Early Childhood through Young Adulthood
LIBRARY MEDIA

Scoring Guide for Candidates

For retake candidates who began the Certification process in 2013-14 and earlier.

- **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

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.boardcertifiedteachers.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: Instructional Collaboration

In this entry: You demonstrate your ability to collaborate with teachers to plan, develop, and implement an instructional sequence that integrates digital content, research, or information literacy processes into classroom instruction. You provide a total of four student/group work samples and a Written Commentary that provides a context, analyzes the collaboration plan, assesses the student work, and reflects on your teaching. You also provide Documentation of Collaboration to help assessors see evidence of partnering with a teacher or teachers to create, implement, and assess student learning experiences.

> **THE LEVEL 4** performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to collaborate effectively with a colleague to plan, develop, and implement a meaningful instructional sequence that links the library media program and its resources to a content area and to assess student work that results from the instructional collaboration.

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

- that the library media specialist (LMS) has the ability to collaborate with the classroom teacher in effectively planning the goals and implementation of an engaging, thought-provoking instructional sequence to enhance student learning.

- that the LMS is capable of using his or her extensive knowledge of multiple student learning styles and developmental levels to effectively set high and worthwhile goals that are appropriate for these students and to effectively incorporate a rich variety of appropriate, informed teaching strategies into the lesson.

- that the LMS seamlessly uses a collegial approach to collaborative instruction that fosters a solid student understanding of the tightly connected role of the library media center and classroom learning.

- that the LMS demonstrates a strong command of library and information studies linked with appropriate instruction that is used to facilitate students' deep understanding of the content goals, interweaving multiple aspects of library studies into instruction.

- that the LMS demonstrates substantive knowledge of a rich variety of instructional resources and technologies to promote student learning logically and effectively.

- that the LMS convincingly shows that, with a collaborating teacher, he or she can thoroughly analyze and assess student progress.

- that the LMS can reflect fully on the effectiveness of his or her teaching practice and thoughtfully modify it for future instruction.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to collaborate effectively with a colleague to plan, develop, and implement a meaningful instructional sequence that links the library media program and its resources to a content area and to assess student work that results from the instructional collaboration.

> **THE LEVEL 3** performance provides *clear* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to collaborate effectively with a colleague to plan, develop, and implement a meaningful instructional sequence that links the library media program and its resources to a content area and to assess student work that results from the instructional collaboration.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the library media specialist (LMS) has the ability to collaborate with the classroom teacher in effectively planning the goals and implementation of an engaging instructional sequence to enhance student learning.

- that the LMS is capable of using his or her knowledge of student learning styles and developmental levels to effectively set worthwhile goals that are appropriate for these students and to incorporate a variety of appropriate teaching strategies into the lesson.

- that the LMS uses a collegial approach to collaborative instruction that fosters student understanding of the tightly connected role of the library media center and classroom learning.

- that the LMS demonstrates substantive knowledge of a variety of instructional resources and technologies to promote student learning logically and effectively.

- that the LMS clearly demonstrates a strong command of library and information studies linked with appropriate instruction that is used to facilitate students' deep understanding of the content goals, interweaving multiple aspects of library studies into instruction.

- that the LMS appropriately shows that, with a collaborating teacher, he or she can analyze and assess student progress.

- that the LMS can reflect on the effectiveness of his or her teaching practice and modify it for future instruction.

One part of the performance may be more indicative of accomplished practice than another, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to collaborate effectively with a colleague to plan, develop, and implement a meaningful instructional sequence that links the library media program and its resources to a content area and to assess student work that results from the instructional collaboration.

> **THE LEVEL 2** performance provides *limited* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to collaborate effectively with a colleague to plan, develop, and implement a meaningful instructional sequence that links the library media program and its resources to a content area and to assess student work that results from the instructional collaboration.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the library media specialist (LMS) has the ability to collaborate with the classroom teacher in planning the goals and implementation of an instructional sequence to enhance student learning. The goals may be vague, of minimal significance, or only loosely related to instruction. Teaching strategies may show vague consideration for the variety of learning styles of students or may not show high expectations for all students.

- that the approach to collaborative instruction may be weak or only loosely connects the library media center and classroom learning.

  In a Level 2 performance, the LMS demonstrates a sketchy command of library and information studies linked with somewhat appropriate instruction that is used to facilitate students' understanding of the content goals and that loosely interweaves multiple aspects of library studies into instruction.

