# Quality Assessment Workshop

Stevie Chepko, Senior, VP for Accreditation

[Stevie.chepko@caepnet.org](mailto:Stevie.chepko@caepnet.org)

CAEP — Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

# Outline of Workshop

- Creating Quality Assessments – Stevie Chepko
  - Worksheets are in packet
  - Tips for developing rubrics to align with CAEP Standards
  - Importance of the conversations
- Using the InTASC Standards – Maria Salazar
  - Using the InTASC as a framework for developing assessments
  - Experience at Denver University – working with an urban school system
- Reviewing sample instruments – Stevie Chepko
- Establishing validity

CAEP
Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

# Assessments & Scoring Guides

- Tool faculty use to evaluate candidates and provide feedback on candidate performance
  - Address relevant and meaningful attributes of candidate knowledge, performance, and dispositions
  - Same or consistent categories of content appear in the assessment as are in standards
  - Congruent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skill requirements described in standards
  - Effort required, or degree of challenge of assessments is consistent with standards and reasonable for candidates

# Mapped/Linked to Standards/Elements

- Assessment should provide evidence directly linked/mapped/aligned with standards/elements
  - Should define characteristics or essential behaviors of performance
  - Should be intentional and purposeful
  - Start with the standard/element and identify key components
    - Look for key verbs
    - Look for content or action associated with the verbs
    - Identify the intent of the standard/element
    - May take multiple items to assess the complexity associated with standard/element

**CAEP** Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

# Alignment with Standards

- **CAEP Standard 1:** *The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.*

- **CAEP Component 1.1***:* Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s)[i] in the following categories: **the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.**

# Alignment with Standards (cont.)

- **Category InTASC – Learner and Learning**

  - **InTASC 3 (b)** - The teacher <u>develops</u> *learning*

  *experiences* that **<u>engage</u>** learners in **<u>collaborative and</u>**

  **<u>and self-directed learning</u>** and that **<u>extend learner</u>**

  **<u>interaction</u>** with **<u>ideas and people locally and globally</u>**.

CAEP
Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

# Alignment with Standards (cont.)

- Various parts would need to be disaggregated from the whole for assessment to be meaningful.
- Measurement of this one element would require more than one item
- Example of disaggregating from the whole for development of an item on an assessment –

**InTASC 3** -  The teacher <u>develops</u> *learning*

*experiences* that **<u>engage</u>** learners in **<u>collaborative</u>** and

and self-directed learning<u>.</u>

# Worksheet #1 – Developing Criteria

- – What behaviors or characteristic of a learning experience  would you look for as an acceptable level of performance of a candidate that demonstrates engaging students in a learning experience?  Now give me a list of 5 characteristics or attributes that are typical of a collaborative learning experience.

- **Remember – must be observable behaviors**

Worksheet #1 (blue handout) – create a list with your group or partner at your table –   (7 minutes)

# Possible Answers: Behaviors or Task Characteristics of Student Engagement

- Candidates provides specific instruction for completing the task
- Student accountability build into the task – product is created (choice of how the product is presented)
- Candidate facilitates the learning tasks (What teaching strategies are associated with student engagement?)
- Task is interactive
- Culture of explanation
- Reflecting, questioning, conjecturing, evaluating and making connections
- Student choice
- Questioning strategies
- Others

CAEP
Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

# Possible Assessment Items for collaboration-

- Teacher develops learning experiences that engage students in collaborative learning.
- Behaviors associated with collaborative learning
  - Thin-Pair-Share
  - Peer evaluation
  - Small group project based learning
  - Assign reporters for small groups
  - Require an outcome be produced for the small group assignment
  - Whip Around
  - Open-ended questions
  - Do Not Judge Responses
  - Collect Assessment Evidence from Every Student, Every Class

# Five criteria for Rubric Development

- Appropriate – aligned with some aspect of the standards
- Definable – clear, agreed-upon meaning
- Observable – quality of performance can be perceived
- Distinct from one another – each level defines distinct levels of candidate performance
- Complete – all criteria together describes the whole of the learning outcome

