

## APPENDIX G – Assessment Rubric

### CAEP EVALUATION TOOL FOR EPP-CREATED ASSESSMENTS

#### USED IN ACCREDITATION

**For use with: assessments created by EPPs including observations, projects/ assignments and surveys**

**For use by: EPPs, CAEP assessment reviewers and Site Visitors**

EXCERPT from the CAEP ACCREDITATION HANDBOOK on “Optional Early Instruments Evaluation”

Early in the accreditation process, providers can elect to submit to CAEP the generic assessments, surveys, and scoring guides that they expect to use to demonstrate that they meet CAEP standards. . . The purpose of this review is to provide EPP’s with formative feedback on how to strengthen assessments, with the ultimate goal of generating better information on its candidates and continuously improving its programs. . . . This feature is a part of CAEP’s specialty/ license area review under Standard 1.

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL	CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL
<p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use or purpose are ambiguous or vague</li> <li>• Limited or no basis for reviewers to know what information is given to respondents</li> <li>• Instructions given to respondents are incomplete or misleading</li> <li>• The criterion for success is not provided or is not clear</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. ADMINISTRATION AND PURPOSE</b> (informs relevancy)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The point or points when the assessment is administered during the preparation program are explicit</li> <li>• The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions on progression are specified and appropriate</li> <li>• Evaluation categories or assessment tasks are tagged to CAEP, InTASC or state standards</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>2. INFORMING CANDIDATES</b> (informs fairness and reliability)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidates who are being assessed are given a description of the assessment’s purpose</li> <li>• Instructions provided to candidates about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous</li> <li>• The basis for judgment (criterion for success, or what is “good enough”) is made explicit for candidates</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose of assessment and use in candidate monitoring or decisions are consequential</li> <li>• Candidate progression is monitored and information used for mentoring</li> <li>• Candidates are informed how the instrument results are used in reaching conclusions about their status and/or progression</li> </ul>

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

- Category or task link with CAEP, InTASC or state standards is not explicit
- Category or task has only vague relationship with content of the standards being informed
- Category or task fails to reflect the degree of difficulty described in the standards
- Evaluation categories or tasks not described or ambiguous
- Many evaluation categories or tasks (more than 20% of the total score) require judgment of candidate proficiencies that are of limited importance in CAEP, InTASC or state standards
- Rating scales are used in lieu of rubrics; e.g., “level 1= significantly below expectation” . . . “level 4 = significantly above expectation”.
- Levels do not represent qualitative differences and provide limited or no feedback to candidates specific to their performance.
- Proficiency level attributes are vague or not defined, and may just repeat from the standard or component

## CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**3. CONTENT OF ASSESSMENT** (informs relevancy)

- Evaluation categories or tasks assess explicitly identified aspects of CAEP, InTASC or state standards
- Evaluation categories or tasks reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards
- Evaluation categories or tasks unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated
- When the standards being informed address higher level functioning, the evaluation categories or tasks require higher levels of intellectual behavior (e.g., create, evaluate, analyze, & apply). For example, when a standard specifies that candidates’ students “demonstrate” problem solving, then the category or task is specific to students’ application of knowledge to solve problems
- Most evaluation categories or tasks (at least those comprising 80% of the total score) require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards

**4. SCORING** (informs reliability and actionability)

- The basis for judging candidate work is well defined
- Each proficiency level is qualitatively defined by specific criteria aligned with the category (or indicator) or with the assigned task
- Proficiency level descriptions represent a developmental sequence from level to level (to provide raters with explicit guidelines for evaluating candidate performance and candidates with explicit feedback on their performance)
- Feedback provided to candidates is actionable
- Proficiency level attributes are defined in actionable, performance-based, or observable behavior terms. NOTE: If a less actionable term is used such as “engaged”, criteria are provided to define the use of the term in the context of the category or indicator

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

- Almost all evaluation categories or tasks (at least those comprising 95% of the total score) require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards
- Higher level actions from Bloom’s taxonomy are used such as “analysis” or “evaluation”

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL

**CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL**

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES  
ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL

- Plan to establish validity does not inform reviewers whether validity is being investigated or how
- The instrument was not piloted prior to administration
- Validity is determined through an internal review by only one or two stakeholders.
- Described steps do not meet accepted research standards for establishing validity.
- Plan to establish reliability does not inform reviewers whether reliability is being investigated or how.
- Described steps do not meet accepted research standards for reliability.
- No evidence, or limited evidence, is provided that scorers are trained and their inter-rater agreement is documented.

**5.a DATA VALIDITY**

- A description or plan is provided that details steps the EPP has taken or is taking to ensure the validity of the assessment and its use
- The plan details the types of validity that are under investigation or have been established (e.g., construct, content, concurrent, predictive, etc.) and how they were established
- The assessment was piloted prior to administration
- The EPP details its current process or plans for analyzing and interpreting results from the assessment
- The described steps generally meet accepted research standards for establishing the validity of data from an assessment

**5.b DATA RELIABILITY**

- A description or plan is provided that details the type of reliability that is being investigated or has been established (e.g., test-retest, parallel forms, inter-rater, internal consistency, etc.) and the steps the EPP took to ensure the reliability of the data from the assessment
- Training of scorers and checking on inter-rater agreement and reliability are documented
- The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing reliability

- A validity coefficient is reported
- types of validity investigated go beyond content validity and move toward predictive validity

- A reliability coefficient is reported
- Raters are initially, formally calibrated to master criteria and are periodically formally checked to maintain calibration at levels meeting accepted research standards

**WHEN THE INSTRUMENT IS A SURVEY:**

Use Sections 1 and 2, above, as worded and substitute 6.a and 6.b, below for sections 3, 4 and 5.

**6.a. SURVEY CONTENT**

- Individual item are ambiguous or include more than one subject
- Items are stated as opinions rather than as behaviors or practices
- Questions or topics are explicitly aligned with aspects of the EPP’s mission and also CAEP, InTASC or state standards
- Questions have a single subject; language is unambiguous
- Leading questions are avoided
- Items are stated in terms of behaviors or practices instead of opinions, whenever possible
- Surveys of dispositions make clear to candidates how the survey is related to effective teaching
- Scoring is anchored in performance or behavior demonstrably related to teaching practice
- Dispositions surveys make an explicit

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL	CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dispositions surveys provide no explanations of their purpose</li> <li>Scaled choices are numbers only, without qualitative description linked with the item under investigation</li> <li>Limited or no feedback provided to candidates</li> <li>No evidence that questions are piloted</li> </ul>	<p><b>6.b DATA QUALITY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An even number of scaled choices helps prevent neutral (center) responses</li> <li>Scaled choices are qualitatively defined using specific criteria aligned with key attributes identified in the item</li> <li>Feedback provided to the EPP is actionable</li> <li>EPP provides evidence that questions are piloted to determine that candidates interpret them as intended and modifications are made, if called for</li> <li>EPP provides evidence that candidate responses are compiled and tabulated accurately</li> <li>Interpretations of survey results are appropriate for the items and resulting data</li> <li>Results from successive administrations are compared (for evidence of reliability)</li> </ul>	<p>connection to effective teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPP provides evidence of survey construct validity derived from its own or accessed research studies</li> </ul>