



National Board for
**PROFESSIONAL
TEACHING
STANDARDS®**

**Early Childhood through Young Adulthood
School Counseling**

Scoring Guide

Effective 2006

Copyright © 2006 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, and National Board Certification are registered trademarks of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

This project is funded in part with grants from the U.S. Department of Education and the National Science Foundation. Through September 2005, NBPTS has been appropriated federal funds of \$149.1 million, of which \$136.7 million was expended. Such amount represents approximately 34 percent of the National Board Certification project. More than \$261 million (66 percent) of the project's cost was financed by non-federal sources.

The contents of this publication were developed under a grant from the 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards	4
Overview of the Early Childhood through Young Adulthood/ School Counseling Assessment	7
The Early Childhood through Young Adulthood/ School Counseling Scoring System	11
Understanding Scores	16

2. SCORING MATERIALS FOR PORTFOLIO ENTRIES

Introduction	18
Entry 1: Addressing Personal/Social Needs	19
Entry 2: Exploring Career Development	27
Entry 3: Maximizing Academic Learning	34
Entry 4: Documented Accomplishments: Contributions to Student Learning	44

3. SCORING MATERIALS FOR ASSESSMENT CENTER EXERCISES

Introduction	53
Exercise 1: Human Growth and Development	54
Exercise 2: School Counseling Program	58
Exercise 3: Diverse Populations	62
Exercise 4: Theory	66
Exercise 5: Data and Planning	70
Exercise 6: Collaboration	74

4. SELECTED ASSESSMENT CENTER EXERCISES

Introduction	78
Exercise 2: School Counseling Program	79
Exercise 3: Diverse Populations	81

1

Background Information

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards®

The Vision of the National Board

It is the mission of the National Board to establish high and rigorous standards for what accomplished teachers/school counselors should know and be able to do, to develop and operate a national, voluntary system to assess and certify teachers/school counselors who meet these standards, and to advance related education reforms for the purpose of improving student learning in American schools.

In 1987, a diverse group of exemplary teachers, other educators, state and local policymakers, and national leaders founded the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards® (NBPTS®). The National Board is a private, nonprofit organization governed by a board of directors, the majority of whom are classroom teachers. Two-thirds of the directors are “teaching professionals,” a category that includes National Board Certified Teachers® (NBCT®) and other teachers noted for excellence in the classroom, teacher-educators, leaders of teacher unions, and leaders of disciplinary and specialty associations. One-third of the directors are “public and other educator members,” including school administrators, local and state school board members, governors and state legislators, and business and community leaders.

National Board Certification®

National Board Certification® attests to a teacher’s/school counselor’s high-level skills and ability to satisfy rigorous professional teaching/school counseling standards. Candidates demonstrate high levels of accomplishment through this state-of-the-art performance-based assessment, which provides a rich and rewarding professional development experience, unique in its depth and challenging nature. Because National Board Certification is voluntary, it is meant to complement, not replace, state licensing.

NBPTS has identified more than 25 areas of teacher specialization, has worked with Standards committees to define the Standards for certification in each area, and has recommended these Standards to the National Board. The committees have also advised those involved in developing each corresponding assessment package.

The Standards and the assessments for all certificate areas are based on five core propositions for accomplished teaching:

- (1) teachers are committed to students and their learning;
- (2) teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students;
- (3) teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning;
- (4) teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience; and
- (5) teachers are members of learning communities.

Impact of National Board Certification

Teaching is at the heart of education, so one of the most important actions the nation can take to improve education is to strengthen the teaching profession. National Board Certification advances the profession and the quality of teaching in America's schools in a number of important ways. The certification process provides teachers/school counselors with opportunities for serious reflection about their practice and fosters self-examination by encouraging professional dialogue with colleagues. It also enables them to evaluate their skills and knowledge against objective, peer-developed Standards of accomplished practice, and to adjust and improve their practice as necessary. Recognized for their experience and expertise, National Board Certified Teachers may work with administrators and colleagues on curricular and instructional issues and may serve as mentors to new teachers and as exemplars for their peers, thus spreading their knowledge and skills across a much broader landscape than is typically the case.

National Board Certification will make quality count. It will enable school districts, colleges, universities, and the public at large to gain a new appreciation of the demands and complexities of teaching/school counseling. It will also provide a new definition of excellence in teaching and school counseling that will inform thinking about schooling and about teaching and school counseling policies. The implementation of National Board Certification will prompt teachers and administrators to engage in a healthy reexamination of current incentive structures, professional development programs, hiring practices, teaching assignments, and teacher career paths. At the same time, the promise of professional recognition and reward and the prospect of increased

mobility and new career opportunities will help attract many college graduates into teaching and help to convince capable teachers to remain in their profession. Most importantly, National Board Certification can become a pathway to improved student learning because it can encourage state and local authorities to refashion teaching and learning.

The National Board Certification Process

A teacher or school counselor who applies for National Board Certification must first meet minimum requirements and then complete a two-part assessment. The first part of the assessment requires the teacher/school counselor to compile a school-site portfolio reflecting various facets of teaching/counseling, including written commentaries describing the teaching, counseling, and learning in his or her classroom, video recordings of interactions with students, and samples of student work with the teacher's/school counselor's written comments. The second part requires a teacher/counselor to attend a computer-based assessment center to respond to exercises that measure the teacher's/counselor's content area knowledge.

The assessments are designed to evaluate the complex knowledge and teaching/counseling behaviors described by the Standards. They evaluate how the candidates critically analyze and reflect on their practice and how effectively they act on their insights.

Purpose of this Guide

This *Guide* is designed primarily to help you understand how scores are determined in the *Early Childhood through Young Adulthood/School Counseling (ECYA/SC)* assessment. More specifically, it is intended to provide you with information that will enable you to understand the characteristics of Level 4 and Level 3 responses that are consistent with the Standards assessed by each entry and exercise and the criteria in the rubrics. This *Guide* should also help you think about how you might strengthen your practice, or how to better demonstrate your teaching expertise.

The information provided includes:

- an explanation of how candidate performances are scored;
- a brief description of each portfolio entry and assessment center exercise;
- the rubrics used by assessors to evaluate performance on each portfolio entry;
- the rubrics used by assessors to evaluate performance on each of the assessment center exercises; and
- selected assessment center prompts used in a previous assessment cycle.

Overview of the Early Childhood through Young Adulthood/School Counseling Assessment

The *Early Childhood through Young Adulthood/School Counseling* certificate is designed for school counselors of students ages 3 through 18+. School counselors who receive certification have displayed their accomplishment in the ways that they reflect on their practice, create a climate that supports development and learning, improve the school counseling program, analyze students' work, assess and support the growth of students, and form partnerships with parents and colleagues. The assessment has two components: a portfolio with four entries and an assessment with six exercises, taken at an assessment center. Each component is described briefly on the following pages.

Portfolio Entry Descriptions

The four ECYA/SC portfolio entries are completed by school counselors over a six- to nine-month period at their school or program site. School counselors are encouraged to collaborate with colleagues throughout the process and to focus energy and attention on the *School Counseling Standards* for National Board Certification—the bedrock upon which the assessment is based.

Entry 1: Addressing Personal/Social Needs

You will identify a critical student need within the personal/social domain, design and implement a small-group session which includes a structured activity, and select three student work samples to submit. You will complete a written commentary that analyzes, describes, and reflects on your small-group session.

Entry 2: Exploring Career Development

You will video record a whole class engaged in a career development lesson. You will complete a written commentary that describes the lesson and student reactions as they relate to the lesson and that analyzes and reflects on the lesson.

Entry 3: Maximizing Academic Learning

You will video record an individual academic counseling session that shows you supporting academic learning. You will submit an academic intervention plan that documents what you and the student have discussed. You will complete a written commentary that provides evidence of the academic counseling you provided to the student.

Entry 4: Documented Accomplishments: Contributions to Student Learning

You will describe and document those activities associated with your counseling practice that are beyond explicit student counseling which involve students' families and community, your development as a learner, and as a leader/collaborator that impact student learning and improve the school counseling program.

Assessment Center Exercise Descriptions

The assessment center portion of the ECYA/SC certification assessment is a written assessment that focuses primarily on content knowledge.

Exercise 1: Human Growth and Development

Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of a specific human growth and development theory, and then apply that knowledge to a given developmental stage.

Exercise 2: School Counseling Program

Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the development, implementation, and management of a school counseling program.

Exercise 3: Diverse Populations

Candidates will use knowledge of counseling diverse populations to apply counseling skills, techniques, and interventions to a student situation.

Exercise 4: Theory

Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of a counseling theory and theorist by describing the theory and applying it to a school counseling issue.

Exercise 5: Data and Planning

Candidates will demonstrate the ability to interpret and analyze the data provided, make appropriate recommendations for school improvement, then discuss the rationale and steps for implementation of the recommendations.

Exercise 6: Collaboration

Candidates will assess a student concern, then discuss the legal and ethical procedures and medical concerns to consider while creating a plan of collaboration to help the student succeed.

What to Expect at the Assessment Center

All of the assessment center exercises in all certificate areas have the following characteristics in common:

- There are six exercises in the assessment.
- Candidates are allowed 30 minutes to respond to each exercise.
- Each exercise is delivered on a computer screen.*
- Candidates must answer each prompt presented in each exercise.
- Each exercise is separately scored and yields one exercise score.

The prompts in some exercises include an age range for students that candidates should consider when responding. Please note that candidates in all certificate areas are expected to demonstrate knowledge of developmentally appropriate content and pedagogy across the full range of their certificate areas.

While all candidates are expected to show a command of standard written English, the assessment center exercises are not writing ability assessments. Candidates are encouraged to formulate their responses in the manner that best fits what they want to convey. Candidates may answer using connected paragraphs, or may choose to answer some questions using a bulleted list.

What is valued in the scoring is specific and detailed responses to the questions asked. It is important to read the questions or prompts carefully and to direct answers explicitly to what the prompt asks. Specific detail and clarity are valued in high-scoring responses.

* Exceptions: The six Music exercises and Exercise 1 of World Languages Other than English. The nature of these exercises requires that they be delivered to candidates by means other than computer.

The Early Childhood through Young Adulthood/School Counseling Scoring System

All of the ECYA/SC entries and exercises are scored using the NBPTS twelve-point score scale, which is based on four primary levels of performance (levels 1, 2, 3, and 4), with plus (+) and minus (–) variations at each level. Possible scores range from 1– or 0.75 (the lowest score possible) to 4+ or 4.25 (the highest score possible). Each performance (an entry or an exercise) is scored separately from the others. Each portfolio entry and assessment center exercise is scored by one or more assessors who have been intensively trained. If two scores for a response differ by more than 1.25, then the performance is scored a third time by the trainer of the assessors. In cases where two scores are assigned, they are averaged. In cases where the trainer evaluates the performance by a third reading, the weighted average is computed by doubling the trainer’s score, adding the two assessors’ scores, and dividing by four.

