



Middle Childhood **GENERALIST**

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: Writing: Thinking through the Process	2-1
Entry 2: Building a Classroom Community through Social Studies	2-5
Entry 3: Integrating Mathematics With Science	2-9
Entry 4: Documented Accomplishments: Contributions to Student Learning.....	2-13
SCORING RUBRICS FOR ASSESSMENT CENTER EXERCISES	2-17
Exercise 1: Supporting Reading Skills	2-17
Exercise 2: Analyzing Student Work	2-19
Exercise 3: Knowledge of Science	2-21
Exercise 4: Social Studies	2-23
Exercise 5: Understanding Health	2-25
Exercise 6: Integrating the Arts	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: Writing: Thinking through the Process

In this entry: You demonstrate your use of writing to develop students' thinking and writing skills for different audiences and purposes. You provide evidence of your planning and teaching, and your ability to describe, analyze, and use student work to reflect on your practice. You submit a Written Commentary, two assignments/prompts, instructional materials, and four student responses.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to further students' development as thinkers and writers who explore important ideas in language arts, and develop skills in expository and narrative writing.

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

- that the teacher recognizes students' individual learning differences and past experiences to set high, worthwhile, and appropriate goals for student learning and connects instruction to those goals.
- that the teacher engages students in meaningful exploration of important ideas in language arts and that he or she develops students' thinking and communication skills through the use of writing in these areas.
- that the teacher uses rich and varied assignments that offer students opportunities to use writing as a significant intellectual tool and to facilitate personal expression.
- that the teacher develops students' abilities to write for a variety of audiences and purposes, to engage in the processes of writing, as shown by multiple drafts of writing, and to foster students' responsibility for their own development as writers.
- of the teacher's ability to accurately describe, analyze, and evaluate student work, and provide feedback to students about their learning and development as writers.
- of the teacher's ability to engage in reflective thinking that suggests a clear understanding of past teaching and involves constructive suggestions for future teaching.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to further students' development as thinkers and writers who explore important ideas in language arts, and develop skills in expository and narrative writing.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to further students' development as thinkers and writers who explore important ideas in language arts, and develop skills in expository and narrative writing.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher recognizes students' individual learning differences and past experiences to set worthwhile and appropriate goals for student learning and connects instruction to those goals.
- that the teacher engages students in meaningful exploration of important ideas in language arts and that he or she develops students' thinking and communication skills through the use of writing in these areas.
- that the teacher uses varied assignments that offer students opportunities to use writing as an intellectual tool and to facilitate personal expression, although assignments may not be as varied as in a Level 4 performance.
- that the teacher develops students' abilities to write for a variety of audiences and purposes, to engage in the processes of writing, as shown by multiple drafts of writing, and to foster students' responsibility for their own development as writers.
- of the teacher's ability to accurately describe, analyze, and evaluate student work, showing knowledge of students and insight about their learning and development as writers, though the analysis may not be as deep or as detailed as in a Level 4 performance.
- of the teacher's ability to engage in reflective thinking that suggests a clear understanding of past teaching and involves constructive suggestions for future teaching. However, the reflection may not be as insightful as that in a Level 4 performance.

A Level 3 performance may show imbalance in the different sources of evidence or in different parts of the analysis. One part of the response may be more indicative of accomplished practice than another, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to further students' development as thinkers and writers who explore important ideas in language arts, and develop skills in expository and narrative writing.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence that the teacher is able to further students' development as thinkers and writers who explore important ideas in language arts, and develop skills in expository and narrative writing.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher recognizes students' learning differences and past experiences to set appropriate goals for student learning and connects instruction to those goals. The goals for student learning may be vague, of limited significance, or only loosely related to the instruction.
- that the teacher engages students in exploration of ideas in language arts and that he or she develops students' thinking and communication skills through the use of writing in these areas. The goals and learning experiences may be much more focused on one area than on the other.
- that the teacher uses assignments that offer students opportunities to write, but there is limited use of writing as an intellectual tool or as a tool for personal expression.
- that the teacher develops students' abilities to write for a variety of audiences and purposes. Students may be encouraged to engage in the processes of writing in a limited fashion and may be given only limited responsibility for their own development as writers.
- of the teacher's limited ability to describe, analyze, and evaluate student work. The response to student work may be limited, and though the teacher may recognize student progress, he or she offers only limited ways for students to build on that progress.
- of the teacher's ability to engage in reflective thinking about his or her instruction. The reflection may be sketchy or global and includes limited evidence of an understanding of past teaching and implications for future practice.

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 further students' development as thinkers and writers who explore important ideas in language arts, and develop skills in expository and narrative writing.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to further students' development as thinkers and writers who explore important ideas in language arts, and develop skills in expository and narrative writing.

