



Core Proposition #4: Thinking Systematically About Your Practice and Learning From Experience

Competency

Educator expands their repertoire and deepens their pedagogical content knowledge to remain inventive and welcoming to new findings that extend their professional learning.

Key Method

The educator uses feedback from stakeholders (parents, students, colleagues, or administrators), current research, and data on student needs to develop and implement a professional growth plan to increase student success.

Method Components

Educators demonstrate their dedication to continuous growth through the following:

Add steps or strategies needed, background information, definitions, or details that are important to the work submitted in part 2.

- Identifying stakeholders (parents, students, colleagues, or administrators) to elicit feedback regarding instructional practice
- Determining both the needs of students and personal professional needs
- Setting worthwhile goals appropriate to identified needs using varied data points such as summative or formative assessments, student self-evaluations, or stakeholder feedback
- Ability to think reflectively and link trends and/or patterns from student data

- Understanding the Architecture of Accomplished Teaching and applying it to professional practice
- Demonstrating the ability to analyze research and data to impact teaching practice
- Reflecting on the effectiveness of professional learning on student learning
- Demonstrating an understanding of the Five Core Propositions (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards)

Supporting Rationale and Research

Harris, L. M., (2018). *Perceptions of teachers about using and analyzing data to inform instruction*. [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University], 5469.

<https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/5469>

Keiler, L., Diotti, R., Hudon, K. & Ransom, J. (2020). The role of feedback in teacher mentoring: how coaches, peers, and students affect teacher change, *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 28(2), 126-155, DOI: [10.1080/13611267.2020.1749345](https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2020.1749345)

Maksimovic, J., & Osmanovic, J. (2019). Perspective of cognitive thinking and reflective teaching. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education*; Vranje 7(2), 1-10. DOI:10.5937/IJCRSEE1902001M ProQuest.

<https://www.proquest.com/openview/eadbed1d7e31be8b77fc66a6f91c788c/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=4402925>

Messikh, D. (2020). A Systematic Review of the Outcomes of Using Action Research in Education (April 2020). *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*,11(1).

<https://ssrn.com/abstract=3582371>

Playsted, S. (2019). Reflective practice to guide teacher learning: A practitioner's journey with beginner adult English language learners. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 7(3), 37-52. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/sspapers/4583/>

Resources

Articles

[3 ways our school uses data to drive instruction. eSchool News](#)

[Improving your teaching: Obtaining feedback. University of Michigan](#)

[Teaching Without Tears](#)

[Ways to reflect on your teaching – A practical approach. TESL Ontario.](#)

NBCT Resources

[What teachers should know and be able to do](#)

[The architecture of accomplished teaching](#)

Submission Guidelines & Evaluation Criteria

To earn the micro-credential, you must receive a passing score in Parts 1 and 3, and be proficient in all components in Part 2.

Part 1. Overview Questions (Provides Context)

(200-250 words)

Please use the suggested word count as a guide to answer the following contextual questions. This will help our assessor understand your current context for working on this micro-credential.

Please do not include any information that will make you identifiable to your reviewers.

1. What is the type of school/program in which you teach and the grade/subject configuration (single grade, departmentalized, interdisciplinary teams, etc.)?
2. What relevant characteristics of this class influence instructional planning (ethnic, cultural, linguistic diversity, range of abilities, personality of class)?
3. What information about your teaching context do you believe would be important for assessors to know to understand your submission and “see” the class featured?
4. In what ways have you already used findings from educational research to improve your practice?
5. How do you obtain information from colleagues and other stakeholders to help you learn more about the success of your practice?

Passing: Response completely answers each question. Writing is organized and easy to understand.

Part 2. Work Examples/Artifacts/Evidence

To earn this micro-credential, please submit the following four artifacts as evidence of your learning.

**Please do not include any information that will make you or your students identifiable to your reviewers.*

Artifact 1: Stakeholder Feedback

Provide feedback from a stakeholder regarding instructional practice. Evidence may include (but is not limited to) anecdotal notes from feedback discussions, a stakeholder observation template with feedback, and/or videotaped discussions between the educator and the stakeholder. Evidence submitted for this step is limited to 1 page or 1 5-minute video (recommended video format: MP4 or YouTube link). Include the stakeholder's position and the date feedback was provided.