# Worksheet #3 – Defining the Acceptable Level

- Using the criteria you identified on Worksheet #1, create an item that would be used on an observational instrument to determine that candidates have demonstrated the criterion behavior.  For the item, define the acceptable or meets expectations level.  You can write a description or list bullets of criteria that must be demonstrated.
- Things to Think About –
  - What behaviors by a candidate or the learning experience designed by the candidate would demonstrate student engagement?  What criteria would you place in a scoring guide that would allow observers to assess key behaviors associated with student engagement in a learning experience?
- Worksheet #3 (blue handout)
- 7 minutes

# Describing Specific Performance Requirements

- What performance at each level looks like on a specific item
  - Most common approach is to first define the "acceptable" level
  - Criterion change from one level to another can be by –
    - Additive – simply adding more advanced behaviors at each level
    - Qualitative – describing how the quality of the behavior changes at each level
    - Can be both additive and qualitative
    - Lowest level should not simply be defined by the absence of a behavior

# Terms & Tips

- Evaluative terms such as excellent, good, fair, poor, etc. should not be used.
- All rubrics require some level of inference on the part of the observer
- Avoid counting or other formulaic approaches to descriptors
  - Traditional: Candidate uses three teaching strategies during the lesson.
  - Preferred: Candidates selection of teaching strategies aligns with the intent of the lesson, engages students through a series of interactive experiences, and allows student choice within the lesson on how mastery of learning objectives are demonstrated.

# Tips and Terms (cont.)

- Avoid narrow descriptions that allow for only one answer
- Use nouns in place of pronouns (i.e., the problem in place of it)
- Verbs should be simple and active
- Criteria are not traits, but "look fors"
  - Indicators or pointers toward the criteria
  - Define quality candidate output
- Focus on key indicators or constructs

# Defining the Acceptable Level -

| Tag to CAEP | Tag to InTASC | Tag to State | Item on Clinical Observation Instrument | Meeting Expectation (Acceptable) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1 | 3 (b) | | Candidate engages students in learning tasks requiring communication and collaboration. | Candidate uses a range of questions strategies to facilitate and guide students through the application of knowledge; implements problem-based learning tasks with a partner or a small groups; allows students to select ways of demonstrating content mastery; and requires students to articulate solutions. |

# Stepping Up One Level – Exceeding Expectations

| Tag to CAEP | Tag to InTASC | Tag to State | Item on Clinical Observation Instrument | Meeting Expectation (Acceptable) | Exceeding Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1 | 3 (b) | | Candidate engages students in learning tasks requiring communication and collaboration. | Candidate uses a **range of questions strategies** to **facilitate and guide students through the application of knowledge**; implements **problem-based learning tasks** with a **small groups**; allows students to select **ways of demonstrating content mastery**; and requires students to **articulate solutions**. | Candidate uses a range of questions strategies to facilitate and guide students through the application of knowledge; implements problem-based learning tasks with a **partner or a small groups**; allows students to select ways of demonstrating content mastery; and requires students to articulate solutions and **justify their answer verbally or in writing**. |

# Stepping Down – Developing (lowest level next slide)

| Tag to CAEP | Tag to InTASC | Tag to State | Item on Clinical Observation Instrument | Developing | Meeting Expectation (Acceptable) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1 | 3 (b) | | Candidate engages students in learning tasks requiring communication and collaboration. | Candidate uses a **limited range** of questioning strategies (1 or 2) to **guide** students through the application of knowledge; implements a problem-based learning task **with individuals that allows for one solution**; students solve problems but **do not articulate their answers.** | Candidate uses a **range of questions strategies to facilitate and guide students through the application of knowledge;** implements **problem-based learning task** with a **small groups**; allows students to select **ways of demonstrating content mastery**; and requires students to **articulate solutions.** |

CAEP
Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

# Sample – Stepping Down to Emerging

- Lowest level should not be defined by simply being the absences of a behavior or criteria.

  - Candidate does not use a range of questions behaviors; fails to facilitate and guide students; fails to use problem-based learning tasks; and students are not required to articulate their answers.

- Identify what the candidate is doing in place of the criterion behaviors.