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

- that the teacher recognizes students' individual learning differences and past experiences to set appropriate goals for student learning and connects instruction to those goals. The goals for student learning may not be goals at all, but rather activities. When stated, goals are vague, trivial, inappropriate or unconnected to instruction.
- that the teacher engages students in exploration of ideas in language arts or that he or she develops students' thinking and communication skills through the use of writing in these areas. The goals and learning experiences may not be focused on either one of the two areas.
- that the teacher uses assignments that offer students opportunities to use writing as an intellectual tool or to facilitate personal expression.
- that the teacher develops students' abilities to write for a variety of audiences and purposes. Students may actually be discouraged from engaging in the processes of writing for their own purposes and are given little or no responsibility for their own development as writers.
- of the teacher's ability to accurately describe, analyze, and evaluate student work. The response to student work may show an inability to recognize student progress and/or the teacher may not offer ways for students to build on their progress.
- of the teacher's ability to engage in reflective thinking about his or her instruction. 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, the Level 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to further students' development as thinkers and writers who explore important ideas in language arts, and develop skills in expository and narrative writing.

Entry 2: Building a Classroom Community through Social Studies

In this entry: You demonstrate your ability to describe and illustrate how you sustain a classroom environment that supports students' growth, learning, social and emotional development, and emerging abilities to understand and consider perspectives other than their own through a social studies/history theme, issue, or topic. You also display your ability to observe and analyze the interactions in your classroom. You submit a Written Commentary, a 15-minute video recording, and two instructional materials.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to create a stimulating learning climate that supports students' emerging abilities to understand and consider perspectives other than their own through a social studies/history theme, issue, or topic, and to assume responsibility for their actions.

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

- that the teacher understands child development and knows the backgrounds, abilities, interests, aspirations, and values of her or his students, which is evidenced by the detailed description of the students and the compelling rationale behind the strategies for encouraging students to consider a range of perspectives and to enable students to take responsibility for their own actions.
- that the teacher demonstrates the ability to establish a theme, issue, or topic and related learning goals that are central to social studies/history and justify the appropriateness for the students.
- that the strategies employed by the teacher foster students' emerging abilities to understand and respect individual and group differences, to consider a range of perspectives other than their own, and to assume intellectual and social responsibility.
- that the teacher can establish an equitable, accessible, and fair classroom community where students can take intellectual risks and work collaboratively.
- that the teacher can plan, organize, and facilitate students' active participation in a meaningful discussion that develops their expression of ideas and opinions, their consideration of others' points of view, and their assumption of responsibility for their own actions.
- of the teacher's ability to engage in reflective thinking about her or his instructional practice, to support instructional decisions, to articulate a strong rationale for pedagogical actions, and to make decisions that will strengthen the quality of her or his future practice.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to create a stimulating learning climate that supports students' emerging abilities to understand and consider perspectives other than their own through a social studies/history theme, issue or topic, and to assume responsibility for their actions.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to create a stimulating learning climate that supports students' emerging abilities to understand and consider perspectives other than their own through a social studies/history theme, issue, or topic, and to assume responsibility for their actions.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher understands child development and knows the backgrounds, abilities, interests, aspirations, and values of her or his students, which is evidenced by the description of the students and the rationale behind the strategies for encouraging students to consider a range of perspectives and to enable students to take responsibility for their own actions.
- that the teacher is able to demonstrate the ability to establish a theme, issue, or topic and related learning goals that are central to social studies/history and justify the appropriateness for the students.
- that the strategies employed by the teacher foster students' emerging abilities to understand and respect individual and group differences, to consider a range of perspectives other than their own, and to assume intellectual and social responsibility.
- that the teacher can establish a stimulating and supportive classroom community where students can take intellectual risks and work collaboratively.
- that the teacher can plan, organize, and facilitate students' participation in a meaningful discussion that develops their expression of ideas and opinions, their consideration of others' points of view, and their assumption of responsibility for their own actions, though opportunities for students to think through and exchange ideas may be fewer than in a Level 4 performance.
- of the teacher's ability to engage in reflective thinking about her or his instructional practice, to support instructional decisions, to articulate a rationale for pedagogical actions, and to make decisions that will strengthen the quality of her or his future practice. However, the reflection may not be as insightful as that in a Level 4 performance.

A Level 3 performance may show imbalance in the different sources of evidence or in different parts of the analysis. One part of the response may be more indicative of accomplished practice than another, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to create a stimulating learning climate that supports students' emerging abilities to understand and consider perspectives other than their own through a social studies/history theme, issue, or topic, and to assume responsibility for their actions.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence that the teacher is able to create a stimulating learning climate that supports students' emerging abilities to understand and consider perspectives other than their own through a social studies/history theme, issue or topic, and to assume responsibility for their actions.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher understands child development and knows the backgrounds, abilities, and interests of her or his students. The description of the students may be general or uneven, and/or the rationale behind the strategies for encouraging students to consider a range of perspectives and to enable students to take responsibility for their own actions may be only loosely connected to the information provided about students.
- that the teacher demonstrates the ability to establish a theme, issue, or topic and related learning goals that are central to social studies/history and justify the appropriateness for the students.
- that the strategies employed by the teacher foster students' emerging abilities to understand and respect individual and group differences, to consider a range of perspectives other than their own, and to assume intellectual and social responsibility. The students' role may be somewhat superficial.
- that the teacher can establish a classroom community where students can take risks and work collaboratively. The selected topic for discussion or the strategies used to structure the discussion may be vaguely articulated.
- that the teacher can plan, organize, and facilitate students' participation in an activity that is linked to one or both of the featured goals of the entry. The event featured on the video recording may not be a discussion, but rather an activity that addresses one or both goals but does not afford students opportunities to think through or exchange ideas. The interaction may be characterized chiefly by "right answer" questions, recall of information, or a lack of focus.
- of the teacher's ability to engage in reflective thinking about her or his instructional practice and to articulate a rationale for pedagogical actions. The reflection may be sketchy or global and may focus on the positive, failing to identify new ways to encourage students to consider a range of perspectives and to enable students to take responsibility for their own actions.

