

## Protocol for Defining Scoring Criteria

**PURPOSE:** To describe levels of mastery for each Performance Indicator

**TIME NEEDED:** two hours or more for the first Graduation Standard; approximately 1-2 hours for each of the remaining Graduation Standards. *(This work takes time, but remember - once you complete it, you have the components ready-made for every rubric that you will need to build in the future.)*

**ROLES:** Facilitator, timekeeper, note-taker

### **MATERIALS:**

- Proficiency-Based Learning Simplified graphic
- Content-area graduation standards and performance indicators for the content area
- Webb's Depth of Knowledge, Bloom's Taxonomy, or Marzano's Taxonomy
- Design Criteria Chart for Scoring Criteria
- Chart paper and markers or projector and laptop(s)

### **PROCESS:**

1. Unpack the Performance Indicator. Describe what students will need to know (content) and be able to do (skills) at the meets level.
2. Describe Mastery.
  - a. Determine the level of cognitive demand and write a clear, student-friendly description of "meets" using verbs that match the level of complexity identified in the performance indicator.
  - b. Criteria should be about the learning to be demonstrated and the quality of the thinking, not the requirements of an assignment or correctness of a product (Brookhart, 2014).
  - c. Criteria should be descriptive, clear, and matched to the performance indicator (Brookhart, 2014).
  - d. Criteria should distinguish between levels, describe what students *can do*, and provide students with feedback about their learning (Brookhart, 2014).
3. Describe Levels of Mastery. Continue working to either side of "meets" decreasing the level of complexity for descriptors below "meets" and increasing the level of complexity for descriptors above.
4. Tune the scoring Criteria using the Design Chart for Scoring Criteria.
5. Repeat this process for each Performance Indicator.
6. Debrief the process. What worked well? What could we improve on for next time? What resources could we use to support our process next time? (5 min.)

*The next step in the process: align or develop assessments to performance indicators.*

**Sample:**

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1 Does not meet</b>	<b>2 Partially Meets</b>	<b>3 Meets</b>	<b>4 Exceeds</b>
Use the periodic table as a model to predict the relative properties of elements based on the patterns of electrons in the outermost energy level of atoms. (HSPS1-1)	Student is able to <b>locate</b> an element on the periodic table.	Student is able to <b>locate</b> an element on the periodic table, <b>identify</b> its basic properties, and <b>determine</b> the number of electrons in the outermost energy level.	Student is able to <b>use</b> the periodic table to accurately <b>predict</b> relative physical and chemical properties of elements. Student is able to <b>describe</b> the relationship between the pattern of electrons and other characteristics of that element.	Student is able to <b>analyze</b> observed relative physical and chemical properties of elements and <b>classify</b> them appropriately in the periodic table.

**Notes on Writing Clear Descriptions of Levels of Mastery:**

1. Be careful to use well-chosen verbs to describe what students do at the different levels. In the example above, you can see that at the “Meets” level, the student is able to **predict** and **describe** properties and relationships, which matches the level of complexity in the indicator (predicts). A student “Partially meets” if they can **locate** elements and **identify** properties; locate and identify fall at a lower level of complexity than predict on the taxonomy chart. At the “Exceeds” level, the student is able to **analyze** and **classify**, verbs that demonstrate increased complexity and deeper understanding.
2. Try to avoid descriptors that hinge on frequency, like “the student can figure out what words mean in texts “never,” “rarely,” “frequently” or “reliably.” In some instances – for example, when scoring a student’s ability to locate and fix punctuation errors – these are appropriate, but in many cases using them will prevent you from thinking more deeply about the level of cognition that a student will demonstrate at each level.