Artifact 2: Group Profile

Create and submit a group profile for one class/group of students that includes at least 4 points of data from varied sources (summative, formative, student, stakeholder).

Artifact 3: Professional Growth Plan

(150-200 words)

Write a professional growth plan (PGP) that outlines both (1) an identified professional learning need from stakeholder feedback and (2) an identified student need that is linked to trends and/or patterns identified in the group of students described in the group profile in Artifact 2.

Artifact 4: Research Analysis

(250 to 400 words)

Demonstrate the ability to *Think Systematically About Your Practice and Learn From Experience* (NBTS Core Proposition #4) by sharing and analyzing your Professional Growth Plan (PGP).

Write an analysis of a collaborative discussion you have had with a colleague. Ensure you include at least the following:

1. **Peer Feedback and Validation:** What specific feedback or insights did your colleague provide regarding the trends/patterns you identified in your student data (Artifact 2) or the feasibility of your Professional Learning Goal (Artifact 3)?
2. **Impact on Practice:** How did this professional dialogue either affirm, challenge, or refine your planned course of action? (For example: Did the colleague suggest a new resource, a different instructional strategy, or a more effective way to measure the student's need?)
3. **Next Steps in Community:** Based on this discussion, what is one concrete, actionable next step you will take that is directly informed by your

colleague's perspective? How does this process model the value of continuous professional learning within a community?

Part 2. Rubric

	Proficient	Basic	Developing
Artifact 1: Stakeholder Feedback	<p>Feedback is related to instructional practice, includes the stakeholder's position, and specifies the date feedback was provided.</p> <p>Evidence submitted is less than one page or a video less than five minutes.</p>	<p>Feedback is not related to instructional practice. The evidence does not adhere to the space limits. Date/stakeholder description not provided.</p>	<p>Feedback is not submitted.</p>
Artifact 2: Group Profile	<p>Group profile includes at least 4 varied data points that must include, but are not limited to, summative, formative, student, and parent data.</p>	<p>The group profile includes 4 data points, but they are not varied and do not reflect a complete profile for all students.</p>	<p>The group profile does not include 4 data points, and the data included is not varied.</p>
Artifact 3: Professional Growth Plan	<p>Shows a clear connection between the trends/patterns in stakeholder feedback, group profile, and the identified professional learning/student need.</p>	<p>Shows a partial connection between trends/patterns in stakeholder feedback, group profile, and the identified professional learning/student need.</p>	<p>Does not show a connection between stakeholder feedback, group profile, and the identified professional learning/student need.</p>

<p>Artifact 4: Collaborative Practice Analysis</p>	<p>Clearly analyzes and connects the professional dialogue (colleague feedback) to the identified student need and professional learning goal. The analysis describes how the feedback affirmed or refined the PGP and outlines a concrete, informed next step.</p>	<p>Partially analyzes the collaborative discussion, but the connection between the colleague's feedback and the PGP/data may be vague or superficial. The "next step" is included but lacks sufficient concreteness or direct linkage to the feedback received.</p>	<p>Fails to provide evidence of collaborative discussion, or the analysis does not link the colleague's comments to the specific student need or the Professional Learning Goal (PGP). No actionable next step is identified.</p>
---	---	---	---

Part 3 Reflection

(150-200 words)

Use the word count as a guide to write a personal reflection about your work on this micro-credential. For tips on writing a good reflection review the following resource:

[How Do I Write a Good Personal Reflection?](#)

Please do not include any information that will make you identifiable to your reviewers.

Reflect on the impact of the stakeholder feedback and group profile development on (1) how you reprioritized their goals based on professional and/or student need and (2) how the feedback and new learning has inspired 3-5 “next steps” for continued learning.

1. How will this reflective process drive your instruction?
2. What are your next steps? Use student examples and citations from *What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do* to support your claim(s). (See Resources section for *What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do*.)

Passing: The educator reflects on feedback from students, colleagues, or families and the implications of an analytical mind set on instruction. The