  In a Level 2 performance, the LMS demonstrates some knowledge of instructional resources and technologies, but their use may be inappropriate or ineffective. Analysis and assessment of student work may be weak or may show collaboration with the classroom teacher that is only somewhat effective. Assessment may only loosely relate to the learning goals. Reflection may be oversimplified or sketchy and show vague 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 library media specialist's ability to collaborate effectively with a colleague to plan, develop, and implement a meaningful instructional sequence that links the library media program and its resources to a content area and to assess student work that results from the instructional collaboration.

> **THE LEVEL 1** performance provides *little or no* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to collaborate effectively with a colleague to plan, develop, and implement a meaningful instructional sequence that links the library media program and its resources to a content area and to assess student work that results from the instructional collaboration.

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

- that the library media specialist (LMS) has the ability to collaborate with the classroom teacher in planning the goals and implementation of an instructional sequence to enhance student learning. The goals may not be goals at all, but rather activities. Goals may be trivial or unrelated to the instructional sequence.

- of knowledge of student learning styles and developmental levels having any effect on teaching strategies for the lesson.

  In a Level 1 performance, the approach to collaborative instruction is ineffective in fostering student understanding of the connection between the library media center and classroom learning.

  In a Level 1 performance, the LMS demonstrates little or no knowledge of instructional resources and technologies or how to use these resources with students.

  In a Level 1 performance, the LMS demonstrates little or no command of library and information studies and fails to link knowledge with instruction that facilitates students' deep understanding of the content goals or to interweave multiple aspects of library studies into instruction.

- of the library media specialist's ability to analyze and assess student progress and reflect on the effectiveness of his or her teaching practice. The reflection may be missing or be unrelated to instructional collaboration.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to collaborate effectively with a colleague to plan, develop, and implement a meaningful instructional sequence that links the library media program and its resources to a content area and to assess student work that results from the instructional collaboration.

Entry 2: Fostering an Appreciation of Literature

In this entry: You demonstrate your ability to foster an appreciation of literature in your students by encouraging them to read, listen to, or view a variety of literary materials. You provide a 17-minute video recording consisting of a narrated, 2-minute pan of the room to highlight your collection and organization of materials and a 15-minute segment from a single lesson that demonstrates how you help students as developing readers to understand and appreciate literature. You provide a Written Commentary that provides a context and describes your plan for instruction, analyzes the instruction on the video recording, and reflects on your ability to foster an appreciation of literature in your students. You also provide instructional materials related to the lesson featured on the video recording.

> **THE LEVEL 4** performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to foster an appreciation of literature in students by leading them to make inferences and interpretations of literature that are connected to a content area and to other literary materials, to establish a library media center setting that is inviting and supportive, and to provide equal access for all students.

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

- that the library media specialist (LMS) creates an inviting, accessible, and supportive reading, listening, and viewing environment that fosters an appreciation of literature.

- that the LMS ensures fairness, equity, and access for all learners.

- that the LMS has used knowledge of library and information studies to effectively establish a library media center collection that is solidly based upon the curriculum to soundly meet the needs, interests, and abilities of the learners in this lesson.

- that the LMS has attractively and logically organized the library media center for efficient and effective use by all learners.

- that the LMS creatively promotes specific areas of the collection to actively foster an appreciation of literature.

- that the LMS uses knowledge of students' diverse developmental needs, interests, and abilities to select worthwhile and appropriate lesson goals that help motivate students to read.

- that the LMS actively guides students to make thoughtful inferences or interpretations about literature through quality teacher-to-student and/or student-to-student interactions.

- that he or she capably and creatively connects other literature sources to the lesson and effectively connects literature to a content area in order to create an integrated learning experience.

- of thoughtful and complete analysis of instruction, reflection on the effectiveness of the strategies used to generate student response to literature, and comprehensive discussion of implications for future teaching.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to foster an appreciation of literature in students by helping them to make inferences and interpretations of literature, to establish a library media center setting that is inviting and supportive, and to provide equal access for all students.

> **THE LEVEL 3** performance provides *clear* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to foster an appreciation of literature in students by leading them to make inferences and interpretations of literature, that are connected to a content area and to other literary materials, to establish a library media center setting that is inviting and supportive, and to provide equal access for all students.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the library media specialist (LMS) creates an inviting, accessible, and supportive reading, listening, and viewing environment that fosters an appreciation of literature.

- that the LMS ensures fairness, equity, and access for all learners.

- that the LMS has used knowledge of library and information studies to establish a library media center collection that is based upon the curriculum to meet the needs, interests, and abilities of the learners in this lesson.

- that the LMS has attractively and logically organized the library media center for use by all learners.

- that the LMS promotes specific areas of the collection to foster an appreciation of literature.

- that the LMS uses knowledge of students' diverse developmental needs, interests, and abilities to select worthwhile and appropriate lesson goals that help motivate students to read.

- that the LMS actively guides students to make thoughtful inferences or interpretations about literature through quality teacher-to-student and/or student-to-student interactions.

- that the LMS capably connects other literature sources to the lesson and connects literature to a content area in order to create an integrated learning experience.

- of thoughtful analysis of instruction, reflection on the effectiveness of the strategies used to generate student response to literature, and discussion of implications for future teaching.

One part of the performance may be more indicative of accomplished practice than another, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to foster an appreciation of literature in students by helping them to make inferences and interpretations of literature, to establish a library media center setting that is inviting and supportive, and to provide equal access for all students.

> **THE LEVEL 2** performance provides *limited* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to foster an appreciation of literature in students by leading them to make inferences and interpretations of literature, that are connected to a content area and to other literary materials, to establish a library media center setting that is inviting and supportive, and to provide equal access for all students.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the library media specialist (LMS) creates an inviting, accessible, and supportive reading, listening, and viewing environment that fosters an appreciation of literature.

- that the LMS has ensured fairness, equity, and access for all learners.

- that the LMS has used knowledge of library and information studies to establish a library media center collection that is based upon the curriculum to meet the needs, interests, and abilities of the learners in this lesson.

- that the LMS has attractively and logically organized the library media center for use by all learners.

- that the LMS promotes specific areas of the collection to foster an appreciation of literature.

- that the LMS uses knowledge of students' diverse developmental needs, interests, and abilities to select clear, appropriate lesson goals that help motivate students to read.

- that the LMS actively guides students to make inferences or interpretations about literature. Teacher-to-student and/or student-to-student interactions may be mostly one way with few exchanges of ideas.

- that the LMS capably and creatively uses other literature sources to connect to the lesson and connects literature to a content area in order to create an integrated learning experience. Analysis may be weak or may show an inability to generate student response to literature. The reflection may be oversimplified or weak and show a 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 library media specialist's ability to foster an appreciation of literature in students by helping them to make inferences and interpretations of literature, to establish a library media center setting that is inviting and supportive, and to provide equal access for all students.

> **THE LEVEL 1** performance provides *little or no* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to foster an appreciation of literature in students by leading them to make inferences and interpretations of literature, that are connected to a content area and to other literary materials, to establish a library media center setting that is inviting and supportive, and to provide equal access for all students.

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

- that the library media specialist (LMS) creates an inviting, accessible, and supportive reading, listening, and viewing environment that fosters an appreciation of literature.

- that the LMS ensures fairness, equity, and access for all learners.

- that the LMS has used knowledge of library and information studies to establish a library media center collection that is based on the curriculum or meets the needs, interests, and abilities of the learners in this lesson.

- that the LMS has attractively and logically organized the library media center for use by all learners. The evidence that the LMS promotes specific areas of the collection to foster an appreciation of literature is missing or vague.

- that the LMS uses knowledge of students' diverse developmental needs, interests, and abilities to select clear, appropriate lesson goals that help motivate students to read is absent or minimal. It provides only vague evidence that the LMS actively guides students to make inferences or interpretations about literature. Teacher-to-student and/or student-to-student interactions may be absent or weak.

- that the LMS capably and creatively uses other literature sources to connect to the lesson and connects literature to a content area in order to create an integrated learning experience is unclear.

- of the ability to analyze instruction. The reflection may be missing or unrelated to the effectiveness of the strategies used to generate student response to literature and may offer weak discussion of implications for future teaching.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to foster an appreciation of literature in students by helping them to make inferences and interpretations of literature, to establish a library media center setting that is inviting and supportive, and to provide equal access for all students.

