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Researchers gather existing fair, valid and reliable measures for consideration.

Collaboratives use protocol to review researchers’ measures for feasibility, utility and gaps.

Prepare to fill gaps.

Provide recommendations to Technical Steering Committee.

Technical Steering Committee creates frameworks and design principles for collaboratives to use in reviewing and creating measures.

Committee reviews recommendations of collaboratives.

Piloting and peer review of measures.

Aug 2012-Aug 2013: Cohort I piloting & peer review

January 2013-Aug 2013: Cohort II piloting & peer review

Measures placed in online Education Effectiveness Resource Bank for voluntary use.
The objective is to identify an initial BANK of excellent student academic measures which can be used to determine, in part, the effectiveness of an educator.

Sample measures in each grade for each subject will establish the beginning of ongoing “build out” of the BANK.
### A visual of the Bank

#### Reading and Writing and Communicating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= need

---
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# Reading, Writing, and Communicating

## Grade Level Expectations at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Grade Level Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Twelfth Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Oral Expression and Listening | 1. Effective speaking in formal and informal settings requires appropriate use of methods and audience awareness  
2. Effective collaborative groups accomplish goals |
| 2. Reading for All Purposes | 1. Literary criticism of complex texts requires the use of analysis, interpretive, and evaluative strategies  
2. Interpreting and evaluating complex informational texts require the understanding of rhetoric, critical reading, and analysis skills |
| 3. Writing and Composition | 1. Style, detail, expressive language, and genre create a well-crafted statement directed at an intended audience and purpose  
2. Ideas, evidence, structure, and style create persuasive, academic, and technical texts for particular audiences and specific purposes  
3. Standard English conventions effectively communicate to targeted audiences and purposes |
| 4. Research and Reasoning | 1. Independent research designs articulate and defend information, conclusions, and solutions that address specific contexts and purposes  
2. Logical arguments distinguish facts from opinions; and evidence defines reasoned judgment |
How are we doing this? Who is involved?

• Researchers
• Content Collaborative Members
• Technical Steering Committee
• Center for Assessment (NCIEA)
  • Pilot Districts
  • Peer Reviewers
• Other states and districts
Researchers' Role

• Each content specific national researcher identifies and describes assessments that sufficiently measure student academic learning, and offers these assessments for consideration to the collaboratives.

• Assessments are of different types (multiple choice, performance, etc.) and may come from states, countries, districts, universities, vendors, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Susan McGreevy-Nichols</td>
<td>Senior Partner</td>
<td>The Griffin Center for Inspired Instruction</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama &amp; Theatre Arts</td>
<td>Dr. Mary Schuttler</td>
<td>Director of Theatre Education</td>
<td>University of Northern Colorado College of Performing &amp; Visual Arts</td>
<td>Greeley</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Dr. Mark Hudson</td>
<td>Music Department Chair</td>
<td>Colorado State University at Pueblo</td>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWC</td>
<td>Dr. Karin Hess</td>
<td>Senior Associate</td>
<td>Center for Assessment</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>VT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Beth Ratway</td>
<td>Senior Consultant</td>
<td>American Institutes for Research</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>Dr. Frank S. Philip</td>
<td>Independent Researcher &amp; Consultant</td>
<td>Audience Focus</td>
<td>Annapolis</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protocol for Identifying & Developing High Quality Assessments

Review Components

UTILITY  CONTENT  TECHNICAL  TRIAL

Guiding Principles

Use & Purpose

Fairness

Reliability

Validity
Content Collaboratives

**Cohort I:** Roughly 70 educators chosen from over 200 applicants who have expertise in their content area as well as a balance of expertise in:

- Colorado Academic Standards
- Assessment
- Working with Special Populations
- Working with English Language Learners

Review committees also strived to balance the collaboratives in terms of: grade level, geographical representation and rural, suburban and urban schools

**Cohort II:** Same selection criteria. Currently accepting applications
Content Collaboratives--
Cohorts

Cohort One
• February –May 2012
  • Dance
  • Drama/Theatre
  • Music
  • Reading/Writing/Comm
  • Social Studies
  • Visual Arts

Cohort Two
• June-December 2012
  • Comprehensive Health
  • Mathematics
  • Physical Education
  • Science
  • World Languages
Collaboratives' Role

Content review utilizing assessment review tool

• Is the content there?
• Is this reasonable?
• Is there enough to be fair?
• What are the considerations?
• Does this metric make sense to the content?
• Is it creditable?
# Protocol for Identifying & Developing High Quality Assessments

## Review Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Criteria Review Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Guiding Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Center for Assessment (NCIEA)

• Serves as a technical and implementation consultant to CDE.
• Facilitates Technical Steering Committee
• Draft design principles
• Conduct assessment training for CDE and the collaboratives
• Consults on pilot and peer review process
Technical Steering Committee

• Review assessment design principles.
• Review and refine the criteria tools and protocols to be used by the Colorado Content Collaboratives.
• Using the assessment design principals, determine whether assessments selected can be uses as a means of evaluating student growth.
• Review and provide input on the technical criteria to be considered when utilizing assessments to evaluate student growth and teacher effectiveness.
• Review and refine scoring guides, rubrics and assessments that may be developed by the Colorado Content Collaboratives.
• Develop field testing protocols.
Protocol for Identifying & Developing High Quality Assessments

Review Components

Fairness
Reliability
Validity

Guiding Principles & Review

Guiding Principles
What are we producing collaboratively by May, 2012?

Recommendations of student learning measures for piloting

Guiding principles & final protocol
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2012-2015 Work of Content Collaboratives

2012
- Researchers offer assessments for consideration to the Content Collaboratives
- Cohorts I & II of Content Collaboratives review/create/recommend assessments for piloting & peer review, based on technical criteria provided by the Technical Steering Committee
- Cohort I assessments begin piloting in Fall 2012 to determine its utility within educator effectiveness evaluations
- Guiding principles and criteria posted on the website for designing and vetting assessments to be used in ed. Effectiveness evaluations

2013
- Continue piloting of Cohort I assessments & begin peer review of assessments in terms of how the assessments function for the purposes of educator effectiveness evaluation
- Begin piloting of Cohort II assessments in January 2013, with peer review in summer 2013
- Begin populating Resource Bank with assessments in August 2013
- Content Collaboratives, using identified measures, begin working on instructional practice aligned to the Colorado Academic Standards

2014
- Continue to refine and build the Resource Bank
- Build out sophisticated instructional lessons that respond to gaps in student learning

2015
- Continue to refine and build the Resource Bank
- Continue to build statewide capacity
- Continue build-out of the bank in regards to instructional practices
Question for you

With these measures being used for educator effectiveness evaluations, what advice do you have in terms of legal precautions that we should be taking?
Questions/Comments for us?