# Defining Level 1 – What do you see?

| Tag to CAEP | Tag to InTASC | Tag to State | Item on Clinical Observation Instrument | Emerging | Developing |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1 | 3 (b) | | Candidate engages students in learning tasks requiring communication and collaboration. | Candidate **questions rely on simple yes or no answers** or candidate does **not allow time for students to answer the question**; learning experiences are **passive** with **candidate lecturing** to students; students **complete a work sheet in isolation**; and students **simply report their answers** on the worksheet. | Candidate uses a **limited range** of questioning strategies (1 or 2) to **guide** students through the application of knowledge on an isolated task; implements a problem-based learning task **with individuals that allows for one solution**; students **solve problems** but **do not articulate their answers**. |

# Things to Remember

- For all CAEP Standards, the requirement it to provide evidence that the standard is met
  - Components listed under standards are guidepost to meeting the standard
  - Programs are required to provide evidence that every component as been addressed.
  - Reviewers must have a preponderance of evidence that the standard is met.

# Checklists – not a rubric!

- List of specific characteristics with a place for marking whether that characteristics is present or absent
  - Clarifies what is required for the assignment
  - Useful when the learning outcomes are defined by the existence of an attribute (not quality)
  - Useful for candidates to make sure they have followed instruction
  - Make sure all required elements are present
  - Useful for peers to check a partner's submission for completeness of assigned components

**CAEP** Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

# Examples of checklist items

- Is dressed appropriately                        Yes        No
- Is ready to teach each day                   Yes        No
- Unit plan includes goals                     Yes        No

Usually submitted as evidence with portfolio

Includes 5 lesson plans                        Yes        No

Includes four reflections                       Yes        No

Includes professional development plan Yes        No

Checklist do not provide candidates or reviewers with any information on the quality of the submission.

# Rating Scale

- List of specific characteristics with a place for marking the degree to which each characteristics is displayed.

- Use either frequency or quality ratings

- Frequency
  - Always, frequently, sometimes, never
  - Consistently, often, sometimes, never
  - Always, usually, often, occasionally, almost never
  - Very frequently, frequently, occasionally, rarely, very rarely

- Count of how often a behavior occurs

# Rating Scale

- Quality Ratings
  - List judgments of quality (excellent, good, fair, poor)
  - Not helpful to learners
    - Pronounce a verdict without describing the evidence
    - Performance level without descriptions
    - Judgments are not descriptions; do not move learning forward
    - Fail to provide specific feedback to candidates or document specific evidence for meeting a standard

# Criteria for Evaluating Assessments with Scoring guides

- Assessments align with CAEP Standards and provide evidence for meeting the standards –
  - Same or consistent categories of content appear in the assessment item that are found in the standards
  - Assessments are congruent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skill requirements described in the standard
  - Level of respondent effort required, or the difficulty or degree of challenge is consistent with standards

# Criteria for Evaluating Assessments with Scoring Guides (cont.)

- Questions to be answered –
  - Is there a clear basis for judging the adequacy of candidate work?
    - A rubric or scoring guide is used
    - Evidence that the assessment measures what it is purports to measure (validity)
    - Results are consistent across raters and over time (reliability)
    - Criteria in rubric or scoring guide are related to CAEP standards

# Criteria for Scoring Guides or Rubrics

- Distinct levels of candidate performance must be defined
  - Descriptions of each level describe attributes related to actual performance
  - Levels represent a developmental sequence in which each successive level is qualitatively different from prior level
  - It is clear which level represents exit proficiency (ready to practice)
  - Levels are clearly distinguishable from one another
  - Levels are constructed in parallel with one another in terms of attributes and descriptors
  - Scoring guides provide specific feedback to candidates

CAEP
Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

# Assessment #1 – Observational Instrument

- For Assessment #1 (pink copy labeled Assessment #1)in your packet, please use the assessment rubric (white copy)to score the submission.
- Using the rubric
  - Review the instrument by evaluating if the items on the instrument meet the criteria at Level 3 (meets expectation) for each of the categories on the rubric
  - If the instrument does not meet the criteria, move to the next level down.  If it still does not meet the criteria, move to the next level down
  - If the item is beyond Level 3, move up one level.