Entry 3: Integration of Instructional Technologies

In this entry: You demonstrate the effective selection and integration of technologies into the instructional program of your school. You demonstrate teaching strategies used to integrate technologies into a lesson and how you foster students' understanding of the ethical or legal use of information. You provide a 20-minute video recording consisting of two 10-minute continuous and unedited segments showing different parts of a single lesson that demonstrate how you integrate technologies into your teaching and help learners effectively use technology as it relates to their learning process. You provide a Written Commentary that provides an instructional context for the lesson on the video recording, describes your plan for instruction, analyzes the instruction on the video recording, and reflects on the lesson. You also provide instructional materials related to the lesson featured on the video recording.

> **THE LEVEL 4** performance provides *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to demonstrate effective and appropriate selection and integration of technologies into an instructional lesson to enhance student learning and to foster student understanding of the ethical and legal use of information.

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

- that the library media specialist (LMS) uses his or her wide knowledge of learners' diverse developmental needs and abilities to inform integrated choices of technologies in teaching.

- that the LMS sets worthwhile goals that are appropriate for students' learning needs, are directly reflected in the instruction, and holds high expectations for all students.

- that the LMS makes appropriate choices about the selection and integration of technologies into a lesson.

- that the LMS employs a strong command of library and information studies and facilitates learners' deeper understanding of the effective use of technologies.

- of the library media specialist's ability to foster a purposeful, active, equitable, and supportive instructional environment in which learners are invited to participate actively in the learning process.

- that the LMS integrates appropriate technologies to fully enhance learners' decision making, problem solving, research, communication, and/or productivity.

- that the LMS works with learners to facilitate their clear understanding of the effective use of technologies and of the ethical or legal use of information.

- that the LMS describes his or her practice accurately, analyzes it fully and thoughtfully, and reflects insightfully on its implications and significance for future teaching.

Overall, there is *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to demonstrate effective and appropriate selection and integration of technologies into an instructional lesson to enhance student learning and to foster student understanding of the ethical and legal use of information.

THE LEVEL 3 performance provides *clear* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to demonstrate effective and appropriate selection and integration of technologies into an instructional lesson to enhance student learning and to foster student understanding of the ethical and legal use of information.

The Level 3 performance provides *clear* evidence:

- that the library media specialist (LMS) uses his or her knowledge of learners' diverse developmental needs and abilities to inform integrated choices of technologies in teaching.

- that the LMS sets worthwhile goals that are appropriate for students' learning needs, are directly reflected in the instruction, and holds high expectations for all students.

- that the LMS makes appropriate choices about the selection and integration of technologies into a lesson.

- that the LMS employs a strong command of library and information studies and facilitates learners' understanding of the effective use of technologies.

- of the library media specialist's ability to foster a purposeful, equitable, and supportive instructional environment in which learners are invited to participate in the learning process.

- that the LMS integrates appropriate technologies to enhance learners' decision making, problem solving, research, communication, and/or productivity.

- that the LMS works with learners to facilitate their understanding of the effective use of technologies and the ethical or legal use of information.

- that the LMS describes his or her practice thoroughly and accurately, analyzes it thoughtfully, and reflects on its implications and significance for future teaching.

One part of the performance may be more indicative of accomplished practice than another, but viewed as a whole, there is *clear* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to demonstrate effective and appropriate selection and integration of technologies into an instructional lesson to enhance student learning and to foster student understanding of the ethical and legal use of information.

> **THE LEVEL 2** performance provides *limited* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to demonstrate effective and appropriate selection and integration of technologies into an instructional lesson to enhance student learning and to foster student understanding of the ethical and legal use of information.

The Level 2 performance provides *limited* evidence:

- that the library media specialist (LMS) uses his or her knowledge of learners' diverse developmental needs and abilities to inform integrated choices of technologies in teaching.

- that the LMS sets worthwhile goals that are appropriate for students' learning needs, are directly reflected in the instruction, and holds high expectations for all students.

- that the LMS makes appropriate choices about the selection and integration of technologies into a lesson.

  In a Level 2 performance, the LMS employs a weak or inaccurate command of library and information studies and weakly facilitates learners' understanding of the effective use of technologies.

- of the library media specialist's ability to foster a purposeful, equitable, and supportive instructional environment in which learners are invited to participate in the learning process.

