Internal (FHSU EPP-Created) Assessment Review Form

Title of Proposed Assessment:

Faculty members involved in this assessment review:

1. **HOW THE ASSESSMENT IS TO BE USED**
2. What is the purpose of the assessment? How is this assessment expected to inform the EPP’s understanding of candidate development?
3. At what point in candidates’ program is the EPP assessment administered? (e.g. first year, last year, entry course, exit course, etc.)?
4. How does this assessment fit into the EPP’s broader developmental sequence for candidates?

*NOTE: This information would be part of the documentation that the assessments are relevant.*

1. How is this assessment aligned with CAEP standards, and other related standards (InTASC, etc.).
2. **HOW THE ASSESSMENT WAS CONSTRUCTED -- *note: please refer to CAEP standards to answer the following questions. – Please check the appropriate box.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Yes | No\* |
| 1. The assessment/rubric is aligned with CAEP Standards, with specific points of reference noted.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. This assessment/rubric/both are congruent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skill requirements described in the CAEP Standards (e.g., create, evaluate, analyze, & apply). For example, when a standard requires candidates’ students to “demonstrate” problem solving, then the assessment item is specific to students’ application of knowledge to solve problems.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. The level of respondent (candidate) effort required, or the difficulty or degree of challenge of the assessment, is consistent with CAEP Standards and reasonable for candidates who are making appropriate progress toward being ready to teach or to take on other professional educator responsibilities.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. Instructions to candidates for completing the instrument have been reviewed for clarity. Instructions provided to candidates about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. A current version of the assessment is electronically available in the quality assurance data system (Tk20 by Watermark) to all faculty responsible for application of this assessment. This ensures that all faculty and candidates are using the most recent, updated version.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. The basis for judgment (i.e., what is “good enough” or “passing”) is made explicit within the assessment for respondents when appropriate.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. The basis for how this assessment score will be incorporated into the candidate’s grade has been commonly established and communicated to faculty and candidates when appropriate.
 |[ ] [ ]

 **Note: *\*If no is selected for any of the items above, please revise the assessment/rubric to meet this requirement and resubmit OR provide a brief rationale why no is appropriate.***

1. **HOW THE ASSESSMENT IS SCORED – Rubric**

| Rubric criteria | Yes | No\* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. There are at least three performance levels represented on rubric forms (not including a “no data” or “unobserved” category). The EPP recommendation is four levels.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. A “no data” or “unobserved” category is included when appropriate.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. For this assessment/rubric, the items are aligned with the identified, overarching constructs which were determined in advance of the assessment/rubric development.

Note: It is appropriate for the construct to be measured in other assessments as well. As an example, an item on the assessment reads, “The candidate implements interdisciplinary approaches and multiple perspectives for teaching content.” This rubric item is used as a measure of the previously determined overarching construct **Candidate Content Knowledge**; even though there are likely other assessments in the EPP assessment system that are collectively considered to measure **Candidate Content Knowledge**. |[ ] [ ]
| 1. Levels are constructed in parallel with one another in terms of the attributes and descriptors used.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. For each level of performance, attributes are described that are related to actual performance; attributes are not simply mechanical counts of particular attributes. (i.e., no frequency counts, no use of qualifiers like “sometimes” or “most of the time”)
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. Performance levels are qualitatively defined using specific criteria aligned with key attributes identified in the item, defining performance at each level and providing candidates with descriptive, actionable feedback on their performance. Performance is described in observable behavior terms.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. If a less actionable term is used in the performance description (e.g., such as “engaged” or “appropriate,” as in “the candidate’s selected intervention is appropriate”), criteria are provided to define the use of the term in the context of the item.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. There are an appropriate number of performance descriptors included in any given level to determine an accurate evaluation of candidate performance.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. Scoring directions include language to the evaluator for how to score rubric indicators with multiple performance attributes.

For example, a rubric may include three performance attributes to define a level of performance. The candidate may be proficient on two of the three. How is the candidate rated overall? This should be clearly explained or resolved by detailed indicators’ descriptions.  |[ ] [ ]
| 1. Headings/instructions clearly describe which levels are acceptable and which are not acceptable.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. It is clear which level represents exit proficiency (ready to practice) when appropriate.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. The performance levels are described in language that is readily understandable and can be easily communicated to broad audiences including educators, stakeholders, and school partners (i.e., not a lot of jargon or “eduspeak” or ill-defined constructs).
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. Any special terms used are clearly defined in the assessment or in an attached glossary.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. Are multiple raters/scorers utilized for this assessment/rubric? (i.e., is more than one person using this rubric to evaluate candidate performance in a given semester). *(Please be aware that the next phase in this work will include developing training modules/materials for rater scoring).*
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. The candidate’s final score on the assessment is clearly explained and is fair and reasonable. If weighted scoring is used, weights are clearly explained and justified.
 |[ ] [ ]
| 1. There is a procedure in place for providing the score to the candidate.
 |[ ] [ ]

**Note: *\*If no is selected for any of the items above, please revise the assessment/rubric to meet this requirement and resubmit OR provide a brief rationale why no is appropriate.***