Candidates’ responses to National Board Certification assessments that are being offered for the first time are double-scored—each candidate’s response to each entry and each exercise is scored by two independent assessors. This practice is followed during the first-year offering to assure that the scoring system—rubrics, training, and scoring—is reliable, accurate, and fair.

Candidates’ responses for certificates that have been offered for **at least one year** are scored using modified double scoring. In modified double scoring, 25% of all cases submitted for a portfolio entry or an assessment center exercise are double-scored, and 75% are single-scored. (Double-scored means that two assessors working independently score the same response. Single-scored means that candidates’ responses to the different entries and exercises are scored by one independent assessor.) The modified scoring system is organized to ensure that candidates’ responses to the 10 entries and exercises are scored by at least 12 independent assessors.

The degree of assessor reliability reported for NBPTS assessments is considered by measurement experts to be among the highest they have witnessed for such a complex performance assessment. This high level of assessor reliability is the result of the focused and rigorous training that all National Board assessors must complete successfully before they qualify to score candidates’ responses. Only those assessors who demonstrate a clear understanding of a certificate’s standards, a clear understanding of the requirements of the entry or exercise they will be scoring, a clear understanding of the scoring rubric for

the entry or exercise they will be scoring, and who are consistently able to apply the rubric accurately and fairly in the evaluation and interpretation of candidates' responses are permitted to score candidates' responses.

The scoring system for the ECYA/SC assessment was developed by the staff at Educational Testing Service (ETS). Exemplary early childhood through young adulthood school counselors assisted in this development. Additional expert school counselors were involved in the refinement of scoring materials and the delivery of assessor training for administration of the ECYA/SC assessment.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is dedicated to continuously evaluating its assessments and the assessment process. The National Board is committed to making sure that its assessments are valid and meaningful and the scoring of candidates' responses is reliable, accurate, and fair.

How Scoring Works

Throughout the training and scoring processes, the *School Counseling Standards* are reinforced and explored with assessors. The critical documents assessors are trained to use in evaluating NBPTS candidate responses are:

- the **Standards**, the foundation for the ECYA/SC assessment, which represent a professional consensus on the critical aspects of practice that distinguish exemplary school counselors in the field. They incorporate the essential knowledge, skills, dispositions, and commitments that allow school counselors to practice at a high level.
- the **instructions** for each entry and exercise, especially the questions given to candidates to shape their written commentaries for the portfolio entries.
- the **rubric** for each entry and exercise, which is a set of rules used in scoring that describes the characteristics of performances at four major points on the score scale. The words contained in each rubric have been carefully chosen and reviewed for their precision in describing distinctions among performances at each level of the score scale.
- the **Note-Taking Guide** for each portfolio entry, which provides a framework for assessors, who respond to entry-specific questions in these guides when recording and evaluating evidence in the process of arriving at a score.
- the **benchmarks** for each entry and exercise, which are actual performances at each point on the score scale that demonstrate clearly the characteristics described in the rubric. Benchmarks provide a way for assessors to develop a common understanding of qualitative words used in rubrics such as “insightful,” “vague,” “strong,” and “consistent.”

Each of these documents is closely connected to the other, and the common link is the Standards. NBPTS certification assessments are standards-based assessments. This means there is a criterion or standard of performance that must be met by candidates in order to achieve certification, and the content of each NBPTS assessment is wholly determined by the content of the Standards document for that assessment. Before an assessment is made nationally available to candidates, extensive trials are conducted during which portfolio entries and assessment center exercises are completed and scored to determine that both the scoring system and the entries and exercises are fair, valid, and reliable. To achieve certification, each candidate must meet the standard of performance established by the National Board for the candidate's certificate area.

Standards-based assessment is different from norm-based testing, in which candidates would be ranked in comparison to each other. In other words, candidates are not competing with anyone but themselves in NBPTS assessments. What matters in NBPTS assessments is how candidates perform in comparison to the standard of performance set in the National Board Standards documents and in the rubrics that are derived from the Standards.

It is important to note that in the ECYA/SC assessment the rubrics are developed and the benchmarks are selected through a rigorous process that involves early childhood through young adulthood teachers/school counselors. Moreover, all elements of the scoring system are based on and derived from the *School Counseling Standards*.

The Role of the National Board Standards

The Standards for the *Early Childhood through Young Adulthood/School Counseling* assessment were written over a period of many months by a regionally, philosophically, and ethnically diverse team of accomplished school counselors and counselor educators from the field. Their names and affiliations are listed in the back of the Standards document. Their work was reviewed closely by a committee of the National Board and revised. Then, the draft was circulated widely in the field, with school counselors and counselor educators all over the United States having an opportunity to comment on the draft.

The National Board Standards define accomplished teaching/school counseling in any field as *practice that demonstrates the teacher's or school counselor's command of an underlying architecture of conscious and deliberate practice toward well-defined, high goals that are appropriate for these students at this time*. This practice is then evaluated by the teacher/school

counselor, which in turn leads to constant restatement and refinement of goals. As all great buildings, whether a 16th century Italian villa or a modern skyscraper, share common elements of design and purposeful structure, so accomplished teaching/school counseling demonstrates common elements of design, structure, and purpose, regardless of surface features. It is those common elements of design that the National Board seeks to recognize in the assessment and evaluation of teacher's or counselor's practice.

Development of Entries and Exercises

The entries and exercises are derived from the Standards. Each entry and exercise is deliberately designed to assess aspects of several different Standards, and only those Standards.

Development of Rubrics

The rubrics are derived from the Standards but are not necessarily mappable to distinct Standards. This is because, in actual practice, the qualities that characterize accomplished teaching/school counseling are often manifested as combinations of parts of different Standards.

How Assessors Use the Standards

The Standards provide the only lens assessors use to evaluate performance.

Since this is a standards-based assessment, assessors are taught to use the Standards as the lens by which they view the responses they evaluate. They are required to activate their professional expertise while simultaneously suppressing their personal preferences and practices. They must use their expertise to understand what is going on in the teaching/school counseling practice they are evaluating. After they have identified what the response presents, however, they must suppress their personal preferences and biases about teaching/school counseling practices, resources, procedures, and curricula, and judge the performance solely on the basis of the criteria established by the Standards and embodied in the rubrics. Not everyone is able or willing to take on the National Board's vision of accomplished teaching/school counseling as their own. For this reason, the training process is rigorous, and it includes a qualifying step in which potential assessors must demonstrate their ability to evaluate candidate responses fairly, using only the Standards as the criterion.

Assessor Training

Before assessors score actual candidate submissions, they go through a demanding training process. They begin with a careful review of the instructions for the particular entry or exercise to which they are assigned. After they become familiar with what candidates are asked to do, they focus on the Standards assessed and other information about the scoring criteria that is in the training instructions.

Assessors then examine the rubric and the benchmarks, performances which provide exemplars at each of the points on the score scale.

The next step in training is to provide assessors with practice in scoring performances. For this purpose, trainers select samples, each of which has been previously scored by expert assessors. Assessors are asked to score each sample independently and assign a score. After each practice sample scoring session, assessors' scores are collected and logged, the score of the performance is announced to the group, and a group discussion is led by the trainers. Through this process of practice and discussion, assessors learn to apply the rubric to a range of performances. The assessors' performances on the practice samples are evaluated by the trainers. Those who meet the qualifying criteria are invited to move on to scoring candidates' performances. Those assessors who successfully complete the training receive additional training and are monitored carefully throughout the scoring process.

Bias Training

NBPTS assessors receive specific training to identify and minimize factors that might cause bias in scoring decisions. In some important sense, bias is part of being a thinking person—*everyone* has conscious and subconscious biases—and certain opinions and judgments may be legitimate parts of a person's identity. However, automatic judgments that take place in a person's mind may be positive or negative, and some of these may lead assessors to make judgments in the assessment process that are about their personal preferences, not about candidates' performances.

For this reason, assessors participate in exercises that help them honestly identify their personal biases about social groups and about preferences in teaching practices. Each assessor creates a personal "trigger list" that details his or her strongly held opinions and preferences. These are the areas assessors are taught to be especially careful about in their evaluative processes. In addition, supportive group discussions take place for further exploration of how bias can occur. Throughout the scoring process, assessors are reminded that *scoring candidates' performances is about the evidence presented in the candidates' submissions*. They are aware of the effort and commitment involved in this assessment, and of the high stakes for candidates. With this in mind, assessors strive to score candidate performances as objectively as possible based on the evidence of teaching/counseling practice that appears in the performances, not on their expectations or personal standards.

Understanding Scores

What Counts in Scoring?

Regardless of the particulars of the entry or exercise directions, certain characteristics of a candidate's portfolio and assessment center responses serve as evidence of accomplished practice in all National Board assessments.

The National Board Standards emphasize that accomplished teachers/school counselors in every field and at every level are aware of what they are doing and why they are doing it. They are conscious of where they want students' learning to go and how they want to help students get there. Furthermore, they assess progress toward these goals continuously and adjust their strategies and plans in light of this feedback. Accomplished practice shows itself in the teacher's/school counselor's ability to set high and appropriate goals for student learning, to connect worthwhile learning experiences to those goals, and to articulate the connections between the goals and the experiences. Furthermore, accomplished teachers/school counselors can analyze classroom interactions, student work products, and their own actions and plans in order to reflect on their practice and continually renew and reconstruct their goals and strategies.

All of the scoring of candidate responses is based on the evidence candidates submit—the video recordings, student work samples, written commentaries, and written responses to assessment center stimuli and prompts. Each of these sources of evidence offers an opportunity to understand candidates' work and to evaluate candidates' practice in light of the conscious, deliberate, analytical, and reflective criteria the National Board Standards endorse. As mentioned previously, assessors undergo training to learn how to understand and minimize the effects of personal biases on the decisions they make when scoring candidates' performances. Assessors are discouraged from scoring any performance they do not feel capable of scoring objectively.

No one style or approach to teaching/school counseling is mandated by the National Board Standards or rewarded by the scoring process, nor does the achievement level of students whose work is chosen as a part of a teacher's/school counselor's evidence count in scoring. Indeed, many very different styles of teaching and school counseling characterize the teachers who have already achieved National Board Certified Teacher status. However, in every case NBCTs have demonstrated the analytical and reflective abilities previously described.

