**Major Requirements:**

1. **Unit of Instruction Project: 600 points total**
   * **Selected Response Assessment - 200 points**
   * **Extended Written Response Assessment - 200 points**
   * **Performance Task Assessment - 200 points**

**Rubric to be used for: Unit of Instruction Project (i.e. SRA, EWRA, and PTA)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Distinguished** | **Proficient** | **Progressing** |
| **Clear Purpose**  25 | * The intended users and uses are identified. * It is clear that this assessment can accomplish its intended purpose. * When appropriate, students are able to use results to reflect on their learning and to identify strengths and areas for improvement.   Comments: | * The intended users and uses can be inferred. * This assessment can partially accomplish its intended purpose. * When appropriate, an attempt has been made to meet students’ information needs, but they may not be able to use results to identify their strengths and areas for improvements.   Comments: | * The intended users and uses are not identified and cannot be accurately inferred. * It is clear that this assessment cannot accomplish its intended purpose. * Students’ information needs are not taken into account, even though students could benefit from understanding and using the assessment information.   Comments: |
| **Clear Targets**  **25** | * Learning targets measured by the assessment are stated. * The learning targets are clear. * The match between stated learning targets and what is on the assessment is clear. * Learning targets are clearly connected to the state content standards.   Comments: | * Learning targets measured by the assessment are stated or can be inferred easily from the assessment. * Learning targets may be somewhat unclear. * There is a partial match between stated learning targets and what is on the assessment. * Learning targets are partially or loosely connected to the state content standards.   Comments: | * Learning targets measured by the assessment are not stated and cannot be accurately inferred. * Learning targets are stated, but vague or unclear. * There is no apparent match between stated learning targets and what is on the assessment. * There is not apparent connection between learning targets and the state content standards.   Comments: |
| **Sound Design**  **100** | * The method chosen is capable of accurately reflecting the learning target(s) to be assessed. * The learning targets tested represent what was taught (in the case of diagnostic assessment, they represent what is intended to be taught). * The relative importance of each learning target on the assessment matches the relative importance given to it during instruction. * Selected response and short answer (fill-in) items adhere to more than 10 standards of quality (Popham, Stiggins, Wahlstrom). * Extended written response items adhere to standards of quality (Popham, Stiggins, Wahlstrom). * Extended written response scoring procedures adhere to guidelines for quality (Popham, Stiggins, Wahlstrom). * Performance assessment tasks adhere to standards of quality (Popham, Stiggins, etc.). * Performance assessment scoring guides/rubrics adhere to guidelines for quality (Popham, Stiggins, etc.). * There is nothing in the assessment itself or in the conditions under which it is administered that could lead to inaccurate estimates of student learning. * Instructions are present, clear, and concise.   Comments: | * The method chosen to assess the learning targets may have been better if assessed using another method. * The learning targets partially represent what was taught (In the case of diagnostic assessment, they partially represent what is intended to be taught). * The relative importance of each learning target on the assessment partially matches the relative importance to it during instruction * Selected response and short answer (fill-in) items adhere to 5 – 10 standards of quality (Popham, Stiggins, Wahlstrom). * Extended written response items partially adhere to standards of quality (Popham, Stiggins, Wahlstrom). * Extended written response scoring procedures partially adhere to guidelines for quality (Popham, Stiggins, Wahlstrom). * Performance assessment tasks partially adhere to standards of quality (Popham, Stiggins, etc.). * Performance assessment scoring guides/rubrics partially adhere to guidelines for quality (Popham, Stiggins, etc.). * There are a few tings in the assessment itself or in the conditions under which it is administered that could lead to inaccurate estimates of student learning. * Instructions are present, but not as clear or concise as they could be.   Comments: | * The method used is not capable of accurately reflecting the learning targets in question. * The learning targets tested do not represent what is taught. (in the case of diagnostic assessment, they do not represent what is intended to be taught.) * The relative importance of each learning target on the assessment does not match the relative importance given to it during instruction. * Selected response and short answer (fill-in) items adhere to fewer than 5 standards of quality (Popham, Stiggins, Wahlstrom). * Extended written response items do not adhere to standards of quality (Popham, Stiggins, Wahlstrom). * Extended written response scoring procedures do not adhere to guidelines for quality (Popham, Stiggins, Wahlstrom). * Performance assessment tasks do not adhere to standards of quality (Popham, Stiggins, etc.). * Performance assessment scoring guides/rubrics do not adhere to guidelines for quality (Popham, Stiggins, etc.). * There are many things in the assessment itself or in the conditions under which it is administered that could lead to inaccurate estimates of student learning. * Instructions are not present, or are difficult to follow.   Comments: |
| **Communication**  **25** | * There is a mechanism in place for students to track their own progress on learning targets and what they need to do to improve.   Comments: | * There is a mechanism in place for students to track their own progress on learning targets, but they do not know what to do to improve.   Comments: | * There is not a mechanism in place for students to track their own progress on learning targets and what they need to do to improve.   Comments: |
| **Writing Style**  **25** | * Easy to read with few or no grammatical or typographical errors.   Comments: | * Minimal grammatical or typographical errors that are not significant enough to interfere with ease of reading.   Comments: | * Number of grammatical or typographical errors interferes with ease of reading.   Comments: |