

The development and implementation of rubrics as an assessment component of the new undergraduate major in Special Education

A Capstone Project by
Dr. Richard Kiefer-O'Donnell
For the Faculty Certification I from the
MnSU CETL
April, 2005

Purpose of presentation

- Overview steps being taken to develop and implement a rubric infrastructure within the new Undergraduate Major in Special Education
- Emphasize role of the assessment tool in the overall process, as opposed to just displaying individual examples
- “Work in progress....”

Why rubrics?

- Major component of the assessment system for new undergraduate major is through practical experience activities, done individually or by pairs of students.
- Rubric format fits at least 3 types of assignments: interview reports, analysis of Special Education documents, and direct observation of crucial role activities of teachers.
- This is first step of a series of tasks that will lead to use of rubrics by instructors and peers as part of an assessment portfolio system for the major.

Short and long-term activities (already completed related to this task)

- Short-term (completed)
 1. ID assignments across the 9 courses that potentially should employ a rubric grading structure
 2. Categorize and group assignments to find core set of rubrics for the major that then would be individualized for the specific student task.
 3. Develop core rubrics (3)
 1. Defined characteristics
 2. Broad scale (percentage of overall points)
 3. Specific anchors (descriptive of outcome or quality expected at each level)

Short and long-term activities

(in process, done by the end of the summer)

- Long-term (in process and this summer)
 1. Individualize core rubric for specific assignments and employ
 2. Link rubric assessment to e-portfolio infrastructure (also under development)
 3. Modify specific rubric to allow peer review element to each (25% of overall grade – 10% of peer's grade/15% for completion of rubric on peer's work)
 4. Integrate modified rubric into e-portfolio infrastructure.

Pre-project activities and elements

- Analysis of assessment activities in nine course syllabi and assessments (4 core Special Education courses and 5 specialty courses in Development/Cognitive Disabilities)
- 2:3 ratio for student assessment
 - 200 points traditional examination-based assessment
 - 300 points for successful completion of project and service learning activities
- Shared field experience for cohort courses to permit quality implementation of project and service learning activities in schools and community.

Ten student projects targeted for core rubric development

- Four interviews of professionals and parents of students with disabilities
- Three document reviews
- Three direct observations conducted by students

Other service learning and guided practice teaching (pre-student teaching) may be added later.

Suggested Rubric Format

Format and elements suggested by T. Pellett

- Focus on the targeted outcomes from the instruction.
- Start with checklist format and move to one that has multiple anchored descriptors of student performance.
- Each level of performance is defined (within the cell) rather than broad scale-anchors alone
- Explore multiple application of rubric format to promote continuity of grading across related activities and courses.

See rubrics presentation by Tracey Pellett
during the January 2005

Professional Development Day presentation

<http://www.mnsu.edu/humanres/profdev/handouts/assessmentworkshop11205.ppt>

Sample Rubric: Interviews

Trait format, with 4 major areas of concern

- Preparation and planning
- Implementation
- Summary of interview
- Analysis and linkage to course-based content (instructional and service methods)

Interviews: Trait Category 1 (20%)

- Preparation and planning
 1. Identification of critical role activities and issues
 2. Translation of roles and issues into relevant questions
 3. Sequencing of questions
 4. "Wordsmith'ing" of questions to ensure clarity

Interviews: Trait Category 2 (20%)

- Implementation
 1. Identification of professional or family member
 2. Scheduling of interview
 3. Length of interview
 4. Signed confidentiality statement

Interviews: Trait Category 3 (20%)

- Summary of interview
 1. Documentation of actual responses
 2. Accurate summation of individual responses
 3. Summation of overall interview including context, role, process, length and goals.

Interviews: Trait Category 4 (40%)

- Analysis and linkage to course-based content (instructional and service methods)
 1. Summary of findings that agree with practices suggested through courses
 2. Summary of findings that contradict with practices suggested through courses
 3. Suggest possible reasons for this variation
 4. Identification of barriers or challenges
 5. Identification of resources
 6. Recommendations for problem resolution

Part Four of the Interview Rubric

D. Analysis and linkage to course-based content (instructional and service methods) (40%)	Score	Unsatisfactory 40%	Basic 60%	Satisfactory 80%	Exemplary 100%
1. Summary of findings that agree with practices suggested through courses	/5	Inaccurately, or grossly under-summarizes or fails to summarize info. gathered	Makes some errors in summary of info.	Accurately summarizes basic info. gathered	Summarizes info. in accurate and highly insightful ways
2. Summary of findings that contradict with practices suggested through courses		/5	Inaccurately, or grossly under-summarizes or fails to summarize info. gathered	Makes some errors in summary of info.	Accurately summarizes basic info. gathered

Part Four of the Interview Rubric

D. Analysis and linkage to course-based content (instructional and service methods) (40%)	Score	Unsatisfactory 40%	Basic 60%	Satisfactory 80%	Exemplary 100%
3. Suggest possible reasons for this variation	/8	Fails to address in report statement of variation as a problem or clearly misinterprets results of interview and targets wrong problem area.	Suggests only those basic or very obvious school problems	Suggests logical and real school or personnel problems to a level at least slightly beyond that identified by the interviewee.	Clearly and succinctly identifies real problems or sources to the variations; shows insight in doing so.
4. Identification of barriers or challenges	/8	Failed to address in report or only marginally address school or personnel barriers or challenges that imbed change.	Suggests only those basic school or personnel supports or resources that barriers or challenges that imbed change.	Suggests logical school or personnel barriers or challenges that imbed change, going slightly beyond those recommended by interviewee	Demonstrates insight in the identification of school or personnel barriers or challenges that imbed change; well goes beyond the suggestions made during the interview

Part Four of the Interview Rubric

D. Analysis and linkage to course-based content (instructional and service methods) (40%)		Score	Unsatisfactory 40%	Basic 60%	Satisfactory 80%	Exemplary 100%
5. Identification of resources		/7	Failed to address in report or only marginally address school or personnel supports or resources that can be employed.	Suggests only those basic school or personnel supports or resources that can be employed	Suggests logical school or personnel supports or resources slightly beyond those recommended by interviewee	Demonstrates insight in the identification of school or personnel resources; well goes beyond the suggestions made during the interview
6. Recommendations for problem resolution		/10	Failed to address in report or only marginally address alternatives to identified needs or problems.	Suggests only those recommendations made by the parent or professional	Suggests logical alternatives slightly beyond those recommended by interviewee.	Demonstrates insight and creativity in linkage of effective practices in the resolution of problems
Overall Score		/100	Total items that were scored as Unsatisfactory /17	Total items that were scored as Basic /17	Total items that were scored as Satisfactory /17	Total items that were scored as Exemplary /17

Next steps

- Finalize each of the 3 core rubrics
- Adapt for Spreadsheet application (automated scoring)
- Adapt for HTML form application (scoring and posting on web)
- Test within a sample e-Folio site; revise as needed
- Incorporate into the targeted courses
- For more information, contact Richard Kiefer-O'Donnell at richard.kiefer-odonnell@mnsu.edu