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 create a stimulating learning climate that supports students' emerging abilities to understand and consider perspectives other than their own through a social studies/history theme, issue, or topic, and to assume responsibility for their actions.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to create a stimulating learning climate that supports students' emerging abilities to understand and consider perspectives other than their own through a social studies/history theme, issue or topic, and to assume responsibility for their actions.

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

- that the teacher understands child development and knows the backgrounds, abilities, and interests of her or his students. The description of the students may be very weak or absent, and/or the rationale behind the strategies for encouraging students to consider a range of perspectives and to enable students to take responsibility for their own actions may be very weak, unconnected to the information provided about students, or absent.
- that the teacher demonstrates the ability to establish a theme, issue, or topic and related learning goals that are central to social studies/history and justify the appropriateness for the students.
- that the strategies employed by the teacher foster students' emerging abilities to understand and respect individual and group differences, to consider a range of perspectives other than their own, or to assume intellectual and social responsibility.
- that the teacher can establish a classroom community where students can take risks and work collaboratively. The selected topic for discussion or the strategies used to structure the discussion may be inappropriate or unrelated to helping students consider perspectives other than their own or to take responsibility for their actions.
- that the teacher can plan, organize, and facilitate students' participation in an activity that is linked to one or both of the featured goals of the entry. The event featured on the video recording is not a discussion, and may not address either goal. The interactions may reveal inappropriate, negative responses to students.
- of the teacher's ability to engage in reflective thinking about her or his instructional practice. The reflection may be missing or unconnected from the instructional evidence or include little or no evidence of the teacher's understanding of how to encourage students to consider a range of perspectives and to enable students to take responsibility for their own actions.

Overall, the Level 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to create a stimulating learning climate that supports students' emerging abilities to understand and consider perspectives other than their own through a social studies/history theme, issue, or topic, and to assume responsibility for their actions.

Entry 3: Integrating Mathematics With Science

In this entry: You demonstrate how you help students better understand a “Big Idea” in science using relevant science and mathematical knowledge. You engage students in the discovery, exploration, and implementation of these science and mathematics concepts, procedures, and processes by integrating these two disciplinary areas. This entry is designed for you to provide evidence of your ability to plan, describe, illustrate, assess, and reflect on your teaching practice. You submit a Written Commentary, a 15-minute video recording, and three instructional materials.

THE LEVEL 4 performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to help children acquire scientific and mathematical knowledge in thinking, observing, and communicating through planning and implementing a science learning experience that integrates mathematics applications.

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

- that the teacher draws on knowledge of child development and relationships with students to develop an informed approach in helping students as they address complex and real-world issues.
- that the teacher makes an appropriate choice and effective use of one or more “big ideas” from science to enrich students’ understanding of the selected interdisciplinary unit.
- that the teacher develops a learning sequence that is directly relevant to the scientific and mathematical concepts as stated in the goals.
- that the teacher taps children’s natural curiosity and interest.
- that the featured learning experiences demonstrate a strong command of mathematical and scientific knowledge linked to the learning sequence.
- of the teacher’s ability to foster an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which all students are encouraged to participate.
- of the teacher’s ability to set worthwhile goals for substantive learning, have effective strategies for helping students achieve these goals, and adapt materials and activities to meet the needs of individual learners.
- that the teacher is able to employ effective strategies to engage students in the discovery, exploration, and use of concepts, processes, and procedures to build understanding of important content areas in mathematics and science.
- the teacher uses a variety of appropriate resources, including technology, to enhance student learning about mathematics and science.
- of the teacher’s ability to create a supportive, congenial, and purposeful learning environment that promotes active learning and exposes students to a variety of intellectual challenges.
- that the teacher employs assessment that provides insight into student’s abilities, and provides constructive feedback.
- that the teacher engages in reflective thinking about his or her practice to support instructional decisions, and to articulate a strong rationale for pedagogical actions.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the teacher is able to help children acquire scientific and mathematical knowledge in thinking, observing, and communicating through planning and implementing a science learning experience that integrates mathematics applications.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to help children acquire scientific and mathematical knowledge in thinking, observing, and communicating through planning and implementing a science learning experience that integrates mathematics applications.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the teacher draws on knowledge of child development and relationships with students to develop an informed approach in helping students as they address complex and real-world issues.
- that the teacher makes an appropriate choice and effective use of one or more “big ideas” from science to enrich students’ understanding of the selected interdisciplinary unit.
- that the teacher develops a learning sequence that is directly relevant to the scientific and mathematical concepts as stated in the goals.
- that the teacher taps children’s natural curiosity and interest.
- that the featured learning experiences demonstrate a strong command of mathematical and scientific knowledge linked to the learning sequence.
- of the teacher’s ability to foster an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which all students are encouraged to participate.
- of the teacher’s ability to set worthwhile goals for substantive learning, have effective strategies for helping students achieve these goals, and adapt materials and activities to meet the needs of individual learners.
- that the teacher is able to employ effective strategies to engage students in the discovery, exploration, and use of concepts, processes, and procedures to build understanding of important content areas in mathematics and science, though the strategies may not be as effective as in a Level 4 performance.
- the teacher uses a variety of appropriate resources, including technology, to enhance student learning about mathematics and science.
- of the teacher’s ability to create a supportive, congenial, and purposeful learning environment that promotes active learning and exposes students to a variety of intellectual challenges.
- that the teacher employs assessments that provide insight into students’ abilities, and provides constructive feedback.
- that the teacher engages in reflective thinking about his or her practice to support instructional decisions, and to articulate a strong rationale for pedagogical actions. However, the reflection may not be as insightful as that in a Level 4 performance.