CAEP
Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

# Assessment #2 - Reflection

- For Assessment #2 in your packet, please use the assessment rubric to score the submission.

- Discuss any strengths or weaknesses of the instrument

# Assessment 3 - Reflection

- For Assessment #3 in your packet, please use the assessment rubric to score the submission.

Compare Assessment 3 to Assessment 2 – what are the differences?

# Assessment 4 – How would you evaluate this assessment using the rubric?

- Please check for alignment of the items to the identified CAEP and InTASC standards?

- Are the items and the scoring guide criteria aligned with the identified CAEP and InTASC standards?

- Would the data form this instrument provide evidence for meeting the standard?

# Why rubrics?

- Students and evaluators need to know the criteria being used to make the evaluation.
- Students need specific feedback on why they were scored at a level
  - If the criteria is not given on the rubric, students have no way to know what they did right or wrong
  - Not knowing will make any learning random
- Reviewers need guidance on expectations at each level
  - Increases the reliability of the instrument

# Content-related evidence

- Evidence on the extent to which a students' responses to a given assessment instrument reflects students' knowledge of the content area

- Also concerned with the extent to which the assessment adequately samples the content domain

- Quality rubric helps establish content validity

# Measuring Constructs – Career and College Readiness

- Constructs are processes that are internal to an individual
  - i.e., reasoning process
  - Often displayed through results and explanations – isolated answers do not provide clear and convincing evidence of the nature of the individual's underlying reasoning
  - When the purpose of the assessment is to evaluate reasoning, both product (answer) and process (i.e., explanation) should be requested and examined.

# Construct validity (cont.)

- Helps to establish construct validity
  - If a scoring rubric is used to guide the evaluation of students' responses to a task, that rubric must contain criteria that addresses both product and process
  - Must ask –
    - Are the selected criteria appropriate indicators of the underlying construct?
    - Does the evidence support that the assessment instrument is completely and only measuring the intended construct?
  - Must identify the facets of the construct that may be displayed and that would provide convincing evidence of the students' underlying processes.

# Criterion-related evidence

- Supports the extent to which the results of an assessment correlate with a current or future event
- Extent to which students' performance on the given task may be generalized to other, more relevant activities (student teaching evaluation to in-service evaluation)
- Quality of the assessment is dependent on identifying the components of the current environment that will suggest successful performance in the professional environment.

# Questions to Examine Each Type of Validity

- Content
  - Do the evaluation criteria address an extraneous content?
  - Do the evaluation criteria of the rubric address all aspects of the intended content?
  - Is there any content addressed in the task that should be evaluated through the rubric, but is not?

# Questions to Examine Each Type of Validity (cont.)

- Construct validity
  - Are all the important facets of the intended construct evaluated through the rubric?
  - Is any of the evaluation criteria irrelevant to the construct of interest?

- Criterion validity
  - How do the scoring criteria reflect the competencies that would suggest success on related performance?
  - What are the important components of related performance that may be evaluated through the use of the assessment?
  - How do the criteria measure the important components of the future or related performance?
  - Are there any facets of future performance that are not reflected in the scoring criteria?

**CAEP** Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

# Assessment 4

- For Assessment # 4 in your packet, please answer the following questions?

- Are important constructs evaluated with this assessment?
- Are criteria for the assessment clearly defined?
- Are any key constructs not measured?
- How could the rubric be improved?

# Sources for Presentation

- **Brookhart, S. M**. (2013). *How to Create and Use Rubrics for Formative Assessment and Grading.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD

- **Burke, K.** (2011). *From Standards to Rubrics in Six Steps: Tools for Assessing Student Learning. (3rd ed.)* Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage

- **Stevens, D.D. & Levi, A.** (2013). *Introduction to Rubrics: An Assessment Tool to Save Grading Time, Convey Effective Feedback, and Promote Student Learning.* (2nd ed.) Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

- **Walvoord, B.E.** (2010). *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education.* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

**CAEP**
Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation