

Nebraska Department of Education

The purpose of this review document is to assure that the assessment processes and procedures in local districts are of sufficient quality.

**DISTRICT ASSESSMENT PORTFOLIO RUBRIC
2007--2008**

6 Quality Criteria	Not Met	Needs Improvement	Met with Comment	Met
<p>Criterion 1</p> <p>The assessments match the standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No qualifications of the independent reviewers are provided. • No evidence of an independent review for match to standards is provided (reviewers did not write the assessments). • No process for matching assessments to standards is described. • No results of the matching process are provided. • No sufficiency process is described. • No sufficiency results are provided (sufficiency required for both number of items/performances and levels of difficulty. Minimum 12 items or equivalent on reading standards 4.1.3, 8.1.1 and 12.1.1 and math standards 4.2.1, 8.2.2, and 12.2.1) <p><i>*Districts with local standards must designate a reading and a math standard.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No consistency between criterion #1 and other criteria is found. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of the independent reviewers are unclear or incomplete. • Evidence of an independent review for match to standards unclear or incomplete (reviewers did not write the assessments). • The process for matching assessments to standards is unclear or incomplete. • Results of the matching process are unclear or incomplete. • Sufficiency process is unclear or incomplete. • Sufficiency results are unclear or incomplete (sufficiency required for both number of items/performances and levels of difficulty. Minimum 12 items or equivalent on reading standard 4.1.3, 8.1.1 and 12.1.1 and math standards 4.2.1, 8.2.2 and 12.2.1) <p><i>*Districts with local standards must designate a reading and a math standard.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency between criterion #1 and other criteria is unclear or incomplete. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criterion has been fully met, but reviewer believes additional feedback would be helpful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of the independent reviewers are clear and complete. • Evidence of an independent review for match to standards is clear and complete (reviewers did not write the assessments). • The process for matching assessments to standards is clear and complete. • Results of the matching process are clear and complete. • Sufficiency process is clear and complete. • Sufficiency results are clear and complete (sufficiency required for both number of items/performances and levels of difficulty. Minimum 12 items or equivalent on reading standards 4.1.3, 8.1.1 and 12.1.1 and math standards 4.2.1, 8.2.2, and 12.2.1) <p><i>*Districts with local standards must designate a reading and a math standard.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency between Criterion #1 and other criteria is clear.

DISTRICT ASSESSMENT PORTFOLIO RUBRIC 2007–2008

6 Quality Criteria	Not Met	Needs Improvement	Met with Comment	Met
<p>Criterion 2</p> <p>Students have an opportunity to learn.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No qualifications of the opportunity to learn reviewers are provided. • No process for opportunity to learn (both curriculum alignment and timing of assessment/ instruction) is described. • No results of the process for alignment of standards with local curriculum are provided. • No dates are provided when standards are taught. • No dates are provided when standards are assessed (80% of instruction should take place prior to assessment.) • No opportunity to learn information is provided for any standards. • No consistency between Criterion #2 and other criteria is found. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of the opportunity-to-learn reviewers are unclear or incomplete. • The process for opportunity to learn is unclear or incomplete (both curriculum alignment and timing of assessment / instruction is described.) • The results of the process for alignment of standards with local curriculum are unclear or incomplete. • Dates are provided when standards are taught but they are unclear or incomplete. • Dates are provided when standards are assessed but are unclear or incomplete • 80% of instruction should take place prior to assessment. • Opportunity to learn information provided for only some standards. • Consistency between Criterion #2 and other criteria is unclear or incomplete. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criterion has been fully met, but reviewer believes additional feedback would be helpful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of the opportunity to learn reviewers are clear and complete. • The process for opportunity to learn is clear and complete (both curriculum alignment and timing of assessment/ instruction) is described. • The results of the process for alignment of standards with local curriculum are clear and complete. • Dates are provided when standards are taught and they are clear and complete. • Dates are provided when standards are assessed and are clear and complete • 80% of instruction should take place prior to assessment. • Opportunity to learn information provided for all standards. • Consistency between Criterion #2 and other criteria is clear and complete.

DISTRICT ASSESSMENT PORTFOLIO RUBRIC 2007–2008

6 Quality Assessment Criteria	Not Met	Needs Improvement	Met with Comment	Met
<p>Criterion 3</p> <p>The assessments are free of bias and sensitive situations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No qualifications of the bias reviewers are provided. • No bias orientation is described. • No process for bias review of assessment items is described. • No results of a bias review are provided. • No bias information provided for any standards (used for reporting). • No consistency between Criterion #3 and other criteria is found. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of the bias reviewers are unclear or incomplete. • The description of the bias orientation is unclear or incomplete. • The process for bias review of assessment items is unclear or incomplete. • Results of a bias review are unclear or incomplete. • Bias information provided only for some standards (used for reporting). • Consistency between Criterion #3 and other criteria is unclear or incomplete. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Criterion has been fully met, but reviewer believes additional feedback would be helpful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of the bias reviewers are clear and complete. • The description of the bias orientation process is clear and complete. • The process for bias review of assessment items is clear and complete. • Results of a bias review are clear and complete. • Bias information provided for all standards (used for reporting). • Consistency between criterion #3 and other criteria is clear and complete.
<p>Criterion 4</p> <p>The assessments are at the appropriate level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No qualifications of the reviewers for appropriate level are provided. • No process for appropriate level review is described. • No results for the appropriate level review are provided. • Appropriate level information is not provided for any standards (used for reporting). • No consistency between Criterion #4 and other criteria is found. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of the reviewers for appropriate level are unclear or incomplete. • Process for appropriate level review is unclear or incomplete. • Results of the appropriate level review are unclear or incomplete. • Appropriate level information is provided only for some standards (used for reporting). • Consistency between Criterion #4 and other criteria is unclear or incomplete. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Criterion has been fully met, but reviewer believes additional feedback would be helpful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of the reviewers for appropriate level are clear and complete. • Process for appropriate level review is clear and complete. • Results of the appropriate level review are clear and complete. • Appropriate level information is provided for all standards (used for reporting) • Consistency between Criterion #4 and other criteria is clear and complete.

DISTRICT ASSESSMENT PORTFOLIO RUBRIC 2007--2008

6 Quality Assessment Criteria	Not Met	Needs Improvement	Met with Comment	Met
<p>Criterion 5</p> <p>There is consistency of scoring.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No qualifications of the reliability process participants are provided. • No appropriate process for calculating reliability is described. • No reliability value is provided. (Minimum level of acceptable reliability is .70, mean or median, averaged across all standards.) • No procedure for improving reliability is provided. • Reliability is not reported for any standards (used for reporting). • No consistency between Criterion #5 and other criteria is found. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of the reliability process participants are unclear or incomplete. • Appropriate process for calculating reliability is unclear or incomplete. • Reliability value provided but calculations are below the minimum acceptable level. (Minimum level of acceptable reliability is .70, mean or median, averaged across all standards.) • Procedure for improving reliability is unclear or incomplete. • Reliability is reported for only some standards (used for reporting). • Consistency between Criterion #5 and other criteria is unclear or incomplete. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Criterion has been fully met, but reviewer believes additional feedback would be helpful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications of the reliability process participants are clear and complete. • Appropriate process for reliability is clear and complete. • Reliability value provided and calculations are at or above the minimum acceptable level. (Minimum level of acceptable reliability is .70, mean or median, averaged across all standards.) • Procedure for improving reliability is clear and complete. • Reliability is reported for all standards (used for reporting). • Consistency between Criterion #5 and other criteria is clear and complete.
<p>Criterion 6</p> <p>The mastery levels are appropriately set.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No qualifications for mastery level participants are provided. • No evidence of mastery level process is provided. • No results of the mastery level process are provided. • Mastery level information is not provided for any of the standards (used for reporting). • No consistency between Criterion #6 and other criteria is found. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications for mastery level participants are unclear or incomplete. • Evidence of a mastery level process is unclear or incomplete. • Results of the mastery level process are unclear or incomplete. • Mastery level information is provided for only some of the standards (used for reporting). • Consistency between Criterion #6 and other criteria is unclear or incomplete. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Criterion has been fully met, but reviewer believes additional feedback would be helpful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualifications for mastery level participants are clear or complete. • Evidence of mastery level process is clear or complete. • Results of the mastery level process are clear and complete. • Mastery level information is provided for all standards (used for reporting). • Consistency between criterion #6 and other criteria is clear and complete.