



Improving our Assessments/Rubrics

*Faculty Workshop
April 14, 2017*

Presented by:
Chuck Bethel (SC)
Paula Lucas (Huntington)



Overview of the CEF

- The CEF (CAEP Evaluation Framework) applies to any EPP-created assessment: rubrics, surveys, etc.
- The CEF does not apply to any proprietary assessment: edTPA, licensure exams, Danielson framework, etc.
- CAEP no longer provides early instrument review; however, strongly recommends using the Framework with internal or external experts conducting the review.
- The CEF is one tool used by site visitors at the point of the off-site review and the Formative Feedback Report to evaluate the quality of EPP-created assessments and data trustworthiness (validity and reliability).

1. Administration and Purpose

<u>BELOW</u> Sufficient	CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL	<u>ABOVE</u> Sufficient
a. Use or purpose are ambiguous or vague.	a. The point or points when the assessment is administered during the preparation program are explicit.	
b. There is limited or no basis for reviewers to know what information is given to candidates.	b. The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions on progression are specified and appropriate.	a. The purpose of the assessments and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions are <u>consequential</u> . b. Candidate progression is monitored and information is used for <u>mentoring</u> .
c. Instructions given to candidates are incomplete or misleading.	c. Instructions provided to candidates (or respondents to surveys) about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous.	
d. The criterion for success is not provided or is not clear.	d. The basis for judgment (criterion for success, or what is "good enough") is made explicit for candidates (or respondents to surveys).	c. Candidates are informed <u>how the instrument results are used</u> in reaching conclusions about their <u>status</u> and/or <u>progression</u> .
	e. Evaluation categories or assessment tasks are aligned with CAEP, InTASC, national/professional <u>and</u> state standards.	



Sample #1a: Administration and purpose statement in need of improvement

- ▶ The observation rubric is introduced to candidates during Summer 1. It is used here for the instructors and the candidates to assess candidates' teaching in SSI. Not all of the standards on this rubric are appropriate in assessing the SSI teaching, so only certain standards are used. Candidates understand that the rubric assesses their teaching skills.



Sample #1b: Administration and purpose statement at the sufficient level

- The purpose of the rubric is to assess candidates developing skills in teaching, content knowledge as displayed during teaching, and dispositions as displayed in the learning environment. InTASC and NSTA standards guided the development of the rubric.
- The rubric is primarily used by the program faculty who teach academic courses and supervise candidates in their school placements twice each month during their ten month residency (September through June).
- Candidates are expected to achieve at the “basic” level of performance by mid-year (January) and at the “proficient” level by end-of-year (June).
- Observation evaluations from September through December, and again from January through May, are aggregated and used at the January and June Academic Milestone meetings when candidates’ standing in the program is evaluated and discussed.

Tips for Administration and Purpose

- Consider the following:
 - Provide an overview statement that outlines:
 - When, how often and by whom the assessment is administered.
 - Why conduct this assessment? What is captured in terms of candidates' Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions (KSD)?
 - What is the expected level of performance? At what points in the program?
 - How are the results of the assessment used?
 - What standards are used to guide content?
 - Include the candidate-facing instructions underlying the assignment/assessment.



WORKSHOP TIME

Worksheet #1: Administration and Purpose

- ▶ **Tasks:**
 - ▶ **Draft a context statement for the assessment instrument that you brought with you.**
 - ▶ **Answer the questions on Worksheet #1.**

2. Content of assessment

<u>BELOW</u> Sufficient	CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL	<u>ABOVE</u> Sufficient
a. Indicator alignment with CAEP, InTASC national/professional or state standards is incomplete, absent or only vaguely related to the content of the standards being evaluated	a. Indicators assess explicitly identified aspects of CAEP, InTASC, national/professional and state standards.	
b. Indicators fail to reflect the degree of difficulty described in the standard.	b. Indicators reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards.	
c. Indicators not described, are ambiguous, or include only headings.	c. Indicators unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated.	
d. Higher level functioning , as represented in the standards, is not apparent in the indicators.	d. When the standards being informed address higher level functioning, the indicators require higher levels of intellectual behavior (e.g., create evaluate, analyze & apply). *	
e. Many indicators (more than 20% of the total score) require judgment of candidate proficiencies that are of limited importance in CAEP, InTASC,	e. Most indicators (at least those comprising 80% of the total score) require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the	a. Almost all indicators (95% or more of the total score) require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the

CAEP Terminology for Frameworks

Criteria	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Proficient
Indicators	Proficiency-Level Descriptors (PLDs)		



Sample #2a: Content indicators in need of improvement

Indicators	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Proficient
Learning objectives			
Instructional strategies			
Assessment			

Sample #2b: Content indicators at the sufficient level

Planning cluster	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Proficient
1. Develops learning objectives which are appropriate for the subject and grade level that are connected to the standards. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7			
2. Plans appropriate and logically sequenced instructional strategies. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7			
3. Plans for differences in individual needs, abilities, and interests. CAEP 1.4: InTASC 1			



Tips for content indicators

- ▶ Consider the following:
 - ▶ Tag standards on the framework itself.
 - ▶ Address InTASC categories by InTASC standard, not elements.