Understanding the Rubrics

The language of the rubrics is based on the *School Counseling Standards* that are assessed in a particular entry or exercise. Each rubric is constructed with an overarching statement at the beginning. For example, the overarching statement for a Level 4 rubric might read “***The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the school counselor’s knowledge and practice in his or her field.***” Overarching statements summarize the quality of performance at each of the four rubric levels.

In the body of each of the four rubric levels are phrases that have been selected to reflect particular qualitative characteristics of a performance in very precise ways. For example, in Level 4 rubrics it is stated that there is *clear, consistent, and convincing evidence*, while in Level 3 rubrics it is stated that there is *clear evidence*. This precise language is used to indicate qualitative differences at each of the four levels of the score scale.

Finally, the statements that compose each rubric are organized in a manner that reflects the order of tasks or questions within the entry or exercise. Thus, if the candidate is asked to discuss his or her goals first in the response, 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. This can be done by reading the first sentence for Level 4, the first sentence or bullet for Level 3, and so on. In this way, you will be able to see the gradations of quality delineated for each feature of the response.

2

Scoring Materials for Portfolio Entries

Introduction

In this section, you will see the rubrics that assessors use to score the four portfolio entries. Each rubric is composed of four “levels” that describe the characteristics of candidate performance at the four major points on the NBPTS score scale.

Following each rubric is its Note-Taking Guide, which governs how assessors record the evidence in each entry. Notice that the questions in the Note-Taking Guide are directly linked to the rubric, and that the questions are arranged in the order the assessor encounters evidence in each entry.

The materials in this section will be most useful to you if you read them along with your nearly completed responses.

These scoring materials were current at the time of printing. It is possible that minor modifications may be made to the Note-Taking Guide. The rubrics, however, were finalized as they appear in this publication.

Entry 1: Addressing Personal/ Social Needs

Scoring Rubric

Level 4

The Level 4 performance provides **clear, consistent, and convincing** evidence that the counselor identifies a critical student need, gathers and analyzes data, and designs and implements a small-group session that provides responsive services that address student needs in the personal/social domain.

The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor carefully identifies a critical student need and thoughtfully collects and analyzes data that provide insightful information regarding students to select for this group. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor has effectively teamed with appropriate school staff, family, and community resources to facilitate and manage multidisciplinary approaches to problem solving related to the identified student need. In the Level 4 performance, the counselor provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of a strong knowledge of group counseling issues related to fairness, equity, and diversity. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the counselor's knowledge of age-appropriate human growth and development theories and theories of cognitive, moral, and social development. In a Level 4 performance, the counselor establishes high, worthwhile goals to develop identified student competencies that are matched appropriately to activities, materials, and curricula. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of effective planning for a small-group session that addresses the identified student need. In the Level 4 performance, the counselor implements one structured activity within the small-group session that affords students opportunities to practice making sound judgments that will develop skills that are important to their lives both in and out of school. The counselor provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of high-level group counseling skills and techniques during the small-group session. The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor logically incorporates the small-group session into the comprehensive school counseling program and mission of the school. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor practices ethical codes of the profession. In the Level 4 performance, the counselor accurately analyzes the submitted work of three students and identifies patterns that

inform his or her understanding of the needs of these three students. The counselor clearly, consistently, and convincingly involves other members of the family and school community in establishing a positive school climate. In the Level 4 performance, the counselor appropriately encourages students to use self-assessment as a reflective, analytical tool to discover their own personal/social skills and abilities. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor effectively uses self-reflection to examine his or her practice and improve services to students. Overall, there is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor identifies a critical student need, gathers and analyzes data, and designs and implements a small-group session that provides responsive services that address student needs in the personal/social domain.

Level 3

The Level 3 performance provides **clear** evidence that the counselor identifies a critical student need, gathers and analyzes data, and designs and implements a small-group session that provides responsive services that address student needs in the personal/social domain.

The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence that the counselor identifies a critical student need and collects and analyzes data that provide insightful information regarding students to select for this group. There is clear evidence that the counselor has teamed with appropriate school staff, family, and community resources to facilitate and manage multidisciplinary approaches to problem solving related to the identified student need. In the Level 3 performance, the counselor provides clear evidence of knowledge of group counseling issues related to fairness, equity, and diversity although that knowledge may not be as deep as in the Level 4 response. There is clear evidence of the counselor's knowledge of age-appropriate human growth and development theories and theories of cognitive, moral, and social development. In a Level 3 performance, the counselor establishes high, worthwhile goals to develop identified student competencies that are matched appropriately to activities, materials, and curricula, although the goals may not be as well-defined or the materials and activities as closely matched as in the Level 4 response. There is clear evidence of planning for a small-group session that addresses the identified student need, although that planning may not be as effective as in the Level 4 response. In the Level 3 performance, the counselor implements one structured activity within the small-group session that affords students opportunities to practice making sound judgments that will develop skills that are important to their lives both in and out of school, but the activity may not be as well developed as that in a Level 4 performance. The counselor provides clear evidence of appropriate group counseling skills and techniques during the small-group session. The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence that the counselor logically incorporates the small-group session into the comprehensive school counseling program and mission of the school, although that connection may not be as tight as in the Level 4 response. There is clear evidence that the counselor practices ethical codes of the profession. In the Level 3 performance, the counselor accurately analyzes the submitted student work and identifies patterns that inform his or her understanding of the needs of these three students although those understandings may not be as deep as in the Level 4 response. The counselor clearly involves other members of the family and school community in establishing a positive school climate. In the Level 3 performance, the counselor encourages students to use self-assessment as a reflective, analytical tool to discover their own personal/social skills and abilities. There is clear evidence that the counselor uses self-reflection to examine his or her practice and improve services to students although that reflection may not be as deep or thoughtful as in the Level 4 response. Overall, there is clear evidence that the counselor identifies a critical student need, gathers and analyzes data, and designs and implements a small-group session that provides responsive services that address student needs in the personal/social domain.

Level 2

The Level 2 performance provides **limited** evidence that the counselor identifies a critical student need, gathers and analyzes data, and designs and implements a small-group session that provides responsive services that address student needs in the personal/social domain.

The Level 2 performance provides limited evidence that the counselor carefully identifies a critical student need and thoughtfully collects and analyzes data that provide insightful information regarding students to select for this group. In a Level 2 performance, the teaming, that would facilitate and manage multidisciplinary approaches to problem solving may be inappropriate or may only be loosely related to the identified student need. The Level 2 performance provides limited evidence of knowledge of group counseling issues related to fairness, equity, and diversity. In a Level 2 performance, the evidence related to knowledge of age-appropriate human growth and development and theories of cognitive, moral, and social development is minimal. In a Level 2 performance, the goals provided may be inappropriate or may not be connected to the stated student need or to the activity planned. The planning for a small-group session may be weak or inappropriate for those students. In the Level 2 performance, the structured activity that is implemented within the small-group session may be minimally effective and may not afford students opportunities to practice making sound judgments that will develop skills that are important to their lives both in and out of school. The group counseling skills may be weak, inappropriate for those students, or only somewhat effective. The Level 2 performance provides limited evidence that the counselor logically incorporates the small-group session into the comprehensive school counseling program and mission of the school. There is limited evidence that the counselor practices ethical codes of the profession. The counselor may not accurately analyze the submitted student work and does not identify patterns that inform his or her understanding of the needs of these three students. The involvement of other members of the family and school community is minimal and may not assist in establishing a positive school climate. In the Level 2 performance there is limited evidence that the counselor encourages students to use self-assessment as a reflective, analytical tool to discover their own personal/social skills and abilities. The counselor's use of self-reflection may be oversimplified or sketchy and insights for future practice may be weak. The Level 2 performance may be characterized by evidence that occasionally hints at accomplished practice, but overall, there is limited evidence that the counselor identifies a critical student need, gathers and analyzes data, and designs and implements a small-group session that provides responsive services that address student needs in the personal/social domain.

Level 1

The Level 1 performance provides **little or no** evidence that the counselor identifies a critical student need, gathers and analyzes data, and designs and implements a small-group session that provides responsive services that address student needs in the personal/social domain.

The Level 1 performance provides little or no evidence that the counselor carefully identifies a critical student need and thoughtfully collects and analyzes data that provide insightful information regarding students to select for this group. There is little or no teaming with others to facilitate and manage multidisciplinary approaches to problem solving related to the identified student need. There is little or no evidence of knowledge of group counseling issues related to fairness, equity, and diversity. In the Level 1 performance, there is little or no evidence that the counselor has knowledge of age-appropriate human growth and development theories and theories of cognitive, moral, and social development. The goals stated may not be goals at all but rather activities instead. The materials selected may be inappropriate for the students or the curriculum. The planning for the small group session may be incomplete or contain serious misinformation concerning the identified student need. In the Level 1 performance the activity that is implemented within the small-group session may not provide the students opportunities to practice making sound judgments that will develop skills that are important to their lives both in and out of school. The counselor provides little or no evidence of high-level group counseling skills and techniques during the small-group session. The small group session may be done in isolation and not connect to the comprehensive school counseling program and mission of the school. There is little or no evidence that the counselor practices ethical codes of the profession. There is little or no evidence that the counselor accurately analyzes the submitted student work and identifies patterns that inform his or her understanding of the needs of these three students. The counselor does not involve other members of the family and school community in establishing a positive school climate. In the Level 1 performance, the counselor does not encourage students to use self-assessment as a reflective, analytical tool to discover their own personal/social skills and abilities. There is little or no evidence that the counselor uses self-reflection to examine his or her practice and improve services to students. Overall, there is little or no evidence that the counselor identifies a critical student need, gathers and analyzes data, and designs and implements a small-group session that provides responsive services that address student needs in the personal/social domain.