A Level 3 performance may show imbalance in the sources of evidence or in various parts of the analysis. One part of the response may be more indicative of accomplished practice than another, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence that the teacher is able to help children acquire scientific and mathematical knowledge in thinking, observing, and communicating through planning and implementing a science learning experience that integrates mathematics applications.

THE LEVEL 2 performance provides *limited* evidence that the teacher is able to help children acquire scientific and mathematical knowledge in thinking, observing, and communicating through planning and implementing a science learning experience that integrates mathematics applications.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the teacher draws on knowledge of child development and relationships with students to develop an informed approach in helping students as they address complex and real-world issues.
- that the teacher makes an appropriate choice and effective use of one or more “big ideas” from science to enrich students’ understanding of the selected interdisciplinary unit. The science topic may not be a “big idea” that is an appropriate choice to effectively incorporate a math application.
- that the teacher develops a learning sequence that is directly relevant to the scientific and mathematical concepts as stated in the goals.
- that the teacher taps children’s natural curiosity and interest. Students may be disinterested or distracted and uninvolved.
- that the featured learning experiences demonstrate a strong command of mathematical and scientific knowledge linked to the learning sequence.
- of the teacher’s ability to foster an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which all students are encouraged to participate. The activities may be teacher-dominated or dominated by one or two students.
- of the teacher’s ability to set worthwhile goals for substantive learning, have effective strategies for helping students achieve these goals, and adapt materials and activities to meet the needs of individual learners. The goals, strategies, and materials may be loosely connected or inappropriate.
- that the teacher is able to employ effective strategies to engage students in the discovery, exploration, and use of concepts, processes, and procedures to build understanding of important content areas in mathematics and science.
- the teacher uses a variety of appropriate resources, including technology, to enhance student learning about mathematics and science.
- of the teacher’s ability to create a supportive, congenial, and purposeful learning environment that promotes active learning and exposes students to a variety of intellectual challenges.
- that the teacher employs assessments that provide insight into students’ abilities, and provides constructive feedback.
- that the teacher engages in reflective thinking about his or her practice to support instructional decisions, and to articulate a strong rationale for pedagogical actions.

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 help children acquire scientific and mathematical knowledge in thinking, observing, and communicating through planning and implementing a science learning experience that integrates mathematics applications.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to help children acquire scientific and mathematical knowledge in thinking, observing, and communicating through planning and implementing a science learning experience that integrates mathematics applications.

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

- that the teacher draws on knowledge of child development and relationships with students to develop an informed approach in helping students as they address complex and real-world issues.
- that the teacher makes an appropriate choice and effective use of one or more “big ideas” from science to enrich students’ understanding of the selected interdisciplinary unit.
- that the teacher develops a learning sequence that is directly relevant to the scientific and mathematical concepts as stated in the goals.
- that the teacher taps children’s natural curiosity and interest.
- that the featured learning experiences demonstrate a strong command of mathematical and scientific knowledge linked to the learning sequence.
- of the teacher’s ability to foster an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which all students are encouraged to participate.
- of the teacher’s ability to set worthwhile goals for substantive learning, have effective strategies for helping students achieve these goals, and adapt materials and activities to meet the needs of individual learners.
- that the teacher is able to employ effective strategies to engage students in the discovery, exploration, and use of concepts, processes, and procedures to build understanding of important content areas in mathematics and science.
- the teacher uses a variety of appropriate resources, including technology, to enhance student learning about mathematics and science.
- of the teacher’s ability to create a supportive, congenial, and purposeful learning environment that promotes active learning and exposes students to a variety of intellectual challenges.
- that the teacher employs assessments that provide insight into student’s abilities, and provides constructive feedback.
- that the teacher engages in reflective thinking about his or her practice to support instructional decisions, and to articulate a strong rationale for pedagogical actions.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence that the teacher is able to help children acquire scientific and mathematical knowledge in thinking, observing, and communicating through planning and implementing a science learning experience that integrates mathematics applications.