- ▶ Beware of the following:
 - ▶ Double-dipped standards (InTASC 3 and 4).
 - ▶ Headings as place holders for indicators.



WORKSHOP TIME

Worksheet #2: Content Indicators

► Tasks:

- Select at least two indicators in your assessment that do not currently meet the sufficient level.
- Rewrite indicators following guidelines on the worksheet.
- Evaluate all other indicators and make a list of needed revisions.

3. Scoring

BELOW Sufficient	CAEP SUFFICIENT LEVEL	ABOVE Sufficient
a. Rating scales are used instead of rubrics. *	a. The basis for judging candidate performance is well-defined.	
b. Proficiency Level Descriptors (PLDs) do not align with indicators.	b. Each Proficiency Level Descriptor (PLD) is qualitatively defined by specific criteria aligned with indicators.	a. Higher level actions from Bloom's or other taxonomies are used in PLDs such as "analyzes" or "evaluates".
c. PLDs do not represent developmental progressions.	c. PLDs represent a developmental sequence from level to level (to provide raters with explicit guidelines for evaluating candidate performance and for providing candidates with explicit feedback on their performance).	
d. PLDs provide limited or no feedback to candidates specific to their performance.	d. Feedback provided to candidates is actionable –it is directly related to the preparation program and can be used for program improvement as well as for feedback to the candidate.	
e. Proficiency level descriptors are vague or not defined, and may just repeat the language from the standards.	e. Proficiency level attributes are defined in actionable, performance-based, or observable behavior terms. *	

Sample #3a: Scoring levels in need of improvement

Indicators	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Proficient
Develops learning objectives which are appropriate for the subject and grade level that are connected to the standards.	None or few of the learning objectives are appropriate to subject level or none or few of the learning objectives are connected to standards.	Most of the learning objectives are appropriate to subject level and most of the learning objectives are connected to standards.	All of the learning objectives are appropriate to subject level, are clearly connected to standards, and accommodate learning differences.
Plans appropriate and logically sequenced instructional strategies.	Planned instructional strategies are inappropriate or illogical.	Planned instructional strategies are appropriate and logical.	Planned instructional strategies are appropriate to subject and developmental levels and are clearly logical in sequence.

Sample #3b: Scoring levels at the sufficient level

Planning cluster	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Proficient
<p>1. Develops learning objectives which are appropriate for the subject and grade level, and are connected to the standards. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7</p>	<p>Objectives are inappropriate for the subject area/developmental level of learners by being either too difficult or too easy for students. Objectives are not stated in measurable terms, do not include criteria, and/or are not connected to the standards.</p>	<p>Objectives are appropriate for subject area/developmental level of learners, are connected to the standards, and provide appropriate challenges for students (tasks are neither too easy nor too difficult). Objectives are measurable.</p>	<p>Objectives are appropriate for the subject area/developmental level of learners, are connected to the standards., provide appropriate challenges, and incorporate multiple domains of learning. Objectives are measurable and each contains criteria for student mastery.</p>
<p>2. Plans appropriate and logically sequenced instructional strategies. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7</p>	<p>Instructional strategies are incongruent with objectives. Majority of strategies are developmentally inappropriate. Learning/practice tasks are arranged randomly in the lesson with steps between progressions either too large or too small to facilitate skill mastery.</p>	<p>Majority of instructional strategies are congruent with objectives, instructional strategies are developmentally appropriate, and lesson sequence is logical. Learning/practice tasks are arranged in sequential and progressive steps to facilitate learning.</p>	<p>Instructional strategies are congruent with objectives. All strategies are developmentally appropriate and address varied student needs. Learning/practice tasks allow students to begin and end at different levels based on individual readiness and include progressive opportunities for students to extend tasks to increase the challenge.</p>

Tips for writing appropriate scoring levels

- ▶ Consider the following:
 - ▶ Use an actual range of artifacts or an actual set of videos to define levels in performance terms.
 - ▶ Determine what constitutes moving down a level or up a level.
 - ▶ **Bold** critical aspects of performance.
- ▶ Beware of the following:
 - ▶ Words ending in -LY (consistently, frequently, etc.)
 - ▶ Wiggle words (sometimes, often, never, always)
 - ▶ Frequency counts (fewer than 2, 3, 4 or more)
 - ▶ Using the language of the standard at each performance level.
 - ▶ Misalignment of an indicator or the “spirit” of an indicator with the scoring levels.

WORKSHOP TIME

Worksheet #4: Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs)

► Tasks:

- Using your own assessment, circle language that is too subjective, may be hindering actionable feedback, is not performance-based, or is not a developmental sequence.
- Select one Framework line for improvement.
- Revise the scoring levels/PLDs.
- Make a general list of the types of revisions needed for your assessment.

Share Out and/or Questions and Answers

