

- Patterns of errors described may be incorrect or missing.
- Examples from the student’s transcript are not connected to the identified patterns of errors.
- The strategy may not address one of the identified patterns of errors or may be missing.
- An explanation of how the strategy will promote the student’s reading development is incomplete or illogical.

Exercise 5: Interpreting Visual Text

In this exercise: You interpret a piece of visual text by identifying the message and the use of graphics, text, and literary devices to convey that message. You identify the target audience for the visual text and explain how the text targets that audience.

THE LEVEL 4 response provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of an accurate interpretation of the message in a piece of visual text, an explanation of the use of graphics, text, and literary devices to convey a message, and a description of how the visual text targets a specific audience.

Characteristics:

- insightful interpretation of the message in a piece of visual text
- a thorough explanation of how the graphics and the text convey the message
- an accurate identification and definition of two literary devices
- tightly connected examples of how each literary device is used to convey the message
- an accurate identification of the intended audience for the piece of visual text
- a detailed explanation of how the visual text targets that audience

THE LEVEL 3 response provides *clear* evidence of an accurate interpretation of the message in a piece of visual text, an explanation of the use of graphics, text, and literary devices to convey a message, and a description of how the visual text targets a specific audience.

Characteristics:

- logical interpretation of the message in a piece of visual text
- sensible connections made to how the graphics and the text convey the message
- a reasonable identification and definition of two literary devices
- examples of how devices are used to convey the message are accurate
- an appropriate identification of the intended audience for the piece of visual text
- an adequate explanation of how the visual text targets that audience

THE LEVEL 2 response provides *limited* evidence of an accurate interpretation of the message in a piece of visual text, an explanation of the use of graphics, text, and literary devices to convey a message, and a description of how the visual text targets a specific audience.

Characteristics:

- vague interpretation of the message in a piece of visual text
- sketchy connections made to how the graphics and the text convey the message
- Identification and/or definition of literary devices may be incomplete and/or somewhat accurate.
- Examples of how devices are used to convey the message may be weak or only partially accurate.
- The identification of the audience for the piece of visual text may be somewhat accurate.
- The explanation of how the visual text targets that audience may be inadequate.

THE LEVEL 1 response provides *little or no* evidence of an accurate interpretation of the message in a piece of visual text, an explanation of the use of graphics, text, and literary devices to convey a message, and a description of how the visual text targets a specific audience.

Characteristics:

- illogical interpretation of the message
- Connections to how the graphics and text convey a message may be inaccurate or nonexistent.
- Identification and/or definition of literary devices may be incorrect and/or missing.
- Examples of how devices are used to convey the message are illogical.
- The identification of the audience for the piece of visual text may be flawed.
- The explanation of how the visual text targets that audience may be unconvincing.

Exercise 6: Writing Development

In this exercise: You identify one strength and one weakness from a student's writing sample and describe a teaching strategy to address each of them.

THE LEVEL 4 response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate demonstrates knowledge of student writing development by thoughtfully analyzing a writing sample to accurately identify one strength and one weakness with supporting examples, and to describe a teaching strategy to address each of them in detail.

Characteristics:

- The identification of one strength in a student's writing sample is accurate and insightful with supporting examples and the teaching strategy described to build upon that strength is thoughtful and targeted.
- The identification of one weakness in a student's writing sample is detailed and thoughtful with supporting examples and the teaching strategy to address that weakness is effective and is described in-depth.

THE LEVEL 3 response shows *clear* evidence that the candidate demonstrates knowledge of student writing development by thoughtfully analyzing a writing sample to accurately identify one strength and one weakness with supporting examples, and to describe a teaching strategy to address each of them in detail.

Characteristics:

- The identification of one strength in a student's writing sample is accurate with supporting examples and the teaching strategy described to build upon that strength is appropriate.
- The identification of one weakness in a student's writing sample is detailed with supporting examples and the teaching strategy to address that weakness is sensible.

THE LEVEL 2 response shows *limited* evidence that the candidate demonstrates knowledge of student writing development by thoughtfully analyzing a writing sample to accurately identify one strength and one weakness with supporting examples, and to describe a teaching strategy to address each of them in detail.

Characteristics:

- The identification of one strength in a student’s writing sample is sketchy with loosely connected examples and the teaching strategy described to build upon that strength is vague.
- The identification of one weakness in a student’s writing sample may be inaccurate with loosely connected examples lacking detail and the teaching strategy to address that weakness is loosely connected to the weakness or inappropriate.

THE LEVEL 1 response shows *little or no* evidence that the candidate demonstrates knowledge of student writing development by thoughtfully analyzing a writing sample to accurately identify one strength and one weakness with supporting examples, and to describe a teaching strategy to address each of them in detail.

Characteristics:

- The identification of one strength in a student’s writing sample is incorrect or missing, examples are not connected or missing, and the teaching strategy described to build upon that strength is inaccurate or missing altogether.
- The identification of one weakness in a student’s writing sample may be misinformed or missing, examples are not connected or missing, and the teaching strategy to address that weakness is not connected to the weakness, incorrect, 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).