Note-Taking Guide

1. **Aspects of school counseling. As you read through the response, note evidence pertaining to EACH of the aspects listed below. Evidence may come from one or more data sources for any one aspect.**
 - a) **KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS (KOS):** Is there evidence that the candidate has used knowledge of students to identify a critical need and collect and analyze data that provides insightful information which will inform the planning for the small group session?
 - b) **GOALS/CONNECTIONS (G/C):** What are the goals and how are they matched to activities, materials, curricula and the overall school counseling program? What are the connections between the identified critical need, the data collected, and goals of this session?
 - c) **COLLABORATION (COLL):** What is the evidence that the candidate collaborated effectively with appropriate school staff, family and the community? How did this collaboration assist the candidate in decision-making regarding service to students?
 - d) **GROUP PROCESS (GP):** What evidence has the candidate provided for the small group session and structured activity? What techniques were described to generate student involvement and afford students opportunities for making sound judgments? What theories/theorist guided this candidate's group work? How well is the structured activity described and the connection made to the small group session?
 - e) **FAIRNESS, EQUITY, AND DIVERSITY (FED):** What is the evidence that the candidate practiced ethical codes of the profession in relation to the group? What is the evidence that the candidate ensures fairness, equity, and diversity for all group members?
 - f) **SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM (SCP):** How well does the small group session relate to the school counseling program and the mission of the school?
 - g) **SCHOOL CLIMATE (SC):** How did the candidate's small group session help to establish a positive school climate and how did it contribute to educational achievement?
 - h) **ANALYSIS (ANA):** Is the assignment described thoroughly, including how it connects to the small group session? What are the patterns, if any, and how is the pattern connected to the student need? What is the evidence that the student work samples have informed the candidate's understanding?

- i) REFLECTION (R): How did the candidate seek to improve counseling through the process of reflection? Did the candidate plan to modify future practice and seek alternative approaches and techniques based upon reflective practice? How has the candidate encouraged students to discover their own personal and social strengths?

2. Do the counseling techniques and interactions used promote the student’s personal/social development? (Answer for each student.) Think about the quality of and the links among the different parts of the evidence. Are the parts and links logical, accurate, and complete? The links to think about are:

- the critical need identified \leftrightarrow data collection and analysis
- the data collection and analysis \leftrightarrow small group session
- the small group session \leftrightarrow structured activity
- the structured activity \leftrightarrow the student work (i.e., quality of “fit”: do the two sources support and enhance each other or do they conflict and undermine each other?)

3. Does the counselor’s general approach to counseling support student growth? Consider:

- is there support for students to assess, reflect, and discover their own personal and social strengths?
- does the small group session afford students with opportunities to practice making sound judgments and to develop skills that are important in and out of school?
- does the counselor recognize that the counseling process is a complex process, allowing for multiple techniques, multiple stages of development, and collaboration with appropriate individuals, and reflection?
- does the counselor’s use of counseling resources, community resources, assessment, and feedback support students’ continued growth in personal/ social development?

4. **Think about the performance as a whole. Overall, what is the nature of the evidence that the counselor is able to identify a critical need, collect and analyze data to design a small group session that provides responsive services that address student needs in the personal/social domain? Think about this in terms of:**
- evidence in the written commentary
 - your judgment of the effectiveness of the counseling session and the level of engagement in the structured activity, and the student work elicited during the structured activity
 - the links among the different aspects of the performance

Entry 2: Exploring Career Development

Scoring Rubric

Level 4

The Level 4 performance provides **clear, consistent, and convincing** evidence of the counselor's ability to deliver a whole-class lesson that advances student understanding of career development, exploration, and planning.

The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the counselor's ability to accurately design a developmentally appropriate lesson and state instructional goals that are important and linked to career development, and that the counselor has justified the goals as challenging and appropriate for his or her students. The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor accurately demonstrates how the selection of this career development lesson is integrated into the school counseling program and how it aligns with student competencies in the career development area. The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor provides accurate and complete documentation that the identified competencies were addressed. The career theorists/theories that guided his or her career development lesson are discussed thoughtfully. The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor provides instructional strategies that develop students' ability to engage meaningfully in the process of career exploration and acquisition and that his or her strategies support students' critical thinking and decision-making skills. The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor demonstrates active communication with community members regarding career development. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which all students are encouraged to participate and also thoroughly demonstrates the ways in which both traditional and nontraditional careers are explored. The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor uses appropriate technologies and instructional materials to enhance student learning. The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor accurately describes, analyzes, and evaluates classroom interactions, showing knowledge of students and insight into the career development topic. In a Level 4 performance, the counselor demonstrates strong classroom management skills that enable all students to benefit from the instruction provided. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor demonstrates the student-to-student interactions that were part of his or her career

development lesson. The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor thoroughly demonstrates how the lesson helped the students become more knowledgeable of career issues. In the Level 4 performance, there is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor engages in reflective thinking in which he or she describes his or her practice accurately, analyzes it fully and thoughtfully, and reflects on its implications and significance for future classroom career development lessons. The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the counselor's ability to deliver a whole-class lesson that advances student understanding of career development, exploration, and planning.

Level 3

The Level 3 performance provides **clear** evidence of the counselor's ability to deliver a whole-class lesson that advances student understanding of career development, exploration, and planning.

The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence that the counselor can design a developmentally appropriate lesson and state instructional goals that are important and linked to career development, and that the counselor has justified the goals as challenging and appropriate for his or her students although the goals may not be as thoughtful as in the Level 4 response. The counselor clearly demonstrates how this lesson is integrated into the school counseling program and how it aligns with student competencies in the career development area. The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence that the counselor provides documentation that the identified competencies were addressed. The counselor's knowledge of career theorists/theories that guided his or her career development lesson is evident. The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence that the counselor provides instructional strategies that develop students' ability to engage meaningfully in the process of career exploration and acquisition and that his or her strategies support students' critical thinking and decision-making skills. The strategies may not be as detailed or extensive as in the Level 4 response. The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence that the counselor demonstrates communication with community members regarding career development, although that communication may not be as far-reaching as in the Level 4 response. There is clear evidence that the counselor fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which all students are encouraged to participate and also demonstrates the ways in which both traditional and nontraditional careers are explored. The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence that the counselor uses technologies and instructional materials to enhance student learning, although the technologies and materials may not be as rich or varied as in the Level 4 response. The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence that the counselor describes, analyzes, and evaluates classroom interactions, showing knowledge of students and insight into the career development topic. In a Level 3 performance, the counselor demonstrates appropriate classroom management skills that enable all students to benefit from the instruction provided. There is clear evidence that the counselor demonstrates the student-to-student interactions that were part of his or her career development lesson. The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence that the counselor demonstrates how the lesson helped the students become more aware of career issues. In the Level 3 performance, there is clear evidence that the counselor engages in reflective thinking in which he or she describes, analyzes, and reflects on the implications and significance for future classroom career development lessons. A Level 3 performance may show imbalance in the analysis and/or evidence presented for the class or lesson, but overall, there is clear evidence of the counselor's ability to deliver a whole-class lesson that advances student understanding of career development, exploration, and planning.

Level 2

The Level 2 performance provides **limited** evidence of the counselor's ability to deliver a whole-class lesson that advances student understanding of career development, exploration, and planning.

The Level 2 performance provides limited evidence of the counselor's ability to design a developmentally appropriate lesson and state instructional goals that are important and linked to career development and that the counselor has justified them as challenging and appropriate for his or her students. The goals may be vaguely articulated, of limited significance, or only loosely related to the instruction. The lesson may not be integrated into the school counseling program and/or may not align with student competencies in the career development area. The identified competencies may be indirectly addressed or may not be the appropriate ones for that lesson or class of students. There is limited discussion of the career theorists/theories that guided his or her career development lesson. The instructional strategies presented may not assist in developing students' ability to engage meaningfully in the process of career exploration and acquisition and may not support students' critical thinking and decision-making skills. The Level 2 performance provides minimal evidence that the counselor communicates with community members regarding career development. There is limited evidence that the counselor fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which all students are encouraged to participate and minimal evidence for the ways in which both traditional and nontraditional careers are explored. The Level 2 performance provides limited evidence that the counselor uses appropriate technologies and instructional materials to enhance student learning. The materials chosen may be acceptable at times, but may not match the students or lesson shown. There is limited evidence that the counselor accurately describes, analyzes, and evaluates classroom interactions, showing knowledge of students and insight into the career development topic. Evidence of the counselor's content knowledge may be limited. In a Level 2 performance, the classroom management skills may be weak, inappropriate, and students may not benefit from the instruction. The student-to-student interactions may be weak or ineffective. The Level 2 performance demonstrates limited evidence that the lesson helped the students become more aware of career issues. The Level 2 performance provides limited evidence that the counselor is able to describe and analyze his or her practice, but the reflection may be vague or superficial. There is limited evidence of implications for future classroom career development lessons. The Level 2 response may be characterized by evidence that hints at accomplished practice, but overall, there is limited evidence of the counselor's ability to deliver a whole-class lesson that advances student understanding of career development, exploration, and planning.

Level 1

The Level 1 performance provides **little or no** evidence of the counselor's ability to deliver a whole-class lesson that advances student understanding of career development, exploration, and planning.

The Level 1 performance provides little or no evidence of the counselor's ability to design a developmentally appropriate lesson and state instructional goals that are important and linked to career development and that the counselor has justified them as challenging and appropriate for his or her students. When stated, the goals are vague, trivial, inappropriate, or not learning goals at all, but rather activities. There is little or no evidence that the counselor demonstrates how this lesson is integrated into the school counseling program and aligns with student competencies in the career development area. There is little or no documentation that the identified competencies were addressed. There is little or no mention of the career theorists/theories that guided his or her career development lesson, or if they are discussed, they may contain misinformation. The instructional strategies provided would not develop students' ability to engage meaningfully in the process of career exploration and acquisition and the strategies would not support students' critical thinking and decision-making skills. The Level 1 performance provides little or no evidence that the counselor demonstrates active communication with community members regarding career development. There is little or no evidence that the counselor fosters an equitable, accessible, and fair learning environment in which all students are encouraged to participate and does not demonstrate the ways in which both traditional and nontraditional careers are explored. The Level 1 performance provides little or no evidence that the counselor uses appropriate technologies and instructional materials to enhance student learning. There is little or no evidence that the counselor describes, analyzes, and evaluates classroom interactions, showing knowledge of students and insight into the career development topic. Adequate classroom management skills are missing and therefore not all students benefit from the instruction provided. The student-to-student interactions are missing or inappropriate. There is little or no evidence that this lesson helped the students become more aware of career issues. The response may show signs of serious misunderstandings of content. The Level 1 performance provides little or no evidence that the counselor is able to reflect on his or her practice or reflects on the implications and significance for future classroom career development lessons. The Level 1 performance provides little or no evidence of the counselor's ability to deliver a whole-class lesson that advances student understanding of career development, exploration, and planning.

Note-Taking Guide

1. **Aspects of school counseling. As you read through the response, note evidence pertaining to EACH of the aspects listed below. Evidence may come from one or more data sources for any one aspect.**
 - a) **KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS (KOS):** Is there evidence that the candidate has used knowledge of early childhood through young adulthood students' interests, needs, and abilities in the area of career development to inform instruction?
 - b) **CONTENT KNOWLEDGE (CK):** How strong is the candidate's content knowledge related to the topic selected and how appropriate is this topic for the selected class?
 - c) **GOALS/CONNECTIONS (G/C):** What are the connections between goals, student needs, and instruction? Are the goals appropriate, worthwhile, and challenging for this class?
 - d) **INSTRUCTION (INS):** What skills, concepts, and attitudes did the students begin to develop during the lesson? What is the level of engagement of the students during the lesson? Was there active problem solving and critical thinking during the lesson? Were there student-to-student interactions during the lesson? How effective were they?
 - e) **COUNSELING THEORIES (CT):** What theories and/or techniques did the candidate utilize in the career development lesson?
 - f) **CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT (CM):** What classroom management techniques did the candidate utilize to enable all students to benefit from the instruction provided?
 - g) **SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM (SCP):** How well does the career development lesson relate to the school counseling program and the mission of the school? What student competencies did the candidate address within this lesson?
 - h) **COLLABORATION (COL):** To what extent was there community involvement in the career development lesson? How was this demonstrated?
 - i) **FAIRNESS, EQUITY, AND DIVERSITY (FED):** What is the evidence that the candidate ensures fairness, equity, and diversity for all students? How has the candidate encouraged the exploration of both traditional and nontraditional careers?

- j) ANALYSIS (ANA): Is there an accurate analysis of the career development lesson and student learning? What assessment and feedback were used?
- k) RESOURCES AND TECHNOLOGIES (RT): Were appropriate resources and technologies used which promoted student learning? How were they integrated into the career development lesson? How did the instructional materials used help students achieve the goals of the lesson?
- l) REFLECTION (R): Was the candidate able to identify the parts of the lesson that were most effective and discuss why? How did the candidate seek to improve instruction through the process of reflection? What is the extent to which students have increased their knowledge of career development? How does the candidate know this? How did the candidate plan to modify future practice and seek alternative approaches and techniques based upon reflective practice? What is the plan to follow up with these students following this lesson?

2. **Do the instructional techniques and interactions used promote the student’s exploration of career development? Think about the quality of and the links among the different parts of the evidence. Are the parts and links logical, accurate, and complete? The links to think about are:**

- information about the whole class ←→ the goals ←→ the career development lesson
- the instruction and materials ←→ analysis of instruction ←→ reflection
- the written commentary ←→ video recording evidence (i.e., the quality of “fit”: does the video recording support and enhance the written commentary and analysis or does it conflict?)

3. **Think about the performance as a whole. Overall, what is the nature of the evidence that the counselor is able to deliver a whole class lesson that advances students’ exploration of career development?**

Think about this in terms of:

- evidence in the written commentary
- evidence in the video recording
- your judgment of the effectiveness of the instruction and the resources used to further student growth and understanding of career development
- the links between the written commentary and the video recording

Entry 3: Maximizing Academic Learning

Scoring Rubric

Level 4

The Level 4 performance provides **clear, consistent, and convincing** evidence of the counselor's ability to monitor student academic progress and use effective academic counseling to create an academic intervention plan for an individual student in order to maximize academic learning.

The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor thoughtfully identified a student with a substantial academic need and accurately analyzed available data that provides insightful information regarding the student's academic competencies. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor fosters a purposeful, equitable, supportive, and safe counseling environment in which the student is encouraged to participate in open dialogue about why and how decisions are made related to academic progress and interventions. There are high, worthwhile, and appropriate goals established for the academic counseling session. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor skillfully engages the student in meaningful discussions concerning academic achievement and goal setting and that there is a well-defined academic intervention plan developed collaboratively that addresses the specific competencies/needs of the featured student. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor effectively demonstrates the use of individual counseling skills and interventions in recognition of different characteristics and backgrounds of students and there is evidence that the counselor demonstrates deep knowledge of learning styles, which thoughtfully guide the counseling session. In a Level 4 performance, the academic interventions relate directly to the identified academic need of the student. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor has thoughtfully chosen the organization, structure, and pacing of the session and counseling strategies used to thoroughly address the needs of the student while allowing for unexpected adjustments during the session. The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of an in-depth knowledge of academic theories, including those of motivation and academic skill development, and uses a variety of appropriate counseling resources to enhance student awareness about learning styles. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the counselor is able to collaborate appropriately and effectively with staff, students, and parents. In a Level 4 performance, the counselor thoroughly describes how this academic intervention plan is part of the student's larger academic program and accurately describes, analyzes, and assesses the student's learning that results from the

session in a way that demonstrates insights into the student's understanding of the session and the student's academic progress. In a Level 4 response, there is a thorough description of the process used to assist the student in setting high, worthwhile, and appropriate goals that are central to his or her education. In a Level 4 response, the intervention relates directly to the school counseling program and the mission of the school. In a Level 4 response, there is a thorough description of how the academic intervention plan will be monitored and an accurate demonstration of how the counselor will use the knowledge gained to inform his or her work with other students in the future. In a Level 4 response, there is an accurate description of the counselor's practice, a full and thoughtful analysis of the practice, and a reflection on the practice that includes implications for future academic counseling sessions. Overall, the Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the counselor's ability to monitor student academic progress and use effective academic counseling to create an academic intervention plan for an individual student in order to maximize academic learning.

Level 3

The Level 3 performance provides **clear** evidence of the counselor's ability to monitor student academic progress and use effective academic counseling to create an academic intervention plan for an individual student in order to maximize academic learning.

The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence that the counselor identified a student with a substantial academic need and analyzed available data that provides information regarding the student's academic competencies. There is clear evidence that the counselor fosters a purposeful, equitable, supportive, and safe counseling environment in which the student is encouraged to participate in open dialogue about why and how decisions are made related to academic progress and interventions. There are appropriate goals established for the academic counseling session. There is clear evidence that the counselor skillfully engages the student in meaningful discussions concerning academic achievement and goal setting and that there is an academic intervention plan developed collaboratively that addresses the specific competencies/needs of the featured student. The discussions may not be as detailed or deep as in a Level 4 response. There is clear evidence that the counselor demonstrates the use of individual counseling skills and interventions in recognition of different characteristics and backgrounds of students, and there is evidence that the counselor demonstrates knowledge of learning styles, which guide the counseling session. In a Level 3 performance, the academic interventions relate to the identified academic need of the student. There is clear evidence that the counselor has thoughtfully chosen the organization, structure, and pacing of the session and counseling strategies used to address the needs of the student while allowing for unexpected adjustments during the session. One part of the session may not have flowed as smoothly as in the Level 4 response. The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence of knowledge of academic theories, including those of motivation and academic skill development, and uses counseling resources to enhance student awareness about learning styles. There is clear evidence that the counselor is able to collaborate appropriately and effectively with staff, students, and parents although that collaboration may not be as far-reaching or effective as in the Level 4 response. In a Level 3 performance, the counselor describes how this academic intervention plan is part of the student's larger academic program and accurately describes, analyzes, and assesses the student's learning that results from the session in a way that demonstrates insights into the student's understanding of the session and the student's academic progress. In a Level 3 response, there is a description of the process used to assist the student in setting high, worthwhile, and appropriate

goals that are central to his or her education. The description may not be as detailed or thorough as in the Level 4 response. In a Level 3 response, the intervention relates to the school counseling program and the mission of the school although it may not relate as directly as in the Level 4 response. In a Level 3 response, there is a description of how the academic intervention plan will be monitored and a demonstration of how the counselor will use the knowledge gained to inform his or her work with other students in the future. In a Level 3 response, there is an accurate description of the counselor's practice, a thoughtful analysis of the practice, and a reflection on the practice that includes implications for future academic counseling sessions. One part of the response may be more indicative of accomplished practice than the others, but overall, there is clear evidence of the counselor's ability to monitor student academic progress and use effective academic counseling to create an academic intervention plan for an individual student in order to maximize academic learning.

Level 2

The Level 2 performance provides **limited** evidence of the counselor's ability to monitor student academic progress and use effective academic counseling to create an academic intervention plan for an individual student in order to maximize academic learning.

The Level 2 performance provides limited evidence that the counselor identified a student with a substantial academic need and accurately analyzed available data that provides insightful information regarding the student's academic competencies. The academic plan created may not match the need of the student or may be overly broad or vague. There is limited evidence that the counselor fosters a purposeful, equitable, supportive, and safe counseling environment in which the student is encouraged to participate in open dialogue about why and how decisions are made related to academic progress and interventions. There may be goals established for the session but they may be vague or just activities. There is limited evidence that the counselor skillfully engages the student in meaningful discussions concerning academic achievement and goal setting and that there is a well-defined academic intervention plan developed collaboratively that addresses the specific competencies/needs of the featured student. The plan may have been created mainly by the counselor with minimal input from the student or others. There is limited evidence that the counselor demonstrates the use of individual counseling skills and interventions in recognition of different characteristics and backgrounds of students, and there is weak evidence that the counselor demonstrates knowledge of learning styles, which guide the counseling session. In a Level 2 performance, the academic interventions may not relate to the identified academic need of the student. There is limited evidence that the counselor has thoughtfully chosen the organization, structure, and pacing of the session and counseling strategies used to thoroughly address the needs of the student while allowing for unexpected adjustments during the session. The Level 2 performance provides limited evidence of an in-depth knowledge of academic theories, including those of motivation and academic skill development, and there is minimal use of appropriate counseling resources to enhance student awareness about learning styles. There is limited evidence that the counselor is able to collaborate appropriately and effectively with staff, students, and parents. In a Level 2 performance, the academic intervention plan may be in isolation from the rest of the student's larger academic program and the description, analysis, and assessment of student learning that results from the session is weak and may not provide insights into the student's understanding of the session and the student's academic progress. In a Level 2 response there may be goals set, but they may be vague or not be appropriate or central to the student's education. The intervention may relate indirectly to the school

counseling program and the mission of the school. There may be minimal information about how the academic intervention plan will be monitored or how the counselor will use the knowledge gained to inform his or her work with other students in the future. In a Level 2 response, the description of the counselor's practice is generalized, the analysis of the practice is incomplete, and/or the reflection may be vague or superficial and there are minimal implications for future academic counseling sessions. The Level 2 response may be characterized by parts that hint at accomplished practice, but overall, the Level 2 performance provides limited evidence of the counselor's ability to monitor student academic progress and use effective academic counseling to create an academic intervention plan for an individual student in order to maximize academic learning.