Entry 4: Documented Accomplishments: Contributions to Student Learning

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

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

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

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

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- that the teacher treats parents and other interested adults as partners in the child's education, and uses appropriate strategies for reaching out to the families of his or her students. The rationale for the selected strategies may be very vague, unclear, or absent.
- that the strategies are effective in engaging parents and other interested adults. There may be evidence that some families are overlooked or ignored.
- that the communications with families are focused on substantive teaching and learning issues. Instead, the communications are taken up almost exclusively by procedural issues, behavior, or disciplinary matters.
- that the communications with families are interactive. Communications with families are entirely one-way and/or infrequent. Parents may not be kept informed about what is going on in the classroom. If evidence regarding outreach to the wider community is present, the connections may promote trivial interactions with little impact on student learning.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Scoring Rubrics for Assessment Center Exercises

Exercise 1: Supporting Reading Skills

In this exercise: You demonstrate your ability to analyze and interpret student errors and patterns of errors in reading. You are asked to analyze and interpret a transcript of a given student's oral reading of a given passage. You are also asked to identify and justify appropriate strategies to address the identified student's needs.

THE LEVEL 4 response offers *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of content and pedagogical knowledge of reading by accurate identification of a given student's errors or patterns of errors and planning of effective instructional strategies that develop the given student's reading skills.

Characteristics:

- Two errors or patterns are identified. Descriptions of errors or patterns are accurate and specific.
- Cited examples from text (passage and student's reading) are tightly connected to the identified errors and patterns of error.
- Two effective instructional strategies are described thoroughly and in detail. Both instructional strategies effectively address one of the identified errors fully.
- Thorough rationales that justify each instructional strategy are given. The rationales are significantly connected to the reading needs of the student.
- Significant evidence of developmental appropriateness of the instructional strategies is given.

THE LEVEL 3 response offers *clear* evidence of content and pedagogical knowledge of reading by accurate identification of a given student's errors or patterns of errors and planning of effective instructional strategies that develop the given student's reading skills.

Characteristics:

- Two errors or patterns of error are correctly identified.
- Cited examples from text (passage and student's reading) are connected to the identified errors or patterns of error, although one may have a stronger connection than the other.
- Two effective instructional strategies are described although in less detail than in a Level 4 response. Both instructional strategies appropriately address one of the identified errors or patterns of error.
- Clear rationales that justify each instructional strategy are given. The rationales are connected to the reading needs of the student.
- Evidence of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies is given.

THE LEVEL 2 response offers *limited* evidence of content and pedagogical knowledge of reading by accurate identification of a given student's errors or patterns of errors and planning of effective instructional strategies that develop the given student's reading skills.

Characteristics:

- At least one error or pattern of error is correctly identified.
- Cited examples from text (passage and student's reading) may be connected to one of the identified errors or patterns of error.
- Two instructional strategies are described. Both instructional strategies only somewhat address one of the identified errors or patterns of error.
- Rationales that justify each instructional strategy are unclear or inappropriate. The rationales are tangentially connected to the reading needs of the student.
- Limited evidence of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies is given.

THE LEVEL 1 response offers *little or no* evidence of content and pedagogical knowledge of reading by accurate identification of a given student's errors or patterns of errors and planning of effective instructional strategies that develop the given student's reading skills.

Characteristics:

- One or no errors or patterns of error are correctly identified.
- Cited examples from text (passage and student's reading) do not support either of the errors or patterns of error.
- Instructional strategies may be missing, irrelevant, or may not appropriately address either of the identified errors.
- Rationales may be missing, do not justify the instructional strategy(ies), or are unconnected to the reading needs of the student.
- Little or no evidence of developmentally appropriate instructional strategy is given as evidenced through a response that supplies only one instructional strategy, or instructional strategies are unrelated or unconnected to the identified error(s) or pattern(s) of error.

Exercise 2: Analyzing Student Work

In this exercise: You demonstrate your ability to identify mathematical misconceptions/errors in a given student's work, to identify concepts/skills necessary for student understanding of the math problem, and to provide appropriate strategies with a rationale to assist the student's understanding of the identified concepts or skills.

THE LEVEL 4 response offers *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the ability to demonstrate pedagogical and content knowledge of math by accurately identifying the math misconception/error, providing an instructional strategy to assist student understanding of concepts/skills needed to accurately solve the mathematical problem, and providing a rationale that supports the instructional strategy.

Characteristics:

- Analysis of the student's misconception/error is thorough and accurate with a relevant example cited.
- accurate identification of concepts/skills that are embedded in the given problem
- Instructional strategy thoroughly addresses the student's misconception/error or is clear in meeting the needs of the student.
- thorough and sound rationale for the given strategy

THE LEVEL 3 response offers *clear* evidence of the ability to demonstrate pedagogical and content knowledge of math by accurately identifying the math misconception/error, providing an instructional strategy to assist student understanding of concepts/skills needed to accurately solve the mathematical problem, and providing a rationale that supports the instructional strategy.

Characteristics:

- Analysis of the student's misconception/error is clear and accurate with a relevant example cited.
- accurate identification of concepts/skills that are embedded in the given problem
- Instructional strategy demonstrates understanding of the student's misconception/error or is clear in meeting the needs of the student.
- sound rationale for the given strategy

THE LEVEL 2 response offers *limited* evidence of the ability to demonstrate pedagogical and content knowledge of math by accurately identifying the math misconception/error, providing an instructional strategy to assist student understanding of concepts/skills needed to accurately solve the mathematical problem, and providing a rationale that supports the instructional strategy.

Characteristics:

- Analysis of the student's misconception/error is limited or no student example is cited.
- Identification of some related concepts/skills may be inaccurate.
- Instructional strategy demonstrates limited understanding of the student's misconception/error or is limited in meeting the needs of the student.
- Rationale may be implied or loosely connected to the given strategy.

THE LEVEL 1 response offers *little or no* evidence of the ability to use pedagogical and content knowledge of math by accurately identifying the math misconception/error, providing an instructional strategy to assist student understanding of concepts/skills needed to accurately solve the mathematical problem, and providing a rationale that supports the instructional strategy.

Characteristics:

- Analysis of student's misconception/error is vague and sketchy or no student example is cited.
- Identification of concepts/skills may be inaccurate or missing.
- Instructional strategy demonstrates little or no understanding of the student's misconception/error or may be inappropriate in meeting the needs of the student.
- Rationale may be irrelevant or missing.

Exercise 3: Knowledge of Science

In this exercise: You demonstrate your ability to identify and understand fundamental concepts and principles in science. You are asked to respond to a student's inquiry about a real-world phenomenon by identifying scientific concepts and principles that are related to the real-world phenomenon. You are also asked to describe an appropriate learning experience with a rationale that will provide student understanding of a concept/principle that relates to the real-world phenomenon.

THE LEVEL 4 response offers *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the ability to use pedagogical and content knowledge of science to identify fundamental science-related concepts and/or principles of a given real-world phenomenon and provide a developmentally appropriate instructional learning experience that relates to the given real-world phenomenon.

Characteristics:

- accurate identification of science concepts or principles related to the given real-world phenomenon
- a thorough and detailed explanation of how a stated concept or principle applies to the given phenomenon
- a thorough and detailed description of a developmentally appropriate and worthwhile learning experience (including use of materials) that is related to the identified concept or principle
- substantive, thorough, sound, and developmentally appropriate rationale for the use of the learning experience to assist in addressing the student's question

THE LEVEL 3 response offers *clear* evidence of the ability to use pedagogical and content knowledge of science to identify fundamental science-related concepts and/or principles of a given real-world phenomenon and provide a developmentally appropriate instructional learning experience that relates to the given real-world phenomenon.

Characteristics:

- accurate identification of science concepts or principles related to the given real-world phenomenon
- clear explanation of how a stated concept or principle applies to the phenomenon
- a clear description of a developmentally appropriate learning experience (including use of materials) that is related to the identified concept or principle
- a clear and appropriate rationale for the use of the learning experience to assist in addressing the student's question

THE LEVEL 2 response offers *limited* evidence of the ability to use pedagogical and content knowledge of science to identify fundamental science-related concepts and/or principles of a given real-world phenomenon and provide a developmentally appropriate instructional learning experience that relates to the given real-world phenomenon.

Characteristics:

- Identification of science concepts or principles may be somewhat accurate.
- limited or vague explanation of how one stated concept or principle applies to the phenomenon
- weak or vague learning experience (with limited use of instructional materials) that may not be related to the identified concept or principle, or unclearly addresses the needs of the student
- a limited or vague rationale for the use of the learning experience

THE LEVEL 1 response offers *little or no* evidence of the ability to use pedagogical and content knowledge of science to identify fundamental science-related concepts and/or principles of a given real-world phenomenon and provide a developmentally appropriate instructional learning experience that relates to the given real-world phenomenon.

Characteristics:

- Identification of science concepts or principles related to the given real-world phenomenon is inaccurate.
- little or no explanation of how one stated concept or principle applies to the phenomenon or the explanation has serious misconceptions
- Learning experience may not be related to the identified concept or principle, or does not include instructional materials or may be inappropriate for student understanding of the identified concept.
- little or no rationale for the use of the learning experience

Exercise 4: Social Studies

In this exercise: You demonstrate your ability to identify and interpret social studies/history information within a given graphic. You are asked to identify a cause-and-effect relationship based on the information in the given graphic. You are also asked to describe a learning experience/activity that develops student understanding of a real-world connection related to the identified cause-and-effect relationship.