  In a Level 2 performance, the LMS employs inappropriate technologies or makes disconnected references to using technology to enhance learners' decision making, problem solving, research, communication, and/or productivity.

- that the LMS works with learners to facilitate their understanding of the effective use of technologies and the ethical or legal use of information.

  In a Level 2 performance, the LMS weakly describes his or her practice, offers ineffective or loosely related analysis, and vaguely or inaccurately reflects on its implications and significance for future teaching.

The Level 2 performance may be characterized by evidence that hints at accomplished practice, but overall, there is *limited* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to demonstrate effective and appropriate selection and integration of technologies into an instructional lesson to enhance student learning and to foster student understanding of the ethical and legal use of information.

THE LEVEL 1 performance provides *little or no* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to demonstrate effective and appropriate selection and integration of technologies into an instructional lesson to enhance student learning and to foster student understanding of the ethical and legal use of information.

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

- that the library media specialist (LMS) uses his or her knowledge of learners' diverse developmental needs and abilities to inform integrated choices of technologies in teaching.

- that the LMS sets worthwhile goals that are appropriate for students' learning needs, are directly reflected in the instruction, and holds high expectations for all students.

- that the LMS makes appropriate choices about the selection and integration of technologies into a lesson.

   In a Level 1 performance, the LMS demonstrates an inaccurate or unengaging command of library and information studies and does little to facilitate learners' understanding of the effective use of technologies.

- of the library media specialist's ability to foster an active, equitable, and supportive instructional environment in which learners are invited to participate in the learning process.

   The Level 1 performance shows that the LMS minimally integrates appropriate technologies to enhance learners' decision-making, problem-solving, research, communication, and/or productivity.

- that the LMS works with learners to facilitate their understanding of the effective use of technologies and the ethical or legal use of information.

   In a Level 1 performance, the LMS fails to describe his or her practice, offers sketchy analysis, and is unable to reflect on its implications and significance for future teaching.

Overall, there is *little or no* evidence of the library media specialist's ability to demonstrate effective and appropriate selection and integration of technologies into an instructional lesson to enhance student learning and to foster student understanding of the ethical and legal use of information.

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 library media specialist'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 library media specialist (LMS) 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 LMS, 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 LMS facilitates ongoing, mutually beneficial communications between students and the wider community in a way that enhances teaching and learning.

- that the LMS 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 LMS has worked collaboratively with colleagues to improve teaching and learning, either within the school or in the wider professional community. In addition, there is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the LMS 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 LMS'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 LMS who has made an impact on student learning through work with other colleagues, professionals, families, and the community, and as a learner.

- that the LMS 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 LMS'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 library media specialist'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 library media specialist (LMS) 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 LMS, 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 LMS facilitates ongoing, mutually beneficial communications between students and the wider community in a way that enhances teaching and learning.

- that the LMS 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 LMS 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 LMS 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 LMS'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 LMS who has made an impact on student learning through work with other colleagues, professionals, families, and the community, and as a learner.

- that the LMS 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 LMS'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 library media specialist'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 library media specialist (LMS) 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. There is limited evidence 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 LMS has strengthened his or her own teaching practice through professional development; even if the LMS 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 LMS has shared what he or she has learned with colleagues by working with them in a role as a partner, collaborator, or leader.

   The evidence in a Level 2 performance may indicate that the LMS 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 LMS'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 LMS 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 LMS'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 library media specialist'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 library media specialist (LMS) treats parents and other interested adults as partners in the child's education, and uses appropriate strategies for reaching out to the families of his or her students. The rationale for the selected strategies may be very vague, unclear, or absent. There is little or no evidence that the strategies are effective in engaging parents and other interested adults. There may be evidence that some families are overlooked or ignored.

- that the communications with families are focused on substantive teaching and learning issues. Instead, the communications are taken up almost exclusively by procedural issues, behavior, or disciplinary matters.

- that the communications with families are interactive. Communications with families are entirely one way and/or infrequent. Parents may not be kept informed about what is going on in the classroom. If evidence regarding outreach to the wider community is present, the connections may promote trivial interactions with little impact on student learning.

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

- that the LMS 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 LMS 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 LMS 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 LMS'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 LMS 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 LMS'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: Organizational Management

In this exercise: You demonstrate content knowledge of administrative issues and problem solving in the library media center. Given a scenario, you identify and analyze issues, and propose strategies to address those issues.

