**TEMPLATE #4.1**

**Module 4.1: Establish a Customized Standard-Setting Approach**

|  |
| --- |
| **Design Phase** |
| **Subject/Grade Level:**  | **Assessment/Task:** |
| **Targeted Content Standards:** |
| **Skills Associated with Content Standards:** |
| **Performance Level Descriptors-Draft Set** |
| **Advanced** | **Proficient** | **Below Proficient** |
|  |  |  |
| **Student Samples** |
| **Sample Number** | **1** | **2** | **3** |
| **Anchored Score** |  |  |  |
| **Rationale** |  |  |  |
| **Panelist Demographics** |
| **Panelist Number** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Name/Subject Taught/Qualification**  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Grade Level** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Race/Ethnicity** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Additional Comments** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Build Phase-Meeting 1** |
| **Meeting Date:** |
| **Panelists/Qualifications:** |
| **Subject/Grade Level and Assessment/Task:** |
| **Performance Levels and Descriptors-Draft Set** |
| **Advanced** | **Proficient** | **Below Proficient** |
|  |  |  |
| **Calibration Training-Student Sample #1** |
| **Anchored Performance Level** |  |
| **Panelist** | **Panelist 1** | **Panelist 2** | **Panelist 3** |
| **Performance Level Assigned** |  |  |  |
| **Performance Level Rationale** |  |  |  |
| **Deviation** |  |  |  |
| **Identified Issues** |  |  |  |
| **Calibration Training-Student Sample #2** |
| **Anchored Performance Level** |  |
| **Panelist** | **Panelist 1** | **Panelist 2** | **Panelist 3** |
| **Performance Level Assigned** |  |  |  |
| **Performance Level Rationale** |  |  |  |
| **Deviation** |  |  |  |
| **Identified Issues** |  |  |  |
| **Calibration Training-Student Sample #3** |
| **Anchored Performance Level** |  |
| **Panelist** | **Panelist 1** | **Panelist 2** | **Panelist 3** |
| **Performance Level Assigned** |  |  |  |
| **Performance Level Rationale** |  |  |  |
| **Deviation** |  |  |  |
| **Identified Issues** |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Build Phase-Meeting 2** |
| **Meeting Date:** |
| **Panelist /Qualifications:** |
| **Subject/Grade Level of Assessment/Task:** |
| **Performance Levels and Descriptors-Draft Set (from Meeting 1)** |
| **Advanced** | **Proficient** | **Below Proficient** |
|  |  |  |
| **Panelist Anchor Set Assembly-Round 1 (Proficient Level)** |
| **Student Samples (#)** |  |
| **Panelist** | **Panelist 1** | **Panelist 2** | **Panelist 3** |
| **Student Sample Number** |  |  |  |
| **Performance Level Rationale** |  |  |  |
| **Deviation from Anchored Performance Level**  |  |  |  |
| **Identified Issues** |  |  |  |
|  **Panelist Anchor Set Assembly-Round 2 (Advanced Level)**  |
| **Student Samples (#)** |  |
| **Panelist** | **Panelist 1** | **Panelist 2** | **Panelist 3** |
| **Student Sample Number** |  |  |  |
| **Performance Level Rationale** |  |  |  |
| **Deviation from Anchored Performance Level** |  |  |  |
| **Identified Issues** |  |  |  |
| **Panelist Anchor Set Assembly-Round 3 (Below Proficient Level)** |
| **Student Samples (#)** |  |
| **Panelist** | **Panelist 1** | **Panelist 2**  | **Panelist 3** |
| **Student Sample Number** |  |  |  |
| **Performance Level Rationale** |  |  |  |
| **Deviation from Anchored Performance Level** |  |  |  |
| **Identified Issues** |  |  |  |
| **Performance Levels and Descriptors-Amended Set** |
| **Advanced** | **Proficient** | **Below Proficient** |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Build Phase-Meeting 3** |
| **Meeting Date:** |
| **Panelist /Qualifications:** |
| **Subject/Grade Level of Assessment/Task:** |
| **Performance Levels and Descriptors-Amended Set** |
| **Advanced** | **Proficient** | **Below Proficient** |
|  |  |  |
| **Review of Meetings 1-2 Scoring** |  |
| **Cold Student Sample 1** |
| **Panelist** | **Panelist 1** | **Panelist 2** | **Panelist 3** |
| **Performance Level Assigned** |  |  |  |
| **Performance Level Rationale** |  |  |  |
| **Consensus Performance Level**  |  |
| **Cold Student Sample 2** |
| **Panelist** | **Panelist 1** | **Panelist 2** | **Panelist 3** |
| **Performance Level Assigned** |  |  |  |
| **Performance Level Rationale** |  |  |  |
| **Consensus Performance Level** |  |
| **Cold Student Sample 3** |
| **Panelist** | **Panelist 1** | **Panelist 2** | **Panelist 3** |
| **Performance Level Assigned** |  |  |  |
| **Performance Level Rationale** |  |  |  |
| **Consensus Performance Level**  |  |
| **Performance Level Cut Scores** |
| **Advanced** | **Proficient** | **Below Proficient** |
|  |  |  |
| **Designated Assessment Scorers:** | **Projected Date of Completion:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Build Phase- Panelist Survey (Page 1 of 2)** |
| **Please circle rating that best pertains to your experiences as a panelist. Add comments in the “Comments” section if desired.** |
| **Statement** | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
| **1. I understood the purpose of these meetings.** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **2. These meetings provided relevant and adequate information.** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **3. I understood the process of making judgements based on the data provided.** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **4. I understood the process of creating performance level descriptors and cut scores.** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **For this section, indicate how useful each of the following elements were in terms of creating performance level descriptors and setting cut scores.** |
| **Element** | **Very Useful** | **Useful** | **Slightly Useful** | **Not Useful** |
| **1. Creation of performance level descriptors** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **2. Review and discussion of performance level descriptors**  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **3. Rationale-based discussions with other panelist** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **4. Reviewing student work samples** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **5. Reviewing score data and distributions** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **6. My experiences with students, in general** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **7. My experience with this particular content area** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **8. Input (e.g. rationales) of other panelists** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Build Phase- Panelist Survey (Page 2 of 2)** |
| **Indicate the amount of time given for each of the following elements of the workshops.** |
| **Element** | **Too Much Time** | **Enough Time** | **Too Little Time** |
| **1. Training on setting cut scores** | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **2. Discussions of performance level descriptor criteria** | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **3. Revising performance level descriptors** | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **4. Setting cut scores** | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **5. Reviewing student work samples** | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **Use the space below to make any additional comments and/or suggestions.** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Review Phase-Score Reporting** |
| **Performance Level Cut Scores (from Meeting 2)** |
| **Advanced** | **Proficient** | **Below Proficient** |
|  |  |  |
| **Score Reporting (insert number and percentage of students in each category):** |
| **Advanced** | **Proficient** | **Below Proficient** |
|  |  |  |
| **Revalidation** |
| **An amended cut score is/is not (circle one) necessary at this time because…** |
| **Amended Score Reporting-if necessary (insert the new cut scores and amended number and percentage of students in each category):** |
| **Advanced** | **Proficient** | **Below Proficient** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Quality Control Checklist**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Task ID | Task | Status | Comment |
| 4.1.1 | Proficiency criteria is aligned to standards |  | Are the requirements for a “Proficient” score dependent upon content mastery? |
| 4.1.2 | Proficiency criteria are based upon the knowledge, skills, and abilities measurable by the assessment |  | Does the assessment type allow for an accurate evaluation of content-specific skills? |
| 4.1.3 | Cut scores are established by qualified panelist |  | Are the panelists knowledgeable in the students and content area being assessed, and is consensus on the cut score levels established?  |
| 4.1.4 | Score distributions are reported, categorized, and reviewed |  | Are the reported scores classified by performance level and reviewed by panelists knowledgeable in the content area/grade level being assessed? |
| 4.1.5 | Cut scores are validated or amended based on score results |  | Is a rationale that validates the preliminary cut scores or that justifies the creation of a new set of cut scores established? |

**TEMPLATE #4.2**

**Module 4.2: Develop Procedures to Create Performance Level Descriptors**

**Framework**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Advanced** | **Proficient**  | **Below Proficient** |
|  |  |  |

**Content Summary Expectations**

**Quality Control Checklist**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Task ID | Task | Status | Comment |
| 4.2.1 | Performance levels are developmentally appropriate |  | Is the number of levels appropriate for the intended uses? |
| 4.2.2 | Performance levels are named appropriately and reflect the rigor of the content descriptors |  | Do the names of the levels represent the intended meanings of the levels? |
| 4.2.3 | Performance levels consider students’ perceived content knowledge given the exposure students are thought to have received |  | Do the PLDs reflect typical learning progressions for students? |
| 4.2.4 | Targeted content standards are appropriate for test-takers and are reflected in performance level descriptors |  | Are the emphasized standards appropriate for each grade/grade span? |
| 4.2.6 | Performance levels increase in rigor across grade levels and across time spans within grade levels |  | Is there an increased breadth and depth of knowledge articulated across grade levels? |
| 4.2.7 | Skills articulated in performance level descriptors are related to targeted content standards; proficiency criteria is dependent upon content/skill mastery |  | Do the PLDs describe the achievement continuum using content-based competencies for each assessed content area? |
| 4.2.8 | A clear relationship exists between score data and performance level descriptors; performance level descriptors are validated after score reporting |  | Are performance scores be linked to PLDs? |