

Appendix A

Classroom Assessment Quality Rating Scales for the Teacher Evaluation Context

Source: Stiggins, R. J.; Chappuis, J., *Introduction to Student-Involved Assessment for Learning*, 6th Edition © 2012. Adapted by permission of Pearson Education, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ.

This adaptation is from *Defensible Teacher Evaluation: Student Growth Through Classroom Assessment* by Rick Stiggins. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

<i>Key/trait</i>	<i>Side-tracked</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Fast tracked</i>
Key 1, Clear Purposes: The assessment serves a clear and appropriate purpose.	The users fail to understand the summative purpose for the assessment being developed or selected.	No middle ground here. The users either understand the summative assessment context or do not.	It is clear to the users that the assessment is to reflect priority learning targets in order to gather evidence for use in making summary judgments for personnel evaluation purposes.
Key 2, Clear Targets: The assessment reflects a valued student learning target.	The learning target selected is not clearly articulated, has no apparent link to district achievement standards, is not of sufficiently high academic priority within the context of the teacher’s instructional responsibilities, or has not been approved by their supervisor.	The learning target can be clarified with work, links to district standards, and is of moderate importance. Negotiation with the supervisor will result in agreement regarding priority.	The target is clear, focused, and linked to a priority standard within the realm of the teacher’s instructional responsibility. The target is important—worth the assessment time devoted to it. For example, the target is clearly related to state and district content standards, or target descriptions and definitions reflect best thinking in the field.
Key 3, Sound Assessment Design: Learning target is translated into an assessment that yields accurate results.	Choosing the Best Methods. The method does not seem capable of doing the job. One finds oneself asking, “Why did they assess the target <i>that way?</i> ”—or there is no evidence that priority learning targets, student characteristics, accuracy, or efficiency played a part in determining the assessment method.	Choosing the Best Method. No middle ground here—the method is either capable of reflecting the priority achievement standard or not.	Choosing the Best Method. The method matches the learning target and context; the rationale for the choice mentions the target, student characteristics, and/or balancing ideal with efficiency.

<i>Key/trait</i>	<i>Side-tracked</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Fast tracked</i>
	<p>Writing Questions. Items, tasks, or exercises fail to reflect the target, are vague or confusing, and it is difficult to see how they might be fixed. Scoring criteria don't cover important elements of performance, are vague or confusing, are incorrect, miss the point, or are missing entirely.</p> <p>Sampling. There are not enough tasks centered on the learning target tested to draw the desired conclusion about student learning.</p> <p>Sources of Bias. There are no accommodations for diverse student learning characteristics—accommodations are likely to give an inaccurate picture of student attainment. It is easy to identify several potential sources of serious gender or cultural bias that can give rise to mismeasurement.</p>	<p>Writing Questions. Although some tasks or exercises have a few features that are vague or confusing, they reflect the target and are generally sound. Scoring criteria may be a little vague, but they are generally sound and just require some adjustments or rewording.</p> <p>Sampling. The assessment tasks reflect the stated learning target, but additional tasks would strengthen the sample.</p> <p>Sources of Bias. There are some accommodations for diverse student characteristics, and/or accommodations may at times affect final judgment of student attainment. The assessment might work well for one group of students but might need to be reworked for use with other groups.</p>	<p>Writing Questions. Tasks and exercises center clearly on the learning target, are clear, focused, and feasible—it is possible for students to complete them successfully. Performance criteria are clear, well defined, and cover the most important features of a performance.</p> <p>Sampling. There are neither too many nor too few tasks or exercises, but just enough to get a stable estimate of learning, and the tasks cover the learning target(s) well.</p> <p>Sources of Bias. Accommodations for diverse student characteristics are made and such accommodations do not affect final judgment of student learning. Cultural or gender differences will not interfere with students' ability to accurately demonstrate their learning.</p>

<i>Key/trait</i>	<i>Side-tracked</i>	<i>On track</i>	<i>Fast tracked</i>
<p>Key 4, Good Communication: Assessment results are managed well and communicated effectively.</p>	<p>Managing Information. Over the pre/post-test span of time, assessment information is not recorded or summarized in a manner to facilitate standards-based reporting.</p> <p>Communication. The author has not considered the communication context at all. Reporting mechanisms don't seem to fit the requirement of defending an inference about the impact of the teacher's activities on student growth. Factors influencing performance that are beyond the control of the teacher are not mentioned.</p>	<p>Managing Information. Over time, information is a mixture of clear and confusing evidence of impact; some standards-based interpretations are available.</p> <p>Communication. The communication seems to fit the context, but it needs improvement in terms of describing the teacher's impact. Factors beyond instruction that have influenced performance are mentioned but are not described in sufficient detail.</p>	<p>There are almost no potential sources of bias and mis-measurement; none are too serious.</p> <p>Managing Information. Over time, the teacher records results well, keeps them confidential, and combines them into an accurate summary of student status and growth using pre/post-test procedures.</p> <p>Communication. Communication is planned as part of the assessment. The author has anticipated the needs of the users. The evidence of impact is clear and understandable. It is easy to draw inferences about the teacher's impact from the evidence presented. Extraneous factors influencing student growth are addressed in complete terms.</p>