THE LEVEL 4 response offers *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the ability to use content and pedagogical knowledge of social studies/history to identify and interpret social studies/history information within the given graphic and describe and justify an activity to make real-world connections for student learning.

Characteristics:

- a thorough, detailed, and accurate identification and interpretation of social studies/history information within the given graphic
- accurate identification of a cause-and-effect relationship pertaining to information in the given graphic
- accurate identification of a specific historic event related to the cause-and-effect relationship
- identification of an appropriate real-world connection for students that is related to the information embedded in the given graphic
- a thorough and detailed description of a developmentally appropriate learning experience/activity that enhances student understanding of the real-world connection identified, including a description of what the students would be doing in the learning experience
- a sound rationale as to how the learning experience/activity makes real-world connections for student understanding of the related information

THE LEVEL 3 response offers *clear* evidence of the ability to use content and pedagogical knowledge of social studies/history to identify and interpret social studies/history information within the given graphic and describe and justify an activity to make real-world connections for student learning.

Characteristics:

- a detailed and accurate identification and interpretation of social studies/history information within the given graphic
- an identification of a cause-and-effect relationship pertaining to information in the given graphic
- accurate identification of a specific historic event related to the cause-and-effect relationship
- identification of an appropriate real-world connection for students that is related to the information embedded in the given graphic
- a clear and detailed description of a developmentally appropriate learning experience/activity that develops student understanding of the real-world connection identified, including a description of what the students would be doing in the learning experience
- a clear and appropriate rationale as to how the learning experience/activity makes real-world connections for student understanding of the related information

THE LEVEL 2 response offers *limited* evidence of the ability to use content and pedagogical knowledge of social studies/history to identify and interpret social studies/history information within the given graphic and describe and justify an activity to make real-world connections for student learning.

Characteristics:

- an identification and interpretation of social studies/history information within the given graphic that may have minor misconceptions
- an identification of a cause-and-effect relationship pertaining to information in the given graphic that may be somewhat related to the information in the graphic
- identification of a specific historic event related to the cause-and-effect relationship that demonstrates limited knowledge of history
- identification of a real-world connection for students that may be somewhat related to the information embedded in the given graphic
- a description of an activity that may be somewhat appropriate and limited in making real-world connections for student understanding of the related information; the description may include limited information about what students would be doing
- a limited or somewhat weak rationale as to how the learning experience/activity makes real-world connections for student understanding of the related information

THE LEVEL 1 response offers *little or no* evidence of the ability to use content and pedagogical knowledge of social studies/history to identify and interpret social studies/history information within the given graphic and describe and justify an activity to make real-world connections for student learning.

Characteristics:

- an identification and interpretation of social studies/history information within the given graphic that may be inaccurate or unrelated to the given graphic
- an identification of a cause-and-effect relationship pertaining to information in the given graphic that may be vaguely related to or unrelated to the information in the graphic
- identification of a specific historic event related to the cause-and-effect relationship that demonstrates little or no knowledge of history
- identification of a real-world connection for students that may have little or no relationship to the information embedded in the given graphic
- a description of an activity that may be vague, weak, or missing with little or no real-world connections for student understanding of the related information
- a rationale for the learning experience/activity may be missing, vague, or trivial

Exercise 5: Understanding Health

In this exercise: You demonstrate your ability to identify and address health-related needs of a given student. You are asked to read a student profile and determine the particular health issues related to the identified student. You are asked to identify and justify appropriate steps and resources/materials used in meeting the needs of the student.

THE LEVEL 4 response offers *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the ability to use content and pedagogical knowledge of health by accurately identifying a student's physical, mental/emotional, and social issues/concerns and explaining how to meet the needs of the identified student through sound curricular and instructional choices that are informed by knowledge of middle childhood students.

Characteristics:

- an accurate and insightful identification of physical, mental/emotional, and social issues/concerns of the student profiled
- A thorough, detailed, and appropriate explanation of three steps used to meet all the needs of the student individually and with the whole class. Response includes a variety of targeted resources and materials that meet the instructional needs of the student.
- a thorough, detailed, and appropriate rationale to justify the steps used in meeting all the needs of the student individually and with the whole class

THE LEVEL 3 response offers *clear* evidence of the ability to use content and pedagogical knowledge of health by accurately identifying a student's physical, mental/emotional, and social issues/concerns and explaining how to meet the needs of the identified student through sound curricular and instructional choices that are informed by knowledge of middle childhood students.

Characteristics:

- an accurate identification of physical, mental/emotional, and social issues/concerns of the student profiled
- A clear and appropriate explanation of three steps used to meet all the needs of the student individually and with the whole class. Response includes a variety of targeted resources and materials that meet the instructional needs of the student.
- a clear and appropriate rationale to justify the steps used in meeting all the needs of the student individually and with the whole class

THE LEVEL 2 response offers *limited* evidence of the ability to use content and pedagogical knowledge of health by accurately identifying a student's physical, mental/emotional, and social issues/concerns and explaining how to meet the needs of the identified student through sound curricular and instructional choices that are informed by knowledge of middle childhood students.