Level 1

The Level 1 performance provides **little or no** evidence of the counselor's ability to monitor student academic progress and use effective academic counseling to create an academic intervention plan for an individual student in order to maximize academic learning.

The Level 1 performance provides little or no evidence that the counselor identified a student with a substantial academic need and accurately analyzed available data that provides insightful information regarding the student's academic competencies. The counseling environment may not have been supportive or safe, and the dialogue may have been mostly one-way. The goals established are vague, over-broad, or inappropriate for that student's needs. There is little evidence that the counselor engages the student in discussions concerning academic achievement and goal setting. The academic plan may have been created mainly by the counselor with minimal collaboration and may not fit the student's needs as the counselor defined them. The individual counseling skills are weak, ineffective, or inappropriate for the student. There is little or no evidence of the counselor's knowledge of learning styles, which guide the counseling session. The academic interventions do not relate to the identified academic need of the student. In a Level 1 performance, the pacing of the session may be choppy and disorganized. The counselor may not be prepared to manage unexpected adjustments during the session. The counselor's knowledge of academic theories may be missing or inaccurate. The resources used were ineffective or there were none used to enhance the student's awareness of learning styles. There is little or no evidence that the counselor is able to collaborate appropriately and effectively with staff, students, and parents. In a Level 1 performance, the academic plan may stand alone and not be part of the student's larger academic program. In a Level 1 performance, there is little or no evidence that the counselor is able to describe, analyze, and assess the student's learning that results from the session in a way that demonstrates insights into the student's understanding of the session and the student's academic progress. In a Level 1 response, there is minimal description of the process used to assist the student in setting high, worthwhile, and appropriate goals that are central to his or her education. In a Level 1 response, the intervention does not relate or relates very indirectly to the school counseling program and the mission of the school. There is little or no evidence of how the academic intervention plan will be monitored. In a Level 1 response, there is little or no evidence that the counselor will use the knowledge gained to inform his or her work with other students in the future. There is little or no evidence of a description of the counselor's practice, the analysis may be missing or vague, and the reflection, if it is present, does not include implications for future academic counseling sessions. Overall, the Level 1 performance provides little or no evidence of the counselor's ability to monitor student academic progress and use effective academic counseling to create an academic intervention plan for an individual student in order to maximize academic learning.

Note-Taking Guide

1. Aspects of school counseling. As you read through the response, note evidence pertaining to EACH of the aspects listed below. Evidence may come from one or more data sources for any one aspect.

- a) **KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS (KOS):** Is there evidence that the candidate has used knowledge of early childhood through young adulthood students' needs, abilities, and learning styles to inform the counseling session for this featured student? What is the academic need that has been identified for this student? Is the need related to motivation, skill development, or another factor? How does the candidate know this?
- b) **COUNSELING ENVIRONMENT (CE):** What is the evidence that the candidate fostered a counseling environment that was purposeful, supportive, and safe for the student?
- c) **FAIRNESS, EQUITY, AND DIVERSITY (FED):** What is the evidence that the candidate ensures fairness, equity, and diversity for this student? How did the candidate assure academic rigor for this student?
- d) **ENGAGEMENT (ENG):** How did the candidate engage the student in meaningful discussion concerning his or her academic needs? Was the discussion open including active student participation related to the student's evaluation of his or her academic progress? How did the candidate assist the student in setting goals? How did the candidate enhance student awareness about academic learning styles?
- e) **GOALS/CONNECTIONS (G/C):** How well are the goals for this session described? Why are they appropriate for this student? Is there a link between the academic need, the goals set, and the learning style of the student? How did the counselor assure that the goals were met for the session?
- f) **COLLABORATION (COL):** How did the student assist in creating the plan? Is there evidence that the candidate effectively collaborated with appropriate school staff, family, and the community regarding the implementation of the plan? What impact did these collaborations have on the development and implementation of the academic plan?
- g) **COUNSELING SKILLS AND TECHNIQUES (CS&T):** What were the counseling skills and techniques that were utilized? How well does the candidate discuss the rationale and the theoretical background of these techniques? How effective were the techniques? Was the candidate able to adjust the counseling approach when needed during the session? What does the candidate indicate took place during the counseling session besides what was seen on the video recording?

- h) **COUNSELING THEORY (CT):** What is the evidence that the candidate demonstrated a deep knowledge of human growth and development along with academic theories in the planning of the session and the development of the academic plan?
- i) **ACADEMIC INTERVENTION PLAN (AIP):** How did the candidate use the data gathered to inform the collaborative creation of the plan? How does the academic intervention plan directly address the academic need that was identified? How will this plan be monitored?
- j) **ANALYSIS (ANA):** Is there a thorough and accurate analysis of the data, counseling techniques, and the student’s academic progress and plan?
- k) **SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM (SCP):** How does the academic intervention relate to the school counseling program and the mission of the school?
- l) **REFLECTION (R):** To what extent does the candidate identify what went well and not so well within the session? What short- and long-term impact does the candidate’s work have on this student and with others that have similar needs within the school? How does the candidate plan to modify future practice and seek alternative approaches and techniques based upon reflective practice?

2. Do the counseling techniques and interactions used promote the student’s academic progress? Think about the quality of and the links among the different parts of the evidence. Are the parts and links logical, accurate, and complete? The links to think about are:

- information about the individual student needs ← → the goals ↔ the academic counseling session
- the academic counseling session ← → the academic intervention plan
- the written commentary ← → video recording evidence (i.e., the quality of “fit”: does the video recording support and enhance the written commentary and analysis or does it conflict?)

3. **Think about the performance as a whole. Overall, what is the nature of the evidence that the counselor is able to deliver an individual counseling session that addresses the academic need and growth of the student? Think about this in terms of:**
- evidence in the written commentary
 - evidence in the video recording
 - your judgment of the effectiveness of the academic counseling session and the resources used to further student growth and understanding of academic progress
 - the links between the written commentary and the video recording

Entry 4: Documented Accomplishments: Contributions to Student Learning

Scoring Rubric

Level 4

The Level 4 performance provides **clear, consistent, and convincing** evidence of the school counselor's ability to impact student learning and improve the school counseling program through work with families and the community, as a learner, and as a leader and collaborator with colleagues and other professionals.

The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the school counselor treats parents and other interested adults as valued partners in the student's development and 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 school counselor, 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 counseling and learning issues and individual student progress. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the school counselor facilitates ongoing, mutually beneficial interactions between students and the wider community in a way that enhances learning. The Level 4 performance provides clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the school counselor engages in conscious and deliberate ongoing professional development to strengthen knowledge, skills, and abilities relevant to his or her counseling context for the purpose of impacting student learning and improving the school counseling program. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the school counselor has worked collaboratively with colleagues to improve learning within the school or in the wider professional community. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the school counselor consistently and conscientiously advocates for policies, programs, and positions that are intended to enhance personal/social, career, and academic counseling programs. In addition, there is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the school counselor has shared his or her expertise in a leadership role with other educators through facilitating professional development of other staff, improving instructional practices, or advocating for positive change in educational policy. There is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that

the school counselor accurately analyzes and thoughtfully reflects on the significance of all accomplishments taken together, and appropriately plans for future opportunities to impact student learning and improve the school counseling program. Throughout the Level 4 performance, there is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the school counselor's work outside explicit student counseling has been driven by a conscious and deliberate focus on improving counseling, as opposed to merely fulfilling job requirements. The descriptions and documentation provide a rich, detailed, coherent view of a school counselor who has made an impact on student learning and the school counseling program. Overall, there is clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the school counselor's ability to impact student learning and improve the school counseling program through work with families and the community, as a learner, and as a leader and collaborator with colleagues and other professionals.

Level 3

The Level 3 performance provides **clear** evidence of the school counselor's ability to impact student learning and the school counseling program through work with families and the community, as a learner, and as a leader and collaborator with colleagues and other professionals.

The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence that the school counselor treats parents and other interested adults as valued partners in the student'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 school counselor, but they are implemented with skill and enthusiasm and are effective in engaging parents and other interested adults in communication that is interactive, fostering two-way dialogue focused primarily on substantive counseling and learning issues and individual student progress. There is clear evidence that the school counselor facilitates ongoing, mutually beneficial interactions between students and the wider community in a way that enhances learning although the interactions may not be as effective as those in a Level 4 performance. The Level 3 performance provides clear evidence that the school counselor engages in conscious and deliberate professional development to strengthen knowledge, skills, and abilities in areas that are relevant to his or her counseling context for the purpose of impacting student learning and improving the school counseling program. There is clear evidence that the school counselor has worked collaboratively with colleagues to improve learning within the school or in the wider professional community. There is clear evidence that the school counselor conscientiously advocates for policies, programs, and positions that are intended to enhance personal/social, career, and academic counseling programs. In addition, there is clear evidence that the school counselor has shared his or her expertise in a leadership role with other educators through facilitating professional development of other staff, improving instructional practices, or advocating for positive change in educational policy. There is clear evidence that the school counselor analyzes and reflects on the significance of all accomplishments taken together, and appropriately plans for future opportunities to impact student learning and improve the school counseling program. Throughout the Level 3 performance, there is clear evidence that the school counselor's work outside explicit student counseling has been driven by a conscious and deliberate focus on improving counseling, as opposed to merely fulfilling job requirements. The descriptions and documentation provide a coherent view of a school counselor who has made an impact on student learning and the school counseling program. Overall, there is clear evidence of the school counselor's ability to impact student learning and the school counseling program through work with families and the community, as a learner, and as a leader and collaborator with colleagues and other professionals.

Level 2

The Level 2 performance provides **limited** evidence of the school counselor's ability to impact student learning and the school counseling program through work with families and the community, as a learner, and as a leader and collaborator with colleagues and other professionals.

The Level 2 performance provides limited evidence that the school counselor treats parents and other interested adults as valued partners in the student'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 counseling issues. Instead, many of the communications may be dominated by procedural issues or the communications may not show much differentiation between individual students with the same communication going to all families. The Level 2 performance provides limited evidence 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 school, but there is limited evidence of two-way dialogue with families. There is limited evidence regarding meaningful communications between the students and the wider community for the purpose of enhancing counseling. The Level 2 performance may provide limited evidence that the school counselor engages in ongoing professional development. Even if the counselor 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 counseling context for the purpose of impacting student learning and improving the school counseling program. There may be limited evidence that the school counselor has shared what he or she has learned with colleagues by working with them in a role as a partner, collaborator, or leader to improve learning within the school or in the wider professional community. There is limited evidence that the school counselor advocates for policies, programs, and positions that are intended to enhance personal/social, career, and academic counseling programs. There is limited evidence that the counselor has been an advocate for the development, implementation, and management of his or her school counseling program. There may be evidence to indicate that the school counselor is an accomplished practitioner within his or her own area, but that he or she has not shared his or her expertise with others in a significant way through professional development of other school counselors, improving instructional practices, or advocating for positive change in educational policy. There is limited evidence that the school counselor

analyzes and reflects on the significance of all accomplishments taken together, and appropriately plans for future opportunities to impact student learning and improve the school counseling program. The evidence may suggest that the preponderance of the school counselor's activities outside of explicit student counseling has been to fulfill job requirements as opposed to being a conscious and deliberate effort to impact student learning and improve the school counseling program. The descriptions and documentation provide a limited view of a school counselor who has made an impact on student learning and the school counseling program. Overall, there is limited evidence of the school counselor's ability to impact student learning and the school counseling program through work with families and the community, as a learner, and as a leader and collaborator with colleagues and other professionals.

