

**Case Study Rubric**  
**NAGC – CEC Teacher Preparation Standards in Gifted Education (2013)**

Select a student who has gifts and talents and is also identified as exceptional and/or at-risk  
(e.g., twice exceptional, gifted student from low income background, etc.)

<b>The beginning gifted education professional ...</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Competent</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<p><b>Assessment for Identification and Services</b></p> <p>Selects and uses quantitative (formal) assessments that minimize bias to identify students for gifted programs and services (NAGC/CEC Standard #4, 4.1)</p>	<p>The purpose of the assessment is described; however, the assessment may not be appropriate for gifted students because of possible ceiling effects. Limitations of the assessment are not described. The summary of the educational implications for the student with gifts and talents is not related to the assessment’s purpose or the student.</p>	<p>The purpose of the assessment, its technical qualities, scores, and range of student performance as outlined in the technical manual or a review of the tests are summarized. The educational implications for the student with gifts and talents are based on the quantitative data and interpretation of the test results.</p>	<p>The purpose of the assessment, its technical qualities, scores, and range of student performance as outlined in the technical manual or a review of the tests are summarized. The educational implications for the student with gifts and talents are based on the quantitative data and interpretation of the test results. Equity and bias issues that might influence the student’s performance are included within the summary as suggested by the validity studies in the technical manual and the target student’s characteristics. *</p>
<p><b>Assessment for Identification and Services</b></p> <p>Selects and uses qualitative (informal) assessments that minimize bias across settings to identify students for gifted programs and services and identify the ways of promoting the well-</p>	<p>Characteristic checklists are collected from parents and teachers but are summarized quantitatively—not qualitatively. Anecdotal summaries of observations are made during the instructional process but are not descriptive of the interactions between the candidate</p>	<p>Characteristic checklists are collected from parents and teachers that provide qualitative information about the student’s strengths and needs. Anecdotal summaries collected across two weeks of observations in one classroom are made during the instructional process and describe objectively the</p>	<p>Characteristic checklists are collected from parents and teachers in multiple settings that provide qualitative information about the student’s strengths and needs. Anecdotal summaries collected across two weeks of observations across settings are made during the instructional process and describe objectively the interactions between</p>

<p>being of the student (NAGC/CEC Standard #4, 4.1; Standard ;7, 7.3)</p>	<p>and the student. Summary is unclear regarding student characteristics and services.</p>	<p>interactions between the candidate and the student and the student's responses to the interactions. A summary of student characteristics and recommendations for services relate to the observations and to the anecdotal information derived from the checklists.</p>	<p>the candidate and the student and the student's responses to the interactions. Equity and bias issues that might influence the student's performance are included within the summary. A summary of student characteristics and recommendations for services relate to observations and progress records.</p>
<p><b>Collaboration</b></p> <p>Collaborates with colleagues and families in using qualitative (informal) assessments to make decisions and to promote student well-being across settings and experiences (NAGC/CEC Standard #4, 4.3; Standard #7, 7.1, 7.3)</p>	<p>Interviews with teachers are completed describing the student's achievements but not social interactions and emotional strengths/needs. Summary relates to the interviews but does not describe similarities and differences among the perspectives. Collaboration is apparent among teachers in supporting the student's academic needs within the school only.</p>	<p>Interviews with the student, teachers, and parents or guardians are completed and relate to information that describes the student's achievements, social interactions, emotional strengths/needs or interests. Summary describes similarities and differences among the perspectives. Collaboration is apparent in supporting the student's academic needs in both school and outside-of-school activities.</p>	<p>Interviews with the student, teachers, and parents or guardians are completed and relate to information that describes the student's achievements, social interactions, emotional strengths/weaknesses and interests. Summary describes similarities and differences among the perspectives and educational implications and future opportunities for collaboration. Collaboration is apparent in supporting the student's academic and social and emotional needs in both school and outside-of-school academic activities.</p>
<p><b>Curricular Content Knowledge</b></p> <p>Use assessments and their reflections to select, adapt, and create materials to differentiate instructional strategies to</p>	<p>A random set of lesson plans show standards, objectives, materials, procedures, and assessments that clearly differentiate for the student in academic areas. Effectiveness and reflections are included</p>	<p>A sequence of lesson plans show standards, objectives, materials, procedures, and assessments that clearly differentiate for the student in academic, affective, and social areas and address some of the assessment data.</p>	<p>A sequence of six lesson plans show standards, objectives, materials, procedures, and assessments that clearly differentiate for the student in academic, affective and social areas and address the qualitative and quantitative</p>

challenge effectively individuals with gifts and talents (NAGC/CEC Standards #3, 3.3)	for each lesson.	Effectiveness and reflections are included for each lesson.	assessment data. Effectiveness and reflections are included for each lesson.
<b>Development of the Individual Plan</b>  Uses assessment results to develop goals and objectives, taking environment and diversity factors into account and involving the student, parents, and other support personnel in the planning (NAGC/CEC Standard #4, 4.4, 4.5; Standard #7, 7.1, 7.3)	A description of a program for the student that includes short- and long-term goals addresses the cognitive area only with specific activities that involve teachers and the student. The plan relates to the academic and cognitive assessment data. The plan is shared with the student only after it is developed.	A description of a program for the student addresses short- and long-term goals in the cognitive, affective, and social areas; activities involve teachers, parents, and the student. The plan relates to quantitative and qualitative assessment data and was developed after input from the student and parents.	A description of a program for the student addresses short- and long-term goals in cognitive, affective, aesthetic, social and linguistic areas with specific activities in multiple environments that involve teachers, parents, the student, and other supportive personnel within the school and the community as needed. The plan relates to quantitative and qualitative assessment data and was developed after input from the student, parents, and other support personnel.

\* Student characteristics include cognitive, affective, aesthetic, social, and linguistic differences as well as differences of culture, language, sexuality, socio-economic status, gender, disability, and ethnicity.

Note that all of the characteristics for this case study may or may not be used depending on course requirements and the context for data collection. This particular case study was used with candidates who were interning in classrooms with gifted education mentor teachers. They were collected data on a gifted student who might be viewed or was labeled at-risk for performing at potential based on different characteristics such as poverty, ethnicity, race, disability, linguistic difference, behavior challenge, gender. They collected both qualitative and quantitative data and shared the results with their mentor teacher, parents, and/or the student. Quantitative data consisted of assessments that were available in the school setting such as identification instruments, state-required assessments, grades, reading and math inventories, etc.; qualitative data included interviews and reflections made regarding the targeted student's responses to a series of differentiated lessons—a more dynamic assessment. Your candidates may be in different settings such as clinics, their own classrooms, or a variety of settings and may not have opportunities to collect information derived from implemented lessons over a two-week period. Moreover, the program may address some of these standards in other assessments.