Characteristics:

- an identification of physical, mental/emotional, and social issues/concerns of the student profiled that may be somewhat inaccurate or limited
- An explanation of the steps used to meet the needs of the student may not be complete or the steps may be somewhat inappropriate in meeting the needs of the student, or all three steps may not be addressed. Use of resources and materials may be limited or may be loosely connected to meeting the instructional needs of the student.
- a limited or unclear rationale to justify the steps used in meeting all the needs of the student

THE LEVEL 1 response offers *little or no* evidence of the ability to use content and pedagogical knowledge of health by accurately identifying a student's physical, mental/emotional, and social issues/concerns and explaining how to meet the needs of the identified student through sound curricular and instructional choices that are informed by knowledge of middle childhood students.

Characteristics:

- identification of physical, mental/emotional, and social issues/concerns of the student profiled that may be vague, weak, or sketchy, and/or incomplete
- An explanation of the steps used to meet the needs of the student may be missing, inappropriate, trivial, or unrelated. Use of resources and materials to meet the instructional needs of the student may be missing or trivial with no connection to student needs.
- Rationale to justify the steps used in meeting the needs of the student may be missing, irrelevant, or trivial.

Exercise 6: Integrating the Arts

In this exercise: You demonstrate your ability to use the arts to develop student understanding of concepts in another discipline. You are asked to identify concepts in a given subject area and describe an arts-focused learning experience that will establish a connection for students' understanding of an identified concept and provide multiple paths of access for student learning of that concept. You are asked to justify how the arts-focused learning experience will enable students to develop a deeper or broader appreciation of the arts.

THE LEVEL 4 response offers *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the ability to demonstrate an understanding of the arts by integrating an art-focused learning experience that provides multiple access to student understanding of a concept in another discipline and provides a rationale for its use.

Characteristics:

- a thorough and in-depth understanding of the content area as demonstrated through developmentally appropriate concepts
- a thorough and detailed description of a developmentally appropriate arts learning experience that includes resources
- a thorough and detailed analysis of an arts learning experience that establishes a connection for student understanding of a concept as it relates to a given topic
- a sound explanation of how the arts learning experience provides multiple access for student learning of the given concept
- a thorough, detailed, and appropriate explanation as to how the arts learning experience will enable students to have a deeper/broader appreciation of the arts

THE LEVEL 3 response offers *clear* evidence of the ability to demonstrate an understanding of the arts by integrating an art-focused learning experience that provides multiple access to student understanding of a concept in another discipline and provides a rationale for its use.

Characteristics:

- a clear understanding of the content area as demonstrated through identification of concepts that are developmentally appropriate for student learning
- a clear and detailed description of a developmentally appropriate arts learning experience that includes resources
- a detailed analysis of how an arts learning experience establishes a connection for student understanding of a concept as it relates to a given topic
- a clear explanation of how the arts learning experience provides multiple access for student learning of the given concept
- a clear, detailed, and appropriate explanation as to how the arts learning experience will enable students to have a deeper/broader appreciation of the arts

THE LEVEL 2 response offers *limited* evidence of the ability to demonstrate an understanding of the arts by integrating an art-focused learning experience that provides multiple access to student understanding of a concept in another discipline and provides a rationale for its use.

Characteristics:

- a weak understanding of the content area as demonstrated through identification of concepts that may be somewhat limited in connection to the given problem
- a description of an arts learning experience that may not include resources or may be somewhat developmentally inappropriate for student learning
- partial understanding of the given content area through a description of an arts learning experience that may be somewhat developmentally inappropriate
- limited and/or unclear analysis of how an arts learning experience establishes a connection for student understanding of a concept as it relates to a given topic
- a vague explanation of how the arts learning experience provides multiple access for student learning of the given concept
- a sketchy explanation as to how the arts learning experience will enable students to have a deeper/broader appreciation of the arts

THE LEVEL 1 response offers *little or no* evidence of the ability to demonstrate an understanding of the arts by integrating an art-focused learning experience that provides multiple access to student understanding of a concept in another discipline and provides a rationale for its use.

Characteristics:

- little or no understanding of the content area as demonstrated through identification of concepts that are developmentally inappropriate or unrelated to the topic
- a description of an arts learning experience that may be unclear or may not include resources and/or may be inappropriate for student learning
- little or no understanding of the given content through a description of an arts learning experience that is developmentally inappropriate or that does not have resources included
- little or no explanation of how an arts learning experience establishes a connection for student understanding of a concept in a given subject
- an explanation of how the arts learning experience provides multiple access for student learning of the given concept may be unclear
- an explanation as to how the arts learning experience will enable students to have a deeper/broader appreciation of the arts is trivial, unclear, 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).