Level 1

The Level 1 performance provides **little or no** evidence of the school counselor's ability to impact student learning and the school counseling program through work with families and the community, as a learner, and as a leader and collaborator with colleagues and other professionals.

The Level 1 performance provides little or no evidence that the school counselor treats parents and other interested adults as valued partners in the student's education, or 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. There is little or no evidence that the communications with families are focused on substantive counseling issues. Instead, the communications are taken up almost exclusively by procedural issues. The Level 1 performance provides little or no evidence that the communications with families are interactive. Communications with families are entirely one-way and/or infrequent. Parents may not be kept informed about important issues. If evidence regarding outreach to the wider community is present, the connections may promote trivial interactions with little impact on student learning and improvement of the school counseling program. The Level 1 performance may contain negative or disparaging comments about parents, community, or professionals with little or no evidence of the school counselor's efforts to improve the situation. If professional development activities are cited, they may be sketchy or weak or of little or no relevance to the counseling context. There is little or no evidence that the school counselor has worked collaboratively with colleagues to improve counseling either within the school or in the wider professional community. There is little or no evidence that the school counselor advocates for policies, programs, and positions that are intended to enhance personal/social, career, and academic counseling programs. There is little or no evidence that the school counselor has worked with colleagues as a partner, collaborator, or leader or that the counselor has been an advocate for the development, implementation, and management of his or her school counseling program. If school projects are cited, there may be little or no evidence of their impact on student learning or the school counseling program, or the school counselor's role in the project may be very unclear or very passive. There may be evidence that the school counselor is an accomplished practitioner in his or her own area but there is little or no evidence that he or she has shared his or her expertise with others. There is little or no evidence that the school counselor analyzes and reflects on the significance of all accomplishments taken together, and appropriately plans for future opportunities to impact student's learning and improve the school counseling program. The evidence may suggest that the preponderance of the school counselor's work outside of explicit student counseling

has been carried out solely to fulfill job requirements, as opposed to being a conscious and deliberate effort to impact student learning and improve the school counseling program. The descriptions and documentation provide a view of a school counselor who had made little or no impact on student learning and the school counseling program. Overall, there is little or no evidence of the school counselor's ability to impact student learning and the school counseling program through work with families and the community, and work as a learner, leader, and collaborator with other professionals.

Note-Taking Guide

1. Accomplishments:

- Briefly describe each accomplishment, and note the documentation provided by candidates.
- Note the aspect(s) addressed in the evidence for each accomplishment as described below:
 - a) **COUNSELOR AS PARTNER WITH FAMILIES AND COMMUNITY (P-F/C):** Evidence that the counselor treats parents and other interested adults as valued partners in the child’s development and education. Also, evidence that school–community connections facilitate ongoing, mutually beneficial interactions between the students and the wider community and enhance counseling and learning. Evidence that the counselor fosters two-way dialogue with parents and other interested adults.
 - b) **COUNSELOR AS LEARNER (CL):** Evidence that the counselor has engaged in ongoing professional development whereby he or she has strengthened his or her knowledge, skills, and abilities relevant to his or her counseling context. Does the counselor seek information on current theories and research—and their applications—through familiarity with professional literature, participate in and support professional organizations, or take advanced course work relevant to his or her counseling and learning context?
 - c) **COUNSELOR AS LEADER/COLLABORATOR (L/C):** Evidence that the counselor has worked collaboratively with colleagues to improve counseling and learning (within school or in wider professional community). Also, evidence that the counselor has shared his or her expertise in a leadership role with other educators so that counseling and learning can be improved.
- Evaluate each accomplishment and its impact on student learning and the improvement of the school counseling program.

2. Reflective Summary: Does counselor explain what was most effective in impacting student learning? What is the plan to further impact student learning and to improve the school counseling program? Describe and evaluate the summary.

3. Looking at the descriptions and the documentation together with the Reflective Summary, what is the nature of the “fit” among them?

Consider the following:

- descriptions ↔ supporting documentation ↔ reflective summary
(Each and every accomplishment listed by the counselor need not be verified by supporting documentation, and the documentation may not necessarily address every detail of the counselor’s description.)
- supporting documentation ↔ outreach to families and the community; development as a learner; and leading/collaborating with the professional community ↔ reflective summary

4. Appropriateness and extent of outreach to families and the community, professional development, and work with colleagues.

Consider the following evidence:

- that the strategies used by the counselor to reach out to families and the community are appropriate for his or her students and extensive enough to engage families and the community in two-way communication for the purpose of impacting student learning and improving the school counseling program
- that the communications with families and community address substantive counseling and learning issues and student progress (As opposed to communications that are strictly procedural, such as organizing field trips, or focused on behavior or discipline issues.)
- that professional development activities and work with colleagues is ongoing, showing the application of improved content knowledge and/or pedagogical approaches that impact student learning and improve the school counseling program

5. Think about the performance as a whole. Overall, what is the nature of the evidence that the counselor is able to impact student learning and the school counseling program through partnerships with families, and the community, and work as a learner, leader, and collaborator? Think about this in terms of the following areas:

- Counselor as Partner with Families and the Community
- Counselor as Learner
- Counselor as Leader/Collaborator

3

Scoring Materials for Assessment Center Exercises

Introduction

In this section you will see the rubrics used to score the six assessment center exercises. Each rubric is composed of four “levels” that describe the characteristics of candidate performance at the four major points on the NBPTS score scale. The assessment center exercises are focused on content, the rubrics are shorter and less complicated, and there is no Note-Taking Guide, as there is for the portfolio entries.

You may find it particularly useful to compare the rubrics in this section to the selected assessment center prompts that are printed in the next section of this *Guide*. This comparison should help clarify what it is assessors look for in accomplished school counselors’ answers to the kinds of questions posed in the exercises.

These scoring materials were current at the time of printing.

Exercise 1: Human Growth and Development

Scoring Rubric

Level 4

The response shows **clear, consistent, and convincing** evidence of an accurate and thorough explanation of a specified stage of a human growth and development theory and an accurate description of the challenges and issues related to the developmental stage in three specific areas.

Characteristics:

- The explanation of the specified stage of human growth and development is accurate and thorough.
- The discussion of the issues and challenges for the identified stage is informed and substantive, containing a typical issue and/or challenge for each of the three areas noted.

Level 3

The response shows **clear** evidence of an accurate and thorough explanation of a specified stage of a human growth and development theory and an accurate description of the challenges and issues related to the developmental stage in three specific areas.

Characteristics:

- The explanation of the specified stage of human growth and development is accurate, but may not be as thorough as the Level 4 response.
- The discussion of the issues and challenges for the identified stage is informed, containing a typical issue and/or challenge for each of the three areas noted, but the discussion may not contain as much detail as the Level 4 response.

Level 2

The response shows **limited** evidence of an accurate and thorough explanation of a specified stage of a human growth and development theory and an accurate description of the challenges and issues related to the developmental stage in three specific areas.

Characteristics:

- The explanation of the specified stage of human growth and development may be inaccurate or vague, or key information may be missing.
- The discussion of the issues and challenges for the identified stage may be missing pieces, be less informed, sketchy, or insignificant.

Level 1

The response shows **little or no** evidence of an accurate and thorough explanation of a specified stage of a human growth and development theory or an accurate description of the challenges and issues related to the developmental stage in three specific areas.

Characteristics:

- The explanation of the specified stage of human growth and development may be inaccurate or missing.
- The discussion of the issues and challenges for the identified stage may be inaccurate and/or two or more parts may be missing.

Exercise 2: School Counseling Program

Scoring Rubric

Level 4

The response shows **clear, consistent, and convincing** evidence that the candidate demonstrates a thorough and complete knowledge of the development, implementation, and management of a school counseling program.

Characteristics:

- The two issues in the scenario are accurately identified.
- Analysis is in-depth and directly connected to how the issues will impact the school in the scenario.
- Description of two strategies is significant and thorough.
- Explanation of how these strategies will improve the school counseling program is thoughtful and substantive.

Level 3

The response shows **clear** evidence that the candidate demonstrates a thorough and complete knowledge of the development, implementation, and management of a school counseling program.

Characteristics:

- The two issues in the scenario are accurately identified.
- Analysis is connected to how the issues will impact the school in the scenario, but there may not be as direct a connection as in the Level 4 response.
- Description of two strategies is significant but may be less thorough than the Level 4 response.
- Explanation of how these strategies will improve the school counseling program is present but may not contain as much detail as in the Level 4 response.

Level 2

The response shows **limited** evidence that the candidate demonstrates a thorough and complete knowledge of the development, implementation, and management of a school counseling program.

Characteristics:

- The two issues in the scenario may be misidentified or one may be absent.
- Analysis of how the issues will impact the school in the scenario may be vague or misinformed, or the analysis may not be connected directly to the scenario.
- Description of two strategies may be vague or provide little indication that one or more of them would be effective.
- Explanation of how these strategies will improve the school counseling program may be insignificant or sketchy.

Level 1

The response shows **little or no** evidence that the candidate demonstrates a thorough and complete knowledge of the development, implementation, and management of a school counseling program.

Characteristics:

- The two issues in the scenario are misidentified or may be missing.
- Analysis of how the issues will impact the school in the scenario is absent or inaccurate.
- Description of two strategies is missing or misinformed.
- Explanation of how these strategies will improve the school counseling program is absent or inaccurate.

Exercise 3: Diverse Populations

Scoring Rubric

Level 4

The response shows **clear, consistent, and convincing** evidence of a thorough and complete knowledge of the situational and cultural challenges of a diverse population and the application of culturally appropriate counseling skills, techniques, and interventions for a specific student.