THE LEVEL 4 response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of an insightful and concise identification and analysis of specific management issues pertaining to effective administration of a library media center and ability to propose significant strategies to address those issues.

Characteristics:

- Identification of the specific management issues presented is insightful, concise, and directly related to the scenario.

- Analysis of the specific management issues presented is detailed and directly related to the scenario.

- Strategies are specific and explained in considerable detail and directly and accurately address the specific management issues presented in the scenario.

THE LEVEL 3 response shows *clear* evidence of an insightful and concise identification and analysis of specific management issues pertaining to effective administration of a library media center and ability to propose significant strategies to address those issues.

Characteristics:

- Identification of the specific management issues presented is related to the scenario, although one or two areas may be more fully developed than others.

- Analysis of the specific management issues presented is related to the scenario, although one or two areas may be more fully analyzed than others.

- Strategies are specific and explained in detail and address the specific management issues presented in the scenario.

THE LEVEL 2 response shows *limited* evidence of an insightful and concise identification and analysis of specific management issues pertaining to effective administration of a library media center and ability to propose significant strategies to address those issues.

Characteristics:

- Identification of the specific management issues presented is related in some way to the scenario, although one or two areas may be described with limited details and others might be discussed in more general terms.

- Analysis of the specific management issues presented is related in some way to the scenario, although one or two areas may be analyzed with limited details and others might be discussed in more general terms.

- Strategies are somewhat specific with explanations that lack detail, and vaguely address the specific management issues presented in the scenario.

THE LEVEL 1 response shows *little or no* evidence of an insightful and concise identification and analysis of specific management issues pertaining to effective administration of a library media center and ability to propose significant strategies to address those issues.

Characteristics:

- Identification of the specific management issues presented minimally relates to the scenario, and one or two areas may be described in general, inaccurately, or parts may be missing.

- Analysis of the specific management issues presented minimally relates to the scenario, and one or two areas may be missing or inaccurate.

- Strategies are not specific or detailed and fail to address the specific management issues presented in the scenario.

Exercise 2: Ethical and Legal Tenets

In this exercise: You demonstrate content knowledge of key components of a reconsideration challenge. You describe and evaluate one of the components given and describe and explain the value of one specific professional resource when dealing with such a challenge.

THE LEVEL 4 response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to describe and evaluate a key step of a reconsideration challenge and to describe a professional resource related to the reconsideration process and explain its value in dealing with a challenge.

Characteristics:

- The description of a key step in a reconsideration process is detailed and full.
- The explanation of the step's significance to the process is rich and informed.
- The description of a professional resource is insightful and thorough.
- The explanation of how the resource is valuable in addressing a challenge is knowledgeable and is accurately related to the process.

THE LEVEL 3 response shows *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to describe and evaluate a key step of a reconsideration challenge and to describe a professional resource related to the reconsideration process and explain its value in dealing with a challenge.

Characteristics:

- The description of a key step in a reconsideration process is detailed.
- The explanation of the step's significance to the process is informed.
- The description of a professional resource is accurate.
- The explanation of how the resource is valuable in addressing a challenge is knowledgeable and related to the process, although there could be some unevenness in the response.

THE LEVEL 2 response shows *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to describe and evaluate a key step of a reconsideration challenge and to describe a professional resource related to the reconsideration process and explain its value in dealing with a challenge.

Characteristics:

- The description of a key step in a reconsideration process is somewhat detailed, but some points may be missing or inappropriate.
- The explanation of the step's significance to the process is responded to, but lacks detail or knowledge and may contain errors or misconceptions.
- The description of a professional resource lacks depth.
- The explanation of how the resource is valuable in addressing a challenge is somewhat knowledgeable and loosely related to the process.

THE LEVEL 1 response shows *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to describe and evaluate a key step of a reconsideration challenge and to describe a professional resource related to the reconsideration process and explain its value in dealing with a challenge.

Characteristics:

- The description of a key step in a reconsideration process is vague or inaccurate.
- The explanation of the step's significance to the process is uninformed and/or inappropriate.
- The description of a professional resource is weak or inaccurate.
- The explanation of how the resource is valuable in addressing a challenge is missing or is not related to the process.

Exercise 3: Technologies

In this exercise: You demonstrate content knowledge of technological issues related to hardware, software, and connectivity. You explain technological needs to accomplish specific objectives presented in a scenario. Your response will include knowledge of technological issues in implementing programs to meet objectives.

THE LEVEL 4 response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to correctly identify the technological needs of a library media program in a given situation in terms of hardware, software, and connectivity. The candidate provides a well-articulated explanation of a significant issue in each of the three given areas to be addressed in implementing the project.

Characteristics:

- The explanation of the hardware needs is accurate and tightly connected to the scenario.
- The explanation of the software needs is accurate and specifically connected to the scenario.
- The explanation of the connectivity needs is accurate and thoroughly connected to the scenario.
- The explanation of one significant issue for **each** of the three areas given is insightful and thorough.

THE LEVEL 3 response shows *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to correctly identify technological needs of a library media program in a given situation in terms of hardware, software, and connectivity. The candidate provides a detailed explanation of a significant issue in most of the three given areas to be addressed in implementing the project.

Characteristics:

- The explanation of the hardware needs is accurate and strongly connected to the scenario.
- The explanation of the software needs is accurate and strongly connected to the scenario.
- The explanation of the connectivity needs is accurate and strongly connected to the scenario.
- The explanation of one significant issue for **each** of the three areas given is specific and appropriate.

THE LEVEL 2 response shows *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to correctly identify technological needs of a library media program in a given situation in terms of hardware, software, and connectivity. The candidate provides a marginal explanation of a significant issue in each of the three given areas to be addressed in implementing the project.

Characteristics:

- The explanation of the hardware needs is partially accurate and somewhat tied to the scenario.

- The explanation of the software needs is partially accurate and somewhat tied to the scenario.

- The explanation of the connectivity needs is partially accurate and somewhat tied to the scenario.

- The explanation of one significant issue for **each** of the three areas given is generally accurate and remotely tied to the scenario.

THE LEVEL 1 response shows *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to correctly identify technological needs of a library media program in a given situation in terms of hardware, software, and connectivity. The candidate provides an inaccurate or sketchy explanation of a significant issue in each of the three given areas to be addressed in implementing the project.

Characteristics:

- The explanation of the hardware needs is inaccurate and not tied to the scenario.

- The explanation of the software needs is inaccurate and not tied to the scenario.

- The explanation of the connectivity needs is inaccurate and not tied to the scenario.

- The explanation of one significant issue for **each** of the three areas given is inaccurate or inappropriate and not connected to the scenario, or is missing altogether.

Exercise 4: Collection Development

In this exercise: You demonstrate content knowledge of the processes involved in ensuring that the library collection meets the needs of the learning community by identifying weaknesses in a collection development process, and suggesting modifications to strengthen the process in response to a given scenario. You also suggest methods for promoting new acquisitions.

THE LEVEL 4 response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence that the candidate is able to offer insightful and concise analysis of the collection development process and techniques used to effectively promote new acquisitions.

Characteristics:

- Three weaknesses of the given process are accurately identified.

- The recommended modifications thoroughly address the weaknesses identified and the rationale specifically explains how the needs assessment process will be improved by the modifications.

- The suggested acquisition is tightly connected to the scenario and the strategy described for promotion of new material is insightful and detailed.

THE LEVEL 3 response shows *clear* evidence that the candidate is able to offer insightful and concise analysis of the collection development process and techniques used to effectively promote new acquisitions.

Characteristics:

- Three weaknesses of the given process are accurately identified.

- The recommended modifications appropriately address the weaknesses identified and the rationale logically explains how the needs assessment process will be improved by the modifications.

- The suggested acquisition is connected to the scenario and the strategy described for promotion of new material is appropriate.

THE LEVEL 2 response shows *limited* evidence that the candidate is able to offer insightful and concise analysis of the collection development process and techniques used to effectively promote new acquisitions.

Characteristics:

- Some weaknesses may be incorrectly identified.
- The recommended modifications marginally address the weaknesses identified and the rationale vaguely describes how the needs assessment process will be improved by the modifications.
- The suggested acquisition is loosely connected to the scenario and the strategy described for promotion of new material is routine or insignificant.

THE LEVEL 1 response shows *little or no* evidence that the candidate is able to offer insightful and concise analysis of the collection development process and techniques used to effectively promote new acquisitions.

Characteristics:

- Weaknesses of the process described are incorrectly identified.
- The recommended modifications do not address the weaknesses identified and the rationale fails to describe how the needs assessment process will be improved by the modifications.
- The suggested acquisition is weakly grounded in the scenario and the strategy described for promotion of new material is inadequate.

Exercise 5: Information Literacy

In this exercise: You demonstrate content knowledge of information literacy processes and apply this knowledge to a given scenario. You include in the response a description of the components in the process selected and an example of the application of each component in the given situation.

THE LEVEL 4 response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the candidate's understanding of the components of an information literacy process and an ability to propose effective strategies for implementing that process to meet the needs of students.

Characteristics:

- The components of an information literacy process are accurately identified.
- The process described effectively helps students to meet the identified goals for the lesson and is tightly connected to the scenario.
- The examples provided are firmly grounded in the scenario and insightfully and accurately reflect the appropriateness of the information literacy process.

THE LEVEL 3 response shows *clear* evidence of the candidate's understanding of the components of an information literacy process and an ability to propose effective strategies for implementing that process to meet the needs of students.

Characteristics:

- The components of an information literacy process are mostly identified.
- The process described helps students to meet identified goals for the lesson and is connected to the scenario.
- The examples provided are grounded in the scenario and accurately reflect the appropriateness of the information literacy process.

> **THE LEVEL 2** response shows *limited* evidence of the candidate's understanding of the components of an information literacy process and an ability to propose effective strategies for implementing the process to meet the needs of students.

Characteristics:

- The components of an information literacy process are minimally identified.
- The process described marginally helps students to meet identified goals for the lesson and is loosely connected to the scenario.
- The examples provided are partially grounded in the scenario and vaguely reflect on the appropriateness of the information literacy process.

> **THE LEVEL 1** response shows *little or no* evidence of the candidate's understanding of the components of an information literacy process and an ability to propose effective strategies for implementing the process to meet the needs of students.

Characteristics:

- The components of an information literacy process are inaccurately or inappropriately identified.
- The process described is weak and is unconnected to the scenario.
- The examples are not grounded in the scenario and do not reflect on the appropriateness of the information literacy process.

Exercise 6: Knowledge of Literature

In this exercise: You demonstrate your content knowledge of children's or young adults' literature by evaluating a recognized piece of literature in terms of a specified criterion. You then suggest a specific content area lesson that would be enriched by the use of this piece of literature.

> **THE LEVEL 4** response shows *clear, consistent, and convincing* evidence of the candidate's understanding of recognized criteria for evaluating a piece of quality literature and his or her ability to use that piece of literature to enrich a content area lesson.

Characteristics:

- The evaluation of a piece of literature is rich, detailed, and appropriate for the criterion given.
- Rationale for the suggested lesson is insightful and convincing for the literature selected.
- Thoughtful, solid evidence is offered of how the specific lesson will be enriched by use of the selected literature.

> **THE LEVEL 3** response shows *clear* evidence of the candidate's understanding of recognized criteria for evaluating a piece of quality literature and his or her ability to use that piece of literature to enrich a content area lesson.

Characteristics:

- The evaluation of a piece of literature is detailed and appropriate for the criterion given.
- Rationale for the suggested lesson is convincing for literature selected, although some parts may not be as convincing as others.
- Solid evidence is offered of how the specific lesson will be enriched by use of the selected literature.

THE LEVEL 2 response shows *limited* evidence of the candidate's understanding of recognized criteria for evaluating a piece of quality literature and his or her ability to use that piece of literature to enrich a content area lesson.

Characteristics:

- The evaluation of a piece of literature is somewhat appropriate for the criterion given.
- The rationale for the suggested lesson is marginally convincing for the literature selected.
- Some evidence is offered of how the specific lesson will be enriched by use of the selected literature.

THE LEVEL 1 response shows *little or no* evidence of the candidate's understanding of recognized criteria for evaluating a piece of quality literature and his or her ability to use that piece of literature to enrich a content area lesson.

Characteristics:

- The evaluation of a piece of literature is inappropriate for the criterion given.
- The rationale for the suggested lesson is unconvincing for the literature selected.
- Minimal evidence is offered of how the specific lesson will be enriched by use of the selected literature.

Produced for

NBPTS®
National Board for
Professional Teaching Standards

by

PEARSON