

*Handout #7*

*Proposed Changes to Key  
Assessment Rubric*

## Rubric for Evaluating the Use of EPP-Developed Key Assessments, Scoring Guides, & Data (DRAFT 3-2021)

Criteria	Not Addressed	Partially Addressed	Fully Addressed
<b>Adequate Information about the Required Assessment Instrument</b>	The information provides inadequate information about the assessment and its place within the program.	The information provides a general overview of the assessment and its place within the program but some critical information is missing.	The information provides a full understanding about the required assessment and scoring criteria. The instrument itself ( <b>instructions</b> or a rich and full description) and scoring guide are submitted, along with information about when it is administered in the program, and the scoring process.
<b>Required, Program-Specific Assessment*</b>	The assessment is not required. The assessment is not designed to assess proficiencies specific to the program.	The required assessment is designed to be used for multiple teaching fields or areas of instructional support, with only generic references to program-specific standards.	The required assessment is designed to assess criteria specific to the teaching field or area of instructional support.
<b>Consistent Scoring Guides* Alignment to Standards and Indicators</b>	There is <del>little or</del> no explicit alignment among the scoring guide, assessment, and the standards and indicators in the Section III chart.	There is an explicit alignment to common professional studies standards but not program specific standards. Some degree of alignment among the scoring guide, assessment, and standard and indicators. The identified standards and indicators in the Section III chart are partially addressed.	There is an explicit <del>a-demonstrated and-accurate</del> alignment among the scoring guide, assessment, and standards and indicators in the Section III chart. The assessment criteria adequately address the identified standards and indicators in the Section III chart.
<b>Levels of Performance in Scoring Guides</b>	The scoring guide does not describe levels of performance. No minimum acceptable level of competence is identified.	The scoring guide does not clearly describe differences among levels of performance. A minimum acceptable level of competence is identified.	The scoring guide clearly describes observable difference(s) among levels of performance which help candidates and scorers understand expectations. A minimum acceptable level of performance is specified.
<b>Data Reporting Levels</b>	Data are reported only by overall scores or passing rates.	Data are reported by categories or sub-scores. Alignment to scoring guide and standards and indicators is unclear.	Data are reported by appropriate categories or sub-scores. Data are clearly and appropriately aligned to standards and indicators.

\*Cross-references to standards and indicators may be embedded in the assessment instrument, scoring guide, and data table submitted for program review.

## Rubric for Evaluating the Use of EPP-Developed Key Assessments, Scoring Guides, & Data (DRAFT 3-2021)

Criteria	Not Addressed	Partially Addressed	Fully Addressed
<b>Aggregated Data</b>	Data are presented by individuals and include names or other identifying information.	Data are presented by individuals without identifying information.	Data are summarized appropriately.
<b>Disaggregated Data</b>	Data are not disaggregated.	Data are disaggregated, at least in part, but not clearly presented.	Data are disaggregated by the semester or year. ** Data are disaggregated by teaching field when appropriate.
<b>Consistent “n”s</b>	The “n” is not consistent with information provided elsewhere and no explanation is provided.	The “n” is not consistent with information provided elsewhere and no clear explanation is provided.	The “n” is relatively consistent with information provided elsewhere or an explanation is provided.
<b>Data Presentation</b>	Data are not presented clearly.	Less than three years of data are presented without reasonable explanation. Data collection times are not clear. Tables are sometimes less than clear. The team had some difficulty understanding the data. Frequencies or ranges are not reported.	Three years of data are presented or a reasonable explanation is given. Times are given for when data was collected. Tables are reader-friendly, with legends and explanatory notes as necessary. Numerical values are consistently used and clearly defined. Frequencies or ranges are reported. For Class A Reading Specialist, should Key Assessment #3 focus on planning instruction or on planning professional development for reading instruction?
<b>Overall Quality of Data and Data Analysis</b>	The program report does not address overall quality of the data, how it has been analyzed, and what has been learned.	The program report partially explains overall quality of the data, how it has been analyzed, and what has been learned.	The program report discusses overall quality of the data, <b>describes</b> how it has been analyzed, <b>and</b> what has been learned, <b>and references specific data points.</b> <del>and what changes (if any) have been made as a result.</del> <del>The data analysis references specific significant data points.</del>
<b>Use of Data Analysis for Continuous Improvement</b>	The report does not explain how data analysis is used in program evaluation and improvement.	The report provides some examples of how data analysis is used for program evaluation and improvement but the effort is not consistent or systematic.	The report clearly describes how the program consistently and systematically uses data analysis in program evaluation and improvement. <b>Specific programmatic changes are identified.</b>

\*\*Data tables may combine up to five years of data to reach minimum “n” of ten.