Characteristics:

- Description of the situational and cultural challenges of a diverse population is detailed and accurate.
- Discussion of three culturally appropriate counseling skills and techniques, including rationales, is accurate and informed.
- Discussion of three counseling interventions for a specific student is accurate and thorough.

Level 3

The response shows **clear** evidence of a thorough and complete knowledge of the situational and cultural challenges of a diverse population and the application of culturally appropriate counseling skills, techniques, and interventions for a specific student.

Characteristics:

- Description of the situational and cultural challenges of a diverse population is accurate, although it may not be as in-depth as in the Level 4 response.
- Discussion of three culturally appropriate counseling skills and techniques, including rationales, is present but may not contain as much detail as in the Level 4 response.
- Discussion of three counseling interventions for a specific student is accurate but may not be as complete as in the Level 4 response.

Level 2

The response shows **limited** evidence of a thorough and complete knowledge of the situational and cultural challenges of a diverse population and the application of culturally appropriate counseling skills, techniques, and interventions for a specific student.

Characteristics:

- Description of the situational and cultural challenges of a diverse population may be general or contain misinformation.
- Discussion of three culturally appropriate counseling skills and techniques, including rationales, may be general or less significant.
- Discussion of three counseling interventions for a specific student may be inappropriate or ineffective.

Level 1

The response shows **little or no** evidence of a thorough and complete knowledge of the situational and cultural challenges of a diverse population and the application of culturally appropriate counseling skills, techniques, and interventions for a specific student.

Characteristics:

- Description of the situational and cultural challenges of a diverse population is missing or inaccurate.
- Discussion of three culturally appropriate counseling skills and techniques, including rationales, is absent, misinformed, or inappropriate.
- Discussion of three counseling interventions for a specific student is missing, inappropriate, or ineffective.

Exercise 4: Theory

Scoring Rubric

Level 4

The response provides **clear, consistent, and convincing** evidence of a thorough and deep knowledge of the philosophy, goals, and key concepts of a specific counseling theorist and an appropriate application of the given theory to a school counseling issue.

Characteristics:

- The description of the philosophy, goals, and key concepts of a specific counseling theorist is accurate and thorough.
- There is skillful application of the theory to a school counseling issue.

Level 3

The response provides **clear** evidence of a thorough and deep knowledge of the philosophy, goals, and key concepts of a specific counseling theorist and an appropriate application of the given theory to a school counseling issue.

Characteristics:

- The description of the philosophy, goals, and key concepts of a specific counseling theorist is accurate but may contain less detail than in the Level 4 response.
- There is skillful application of the theory to a school counseling issue, but it may not be as thoughtful as in the Level 4 response.

Level 2

The response provides **limited** evidence of a thorough and deep knowledge of the philosophy, goals, and key concepts of a specific counseling theorist and an appropriate application of the given theory to a school counseling issue.

Characteristics:

- The description of the philosophy, goals, and key concepts of a specific counseling theorist may be missing components, vague, or inaccurate.
- Application of the theory to a school counseling issue may be inappropriate or insignificant.

Level 1

The response provides **little or no** evidence of a thorough and deep knowledge of the philosophy, goals, and key concepts of a specific counseling theorist and an appropriate application of the given theory to a school counseling issue.

Characteristics:

- The description of the philosophy, goals, and key concepts of a specific counseling theorist is inaccurate, or numerous components may be missing.
- Application of the theory to a school counseling issue lacks specifics, is missing, or may be inappropriate.

Exercise 5: Data and Planning

Scoring Rubric

Level 4

The response shows **clear, consistent, and convincing** evidence that the candidate is able to interpret and analyze data presented and make appropriate recommendations for improvement, including rationales, along with effective steps for each recommendation.

Characteristics:

- The data is accurately interpreted and thoroughly analyzed with considerations given to patterns and trends.
- The recommendations for school improvement are insightful and appropriate.
- The rationale for each of the recommendations is sensible and thoughtful.
- The steps for implementation are in-depth, appropriate, and effective.

Level 3

The response shows **clear** evidence that the candidate is able to interpret and analyze data presented and make appropriate recommendations for improvement, including rationales, along with effective steps for each recommendation.

Characteristics:

- The data is accurately interpreted, but the analysis may not contain as much detail as in the Level 4 response.
- The recommendations for school improvement are appropriate, although they may not be as insightful as in the Level 4 response.
- The rationale for each of the recommendations is adequate, although one of them may be less thoughtful than in the Level 4 response.
- The steps for implementation are appropriate and effective but may contain less detail than in the Level 4 response.

Level 2

The response shows **limited** evidence that the candidate is able to interpret and analyze data presented and make appropriate recommendations for improvement, including rationales, along with effective steps for each recommendation.

Characteristics:

- The interpretation of the data may be inaccurate, and/or the analysis may be partly missing.
- The recommendations for school improvement may be minimally appropriate but may not connect specifically to the data provided.
- The rationale for each of the recommendations may be partially missing or may be less connected to the recommendations themselves.
- The steps for implementation may be partially missing or inappropriate.

Level 1

The response shows **little or no** evidence that the candidate is able to interpret and analyze data presented and make appropriate recommendations for improvement, including rationales, along with effective steps and rationales for each recommendation.

Characteristics:

- The interpretation of the data may be inaccurate, and/or the analysis may be missing.
- The recommendations for school improvement are inappropriate or seriously misinformed.
- The rationale for each of the recommendations is ambiguous, weak, or missing.
- The steps for implementation are missing or inappropriate.

Exercise 6: Collaboration

Scoring Rubric

Level 4

The response provides **clear, consistent, and convincing** evidence of the thoughtful assessment of a student concern, including a description of the proper legal and ethical procedures and the medical considerations that must be taken into account as you collaborate to provide services designed to help the student succeed.

Characteristics:

- Description of the initial interview with a given student is thoughtful and detailed.
- Description of legal and ethical procedures and the medical concerns to consider are accurate and thorough.
- Identification of three critical components that would be part of a collaborative plan to help the student succeed is accurate and specifically addresses the student's concern.

Level 3

The response provides **clear** evidence of the thoughtful assessment of a student concern, including a description of the proper legal and ethical procedures and the medical considerations that must be taken into account as you collaborate to provide services designed to help the student succeed.

Characteristics:

- Description of the initial interview with a given student is thoughtful but may contain less detail than the Level 4 response.
- Description of legal and ethical procedures and the medical concerns to consider are accurate, but the description may not be as in-depth as in the Level 4 response.
- Identification of three critical components that would be part of a collaborative plan to help the student succeed is effective, but one component may be less appropriate than the others.

Level 2

The response provides **limited** evidence of the thoughtful assessment of a student concern, including a description of the proper legal and ethical procedures and the medical considerations that must be taken into account as you collaborate to provide services designed to help the student succeed.

Characteristics:

- Description of the initial interview with a given student may be general, or some parts may contain misinformation.
- Description of legal and ethical procedures and the medical concerns to consider may be missing, inaccurate, or general.
- Identification of three critical components that would be part of a collaborative plan to help the student succeed is partially missing or does not address student concern.

Level 1

The response provides **little or no** evidence of the thoughtful assessment of a student concern, including a description of the proper legal and ethical procedures and the medical considerations that must be taken into account as you collaborate to provide services designed to help the student succeed.

Characteristics:

- Description of the initial interview with a given student is missing critical components.
- Description of legal and ethical procedures and the medical concerns to consider is misinformed or partially missing.
- Identification of three critical components that would be part of a collaborative plan to help the student succeed is missing or inappropriate.

4

Selected Assessment Center Exercises

Introduction

This section contains exercises administered in a previous assessment cycle. The print versions here present information that candidates saw onscreen at the assessment center: instructions for using the computer, onscreen stimulus materials (if any), and the prompts to which the candidates responded. These exercises have been included in this *Guide* to help you become familiar with the structure of assessment center exercises and to help you understand the rubrics in the previous section. The exercise prompts in this section do not represent actual prompts candidates will see at assessment centers in the future.

Please note that assessment center exercises cover the **entire** age range in the certificate. Be aware that you are expected to demonstrate knowledge of developmentally appropriate content across the full age range of your certificate.

Exercise 2: School Counseling Program

Introduction

In this exercise, you will demonstrate your knowledge of the development, implementation, and management of a school counseling program. You will be asked to respond to three prompts.

Criteria for Scoring

To satisfy the highest level of the scoring rubric, your responses must provide clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the following:

- an accurate identification of two specific issues related to the effective administration of the school counseling program described in the Scenario;
- an in-depth analysis of how these issues impact the school; and
- a thorough description of two significant strategies to address these issues and a thoughtful explanation of how they will improve the school counseling program.

Directions

You may preview all of the prompts by clicking on the “Next” button. The “Previous” button will enable you to return to any of the prompts in order to compose or revise your response in the space provided. Your response will automatically be linked to the prompt that is displayed.

Scenario

You are a school counselor newly assigned to Abbott Elementary School. The counseling program has been operating on a responsive-services-only schedule. The supervisor of school counseling has asked you to meet with her to discuss your vision for improving the school counseling program. According to the supervisor, there has been little teacher support for the school counseling program over the past few years.

Prompts

1. Identify the two issues presented in the Scenario.
2. Analyze how the issues presented in the Scenario impact the school.
3. Describe two significant strategies that you would recommend to address the issues identified, and explain how each would improve the school counseling program.

Exercise 3: Diverse Populations

Introduction

In this exercise, you will use your knowledge about providing counseling to diverse populations. You will apply counseling skills, techniques, and interventions to a student situation described in the Scenario. You will be asked to respond to three prompts.

Criteria for Scoring

To satisfy the highest level of the scoring rubric, your responses must provide clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of the following:

- a detailed and accurate description of the situational and cultural challenges of a diverse population;
- an informed discussion of culturally appropriate counseling skills and techniques, including rationales; and
- an accurate and thorough discussion of three counseling interventions for a specific student.

Directions

You may preview all of the prompts by clicking on the “Next” button. The “Previous” button will enable you to return to any of the prompts in order to compose or revise your response in the space provided. Your response will automatically be linked to the prompt that is displayed.

Scenario

You are a school counselor at Allen Middle School. A 12-year-old student has recently moved with his family from Korea. He comes to your office in tears a week after starting school. He speaks limited English and appears nervous.

Prompts

1. What situational and cultural challenges is the student in the Scenario facing?
2. Discuss three culturally appropriate counseling skills/techniques to use with this student. Provide a rationale for why each is appropriate given the context of his cultural background.
3. Describe three counseling interventions that will be part of the plan for this student. Explain why each is appropriate.

